



**ACADEMIC COUNCIL**  
MINUTES  
MEETING OF TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2015

**Present:**

Deborah Saucier (Acting Chair)  
Nawal Ammar  
Chantelle Bishop  
Carla Cesaroni  
Nicole Charewicz  
Greg Crawford  
Becky Dinwoodie  
Pamela Drayson  
Mikael Eklund  
Shanti Fernando  
Cheryl Foy  
Brenda Gamble  
Mark Green

Janette Hughes  
Ferdinand Jones  
Matthew H. Kaye  
Hossam Kishawy  
Brent Lewis (*via teleconference*)  
Susan McGovern  
Kimberly Nugent  
Michael Owen  
Diana Petrarca  
Namdar Saniei  
Tarlochan Sidhu  
Ed Waller

**Guests:**

Tara Ashley  
Kristen Boujos  
Olivia Petrie  
Niall O'Halloran  
Robert Weaver

**Regrets:**

Tim McTiernan (Chair)  
Reem Ali  
Nadim Arafa  
Robert Bailey  
Perrin Beatty  
Christopher Collins  
Tirtha Dhar  
Craig Elliott  
Franco Gaspari  
Brad MacIsaac  
Miguel Vargas Martin  
Lennart Nacke  
Otto Sanchez

**1. Call to Order**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

**2. Agenda**

The Agenda was approved as presented.

### **3. Chair's Remarks**

D. Saucier was Acting Chair in T. McTiernan's absence and made some remarks on his behalf. She congratulated Dr. Brent Lewis on his retirement and thanked him for his leadership and all of the contributions he made during his time at UOIT. She wished him the best going forward. The Chair then thanked everyone for their participation in convocation. She noted it was very successful and was a great opportunity to meet the students. The Chair also remarked that differentiation seems to be key when it comes to obtaining program approval.

### **4. Minutes of the Meeting of May 19, 2015**

Upon a motion duly brought by N. Ammar and seconded by T. Sidhu, the Minutes were approved as presented.

### **5. Business Arising from the Minutes**

E. Waller addressed international student caps in Graduate Studies, an issue that was raised at the last meeting. He confirmed that there are hard caps on international graduate student admissions. The target should be to reach within 10% of the cap (either under or over) and once reached, that is the starting point for discussions. On a weekly basis, all faculties should know where they stand on enrolment. Faculties are advised when they get close to meeting their target or if it appears as though they will be short of the target. If the faculty aims to overshoot international targets, Graduate Studies will ask the faculty for a priority list of students. He advised that strategic enrolment management is fluid – a target is set, which is an estimate of how many students the university can take domestically and internationally. There is a fairly high international demand. If a program is going to overshoot the target for international graduate students, the university wants to ensure there is a reasonable amount of funding available to those students. He advised that there should be informed discussions with Deans when close to exceeding targets and that a request for a meeting should be made to Graduate Studies. It was further discussed that the responsible Dean has to be on board with exceeding a target and accept fiscal responsibility for the decision. Consideration should also be given to whether the enrolment aligns with the university's strategy. Faculties must take into consideration student funding, space and resource limitations when considering exceeding enrolment targets. It was suggested that the discussion be continued when the new Dean of Graduate Studies starts and that the university should improve communication of the international graduate student admission process to faculties.

### **6. Inquiries and Communications**

There were none.

### **7. Provost's Remarks**

The Provost congratulated everyone on a great convocation. She also expressed excitement about the new Dean of Graduate Studies, Dr. Langis Roy, starting soon and Dr. Robert Bailey starting on July 1. She provided an update on the recruitment of a new Dean of Health Sciences and emphasized the confidentiality of the process.

## 8. Committee Reports

### 8.1.1 Executive Committee

There was no discussion.

### 8.1.2 Nomination of COU Academic Colleague

The Chair advised that the current COU Academic Colleague's term is coming to an end and the Council must nominate and elect a COU Academic Colleague for the upcoming year. She reviewed the report on the COU Academic Colleague with Council members.

*(M. Green left the meeting)*

The Council discussed the past practice of selecting the COU Academic Colleague and whether it was an election process. There was a general consensus that the process should be formalized. The Council also discussed whether there should be an open election process for the position. It was noted that an open election might present difficulties because a non-AC member would then be invited to attend AC meetings in order to facilitate communication. It was suggested that M. Green's term as COU Academic Colleague be renewed for 1 year only and that the alternate would be the intended replacement to take over the position at the end of M. Green's term. This would provide the alternate with a year to be mentored by M. Green and become familiar with the COU procedures.

MOTION CARRIED *On a motion, that Academic Council appoint Mark Green as COU Academic Colleague for an amended term of one (1) year expiring on June 30, 2016.*

*(M. Green returned to the meeting)*

### 8.1.3 Academic Council Governance Work Plan

C. Foy presented the AC Governance Plan 2015-2016, providing an overview of governance priorities for the upcoming year.

She discussed the By-Law Review Project, explaining that several inconsistencies between the UOIT Act, By-Law and Academic Handbook have been found. The project team will benchmark the By-Law against those of other institutions. She also advised that a vote to approve a revised By-Law will require a two-thirds majority of the Board. The By-Law Review working group will provide updates to AC throughout the review process. C. Foy also discussed the process for appointing AC members to the working group.

**8.2 Curriculum and Program Review Committee (CPRC)**

**8.2.1 Faculty of Business and Information Technology (FBIT) – New Bachelor of Information Technology Pathway (CSTU)**

Given the success of other pathway programs with Durham College, FBIT proposed a new pathway program. A member asked whether there was any information or evidence available on the success of Pathways programs. A member commented that there is evidence of success, but it was not on hand. Anecdotally, D. Petrarca stated that the Faculty of Education has had Pathways students enter additional programs at UOIT.

MOTION CARRIED *On a motion, that Academic Council approve the major program modification to the Bachelor of Information Technology – Computer Systems Diploma (CSTU) program.*

**8.2.2 Faculty of Education – Bachelor of Education (16-month program)**

Two minor program adjustments were presented to Council for information. There were no questions.

**8.2.3 Records Management Policy**

The CPRC provided its support for the approval of the Records Management Policy by the Board of Governors.

**8.3 Graduate Studies Committee (GSC)**

**8.3.1 Graduate Studies Regulations – Amendments**

E. Waller explained that the requested amendment was the removal of a sentence that contradicted a previous change to transfer credits in the calendar.

MOTION CARRIED *On a motion, that Academic Council approve the changes to section 3.5.9 of the Graduate Academic Calendar as proposed in the attached documentation.*

**8.3.2 Records Management Policy**

The GSC provided its support for the approval of the Records Management Policy by the Board of Governors.

**8.4 Admissions and Scholarship Committee**

**8.4.1 Change to Major Entrance Scholarships**

The Chair advised that since 2003, there has been no change in the dollar amount of major undergraduate scholarships. Accordingly, scholarships have not been keeping pace with tuition increases. The approved scholarship increases will now allow scholarships to cover tuitions.

#### 8.4.2 Update on Major Award Recipients

The Chair reviewed the report with the Council. There were no questions or comments on this item.

#### 8.4.3 Update on 2015 Graduates

The Chair reviewed the report with the Council. There were no questions or comments on this item.

### 9. Records Management Policy (RMP)

C. Foy started by thanking N. O'Halloran for doing the bulk of the work on drafting and revising the policy, as well as the consultation. She also acknowledged G. Harvel as having contributed greatly to the policy. She pointed out that it's a compliance policy, but it is only one piece of how the university manages information. During the policy process, additional questions arose on how to govern information. She confirmed that there is a larger information governance project in place to address the other issues raised (e.g. Document Scanning Policy). Research records make up a big piece of the RMP and it also governs records that have administrative or financial aspects to them. If a record is pure research or data, RMP does not govern it. She then reviewed the next steps of the project and informed Council that the RMP was discussed at the Research Board twice.

The question was raised as to whether the RMP applies to teaching materials and/or class assignments. C. Foy confirmed that those records are included in the RMP and questions pertaining to those records will be addressed when developing the Retention Schedule. The Retention Schedule for teaching materials and classroom assignments will be consistent across faculties. The Chair remarked that the university currently has inconsistent practices across faculties and wants to standardize the practices, as well as provide the faculties with guidance. If a faculty has a compelling reason to deviate from the Retention Schedule, then an exemption would be considered. The retention of records must also be compliant with related regulations. The intention is for the Retention Schedule to be a one-stop shop to get answers on how long to retain records and it will be made available on the university's website.

MOTION CARRIED *On a motion, that Academic Council approved the following:*

*WHEREAS UOIT is preparing a Records Management Policy ("Policy") within the context of a Records Management Project ("Project");*

*WHEREAS the Policy is considered a compliance policy under the Policy Framework;*

*WHEREAS due to the broad scope of the Policy and its administrative implications, the following bodies have been consulted: Research Board ("RB"), Provost's Advisory Committee on Integrated Planning, Curriculum and Program Review Committee ("CPRC"), Graduate Studies Committee ("GSC"), and Policy Advisory Committee;*

*WHEREAS three Academic Council Committees (CPRC, GSC, and RB) have reviewed and commented on the Policy and their comments have been addressed either within the Policy or as part of the Project, such that they have formally indicated support for the Policy;*

*NOW THEREFORE the Academic Council provides its support for the Policy and recommends the approval of the Records Management Policy by the Board of Governors.*

## **10. Other Business**

### **10.1 Academic Council Meeting Schedule**

M. Green brought the issue to Council. He remarked that he has been on AC for over a decade and has noted the level of discussion has decreased substantially over the years. He pointed out that there are usually more information items on the agenda than discussion/approval items. The result is a decrease in engagement of Council members. Further, he commented that materials are presented over the course of several meetings, rather than at one meeting. This is less effective and makes it difficult down the road to determine how approvals were reached. He surveyed 21 universities and determined that most universities meet between 8-10 times per year. He asked the question as to whether UOIT needs to meet 10 times a year. He also suggested that perhaps a joint meeting with the Board would be helpful. It was also proposed to have one meeting per year in a classroom to present FOR INFORMATION items and make it open to the school. This format might help with recruiting AC members. Another suggestion was the Star System - if an agenda item has an asterisk, it is assumed the material should only be read and not discussed.

There was general discussion by Council regarding whether AC should change the number of meetings held or restructure the meeting format. A member commented that if the number of meetings is reduced, it could delay certain items getting approved, particularly if amendments are required out of AC discussions. Further, delays could significantly affect undergraduate/graduate programs. It would also make it difficult to synchronize program changes for September. It was also noted that AC meetings are already public and it would be difficult to advertise the information meeting as public due to room and space limitations. Another member commented that she enjoys attending the meetings because it creates a sense of community. The general consensus was to maintain the current number of meetings.

It was suggested that all information items be included at the end of the agenda. If anyone wants to discuss one of the information items, it should be raised at the beginning of the meeting. This would help make meetings more efficient. C. Foy suggested that we could add an agenda item called "FOR CONSULTATION or DISCUSSION".

### **10.2 Policy Framework**

C. Foy answered a question regarding the availability of policies on the website. She advised that N. Jagar is working on providing guidelines as to when policies will be reviewed. Her office is also developing a protocol on who can post/remove policies from the website. An archive of policies that were posted should also be created. M. Kaye noted inconsistencies between paper/web versions of documents (e.g. – Academic Calendar Mission/Vision differ from that of website). The search engine on the website is not sophisticated and sometimes directs a user to

outdated webpages. It was agreed that until the website is updated, a best practice is to go to the originating department for a policy document.

**11. Colleagues' Exchange**

There was none.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

---

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary