



ACADEMIC COUNCIL

MINUTES

MEETING OF TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2016

Present:

Tim McTiernan (Chair)
Reem Ali
Robert Bailey
Chantelle Bishop
Taylor Collins
Maurice DiGiuseppe
Becky Dinwoodie
Pamela Drayson (*via teleconference*)
Mikael Eklund
Cheryl Foy
Brenda Gamble
Mark Green

Ferdinand Jones
Lori Livingston
Qusay Mahmoud
Kimberly Nugent
Michael Owen
Langis Roy
Namdar Saniei
Hannah Scott
Mahmoud Shaaban
Tarlochan Sidhu
Kamal Smimou
Miguel Vargas Martin

Guests:

Liqun Cao
Hendrick de Haan
Kimberley McCartney-Young
Jennifer Percival
Olivia Petrie
Shirley Van Nuland

Regrets:

Nawal Ammar
Perrin Beatty
Christopher Collins
Greg Crawford
Craig Elliott
Hossam Gaber
Franco Gaspari
Sharon Lauricella
Brad MacIsaac
Susan McGovern
Pamela Ritchie
Deborah Saucier

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

2. Agenda

The Agenda was approved as presented.

3. Chair's Remarks

The Chair remarked that the students are working intensely as we approach the end of the school year. Recruitment is underway with offers sent out for next year. He noted the intense competition that exists with other GTA institutions.

He reminded Council of the Open House coming up on Saturday, February 27, which is always an exciting and dynamic event. He also spoke about ACE's Beach Day and how ACE is increasingly being used by students in a variety of capacities. It is an excellent example of how ACE can be incorporated into student life at the institution.

The Chair also reported on the recent advancement event sponsored by Adele Imrie, a member of the Board of Governors, which had a tremendous turnout. He informed Council that there were a number of alumni there and they acted as excellent ambassadors for the university. The success of our alumni demonstrates the good work of our faculty.

We are also entering the season of federal and provincial budgets and we will be closely monitoring the impacts on infrastructure, student support, etc.

4. Minutes of the Meeting of January 19, 2016

H. Scott asked that the minutes reflect that she raised the question regarding the university keeping syllabi permanently under the Records Classification and Retention Schedule (RCRS).

The minutes were approved as amended.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

Further to last month's discussion regarding the FIPPA references in the RCRS, M. Eklund advised that CAUT issued a good statement on FIPPA and Records Management and he will forward it to the Secretariat.

6. Inquiries and Communications

6.1 Chancellor Update

The Chair confirmed the good news of N. Taylor accepting the appointment as UOIT's next Chancellor. Her installation will likely take place on May 4 and will be held at Regent Theatre. The Secretariat will keep AC updated as the event details unfold. He spoke about N. Taylor's passion for the university and her legacy connection. He also advised that there will be an opportunity to acknowledge P. Beatty for his advocacy for the university in his role as Chancellor.

6.2 2015 Teaching Awards

R. Bailey was pleased to publicly acknowledge the recipients of the 2015 Teaching Awards. He reviewed the names of the award winners with Council and offered his congratulations.

7. Provost's Remarks

There were none as the Provost was not in attendance.

8. Committee Reports

8.1 Executive Committee

8.1.1 Governance

a) Contract Management Framework & Policy

The Chair invited C. Foy to speak to the Contract Management Framework. She reviewed the work done to date on the framework and policy. It began as a legal review of contracts and developed into guidance as to when legal advice should be consulted.

She invited comments on the policy and procedures. C. Foy reviewed the purpose of the framework, including the protection of the university by establishing a diligence framework. She reviewed how the policy pieces fit together. She also noted that one of the things N. O'Halloran is working on is establishing a contract database, beginning with research services.

She provided an overview of the key policy and procedure elements, including the roles of the Contract Authority and Contract Implementer. She confirmed that a legal review results in an opinion identifying the risks associated with signing a contract.

There was a brief discussion regarding the types of contracts entered into by Research. M. Owen confirmed they enter into at least 100 contracts a year.

C. Foy also addressed a question regarding whether implementation of the framework will possibly result in a delay in getting contracts approved. She advised that Legal Counsel are developing template contracts for each area. Using a template will exempt contracts from review. She advised there are approximately 40 templates prepared. One of the purposes of developing templates is to permit independence with contracts. Establishing thresholds will mean that certain contracts will not have to be sent for legal review and will result in saving time. The turnaround time for contracts will also depend on the availability of resources.

C. Foy advised that the framework is also intended to make people aware of the timelines required to ensure Legal has sufficient time to review the contract prior to when required.

M. Owen clarified the contractual relationship between Tri-Agencies, the institution and the faculty member/student. If a contract between a sponsor and the institution involves the research of a faculty member/student, they will have the faculty member/student sign an acknowledgment of the obligations contained in the contract.

There was also discussion regarding the approval process of templates.

b) Legal Review of Contracts Procedures

Discussed together with the Contract Management Framework and Policy above.

c) Safe Disclosure Policy and Procedures

C. Foy reminded Council members that this was discussed at Council a couple of years ago. This policy developed out of the Whistleblower Policy, which focuses on financial matters. The practices and policies of other universities were reviewed and several other institutions refer to it as a Safe Disclosure Policy. UOIT is proposing to adopt this language as it conveys less stigma.

She reviewed the policy's consultation path and advised that she worked in consultation with C. Elliott and M. Lapp to develop the policy. She highlighted the key policy elements and noted that this policy supplements the existing paths for complaints. She emphasized that it is an early dispute resolution mechanism. It was also developed in response to the extension of the Ontario Ombudsman's jurisdiction over universities starting on January 1, 2016.

She confirmed that two Board Committees will have jurisdiction under the policy – Audit and Finance over financial complaints and Governance, Nominations and Human Resources for non-financial complaints.

H. Scott expressed concern relating to the provision for confidentiality but not anonymity and the protection offered a complainant against reprisal. She commented that the path of reporting is unclear after the immediate supervisor.

C. Foy clarified that this policy would not apply to sexual harassment complaints, which will be dealt with in a separate policy and procedures. The Safe Disclosure Policy was designed to address primarily policy violations. She also advised there will be a separate investigation procedure. C. Foy invited suggestions for improving the protections set out against reprisal.

It was also suggested to change the language in s. 10.1 so that disciplinary action is not mandatory. C. Foy advised there will be a rigorous investigation into the validity of an allegation. She also reviewed the definition of "Good Faith Disclosure". M. Eklund also commented that the related procedures section in the policy should refer to Collective Agreements.

On a motion, that Academic Council recommend:

- i) the Safe Disclosure Policy to the Board for approval; and*
- ii) the Safe Disclosure Procedures to the Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee for approval.*

d) Appointment of Delegate to Graduate Studies Committee

B. Dinwoodie informed Academic Council of B. MacIsaac's appointment of K. Boujos as his delegate to the Graduate Studies Committee pursuant to the terms set out in the Academic Council Handbook.

e) Appointment of Temporary Replacements to Academic Council

B. Dinwoodie advised Academic Council that as a result of class scheduling conflicts, Carla Cesaroni and Franco Gaspari requested the appointment of temporary replacements to AC

MOTION
CARRIED

during their period of absence. She explained the process by which the temporary replacements, Liqun Cao and Helene LeBlanc, were selected.

H. Scott expressed concern at the apparent delay in the temporary appointments, as well as the vacancies created on Academic Council Executive Committee (ACX) as a result of the class conflicts.

MOTION
CARRIED

On a motion, that Academic Council appoint Helene LeBlanc and Liqun Cao as the temporary replacements for Franco Gaspari and Carla Cesaroni, respectively, for the duration of the term.

f) Proposal for New Committee of Academic Council

R. Bailey reported on the proposal for establishing an Elected Members Committee of Academic Council. He advised that ACX has the responsibility and authority for recommending the creation of a new Academic Council committee.

While ACX understood the stimulus behind the proposal, the proposal for the Elected Members Committee was not supported by ACX because the current governance structure is sufficient to meet Academic Council's needs and there are other tools available to address the issues raised.

He reminded Council that any members of Council are free to meet prior to a meeting to discuss agenda issues. Further, if a council member feels he/she has not had adequate time to process material, the member is able to table a motion to defer the matter to allow further time for consideration.

R. Bailey confirmed that the Terms of Reference for Academic Council's standing committees are under review. Some of the options being considered are: elected chairs of Committees, and elections for the faculty representatives on committees. He welcomed Academic Council members to provide their input.

He also pointed out how this forum could have increased involvement by following the rules of order, by having a speaker's list, or having an open President's/Provost's question section.

H. Scott commented that Academic Council requires training on how to bring a motion or how to get an item on the agenda. She also stated that it is difficult to organize the elected members due to the number of them and the difficulty mobilizing people when there is an unofficial structure.

R. Bailey invited her to send him her ideas to improve Council's processes. He clarified that ACX functions as a Committee, not as factions of elected/unelected members. He confirmed that ACX was the appropriate forum for the discussion of the proposal.

C. Foy noted that she felt that H. Scott's comments regarding the Orientation training had been inaccurate as Orientation does include training on procedural matters such as motions and agenda-setting. She noted that those participating in Orientation have been asked for their feedback on Orientation and no comments/suggestions as to how to improve it were given.

M. Eklund commented that he appreciates having the discussion on how processes can be improved.

The Chair remarked that having engaged discussions at Council is good for the institution and good for Council.

8.2 Curriculum and Program Review Committee* (R. Bailey)

8.2.1 Office of the Registrar

a) New Academic Standing Category – Program Dismissal

R. Bailey reviewed the proposal for the new academic standing category. The new category permits the university to remove a student from a program without removing them from the university.

MOTION CARRIED *On a motion, that Academic Council approve the new academic standing category: Program Dismissal.*

b) Academic Standing Clarification – Dismissal

R. Bailey advised that this change makes dismissal permanent, subject to the discretion of the Dean.

MOTION CARRIED *On a motion, that Academic Council approve the clarification to the definition of Dismissal.*

c) Revision to the Program Change Process and Corresponding Calculation of Cumulative Grade Point Average

R. Bailey reviewed the proposal. The change will result in the GPA calculation for the program a student is currently in would not include courses with the grade of D or lower from a previous program. H. Scott expressed concern that students transferring into a program with a C average would be disadvantaging those with genuine C averages. M. Green commented that without this change, students in a new program must excel in order to recover from D’s on their record and are disadvantaged. J. Percival confirmed that the change levels the playing field for our existing students.

R. Bailey clarified that this applies only to D grades received in a previous program. R. Bailey also confirmed that the D will remain on a student’s transcript but will not be calculated in their CGPA. This can be done in Blackboard.

MOTION CARRIED *On a motion, that Academic Council approve the revision to the Program change regulation such that courses from the former program with a D grade or lower will not be included in the GPA calculation for the new program.*

8.2.2 For Information:

R. Bailey directed Council to the informational items.

- a) Office of the Registrar - Minor Amendments to the Undergraduate Academic Calendar
- b) Office of the Registrar - Academic Suspension Process – Addition of a Remediation Option
- c) University Secretary and General Counsel – Records Disposition Procedure and Records Classification and Retention Schedule
- d) Faculty of Science - Bachelor of Science, Chemistry – Minor Program Adjustment

8.3 Graduate Studies Committee

8.3.1 Graduate Studies Regulations – Amendments

L. Roy spoke to the amendments to the Graduate Studies Regulations. He advised that the amendments were brought about by the erosion of the quality of experience of a student's defense. We want to ensure that at that important moment, the student has a memorable experience. Previously, there was no limitation on the number of people who could attend remotely. The change sets the maximum number of remote attendees at two. There are exceptions for programs designed to be online.

L. Roy clarified that it applies to both Master's degrees and PhDs and there is nothing preventing a faculty from making the attendance requirements even more restrictive. H. Scott commented that it is disappointing that this must be explicitly addressed through a policy. B. Gamble added that there are situations requiring individuals to attend remotely.

On a motion, that Academic Council approve the changes to section 3.8.4.5 of the Graduate Academic Calendar as proposed in the attached documentation.

8.3.2 For Information

L. Roy reviewed the informational items.

- (a) Records Classification and Retention Schedule
- (b) Graduate Diploma in Accounting – Minor Program Adjustment
- (c) Graduate Annual Curriculum Reports of Faculty Councils for 2015

9. Conferral of Degrees for Fall 2015 Term

On a motion, that Academic Council authorize the granting of degrees to those students who have fulfilled all degree requirements at the end of the Fall term 2015 and who have been recommended for graduation by the Faculty.

10. Other Business

None.

11. Colleagues' Exchange

None.

MOTION
CARRIED

The meeting was terminated at 4:15 p.m.

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary

*Documents attached (A) Approval (C) Consultation (D) Discussion
(I) Information (P) Presentation (R) Recommend for approval

DRAFT