



ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MINUTES
MEETING OF TUESDAY, MAY 17, 2016

Present:

Tim McTiernan (Chair)
Reem Ali
Nawal Ammar
Chantelle Bishop
Carla Cesaroni
Christopher Collins
Greg Crawford (*via teleconference*)
Becky Dinwoodie
Maurice DiGiuseppe
Pamela Drayson (*via teleconference*)
Craig Elliott
Mikael Eklund (*via teleconference*)
Franco Gaspari
Mark Green

Lori Livingston
Brad MacIsaac
Michael Owen
Langis Roy
Namdar Saniei
Deborah Saucier
Hannah Scott
Mahmoud Shaaban
Kamal Smimou
Miguel Vargas Martin

Guests:

Kristen Boujos
Krista Hester
Nichole Molinaro
Olivia Petrie
Shirley Van Nuland

Regrets:

Robert Bailey
Taylor Collins
Cheryl Foy
Hossam Gaber
Brenda Gamble
Ferdinand Jones
Sharon Lauricella
Qusay Mahmoud
Susan McGovern
Kimberly Nugent
Pamela Ritchie
Tarlochan Sidhu
Noreen Taylor

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

2. Agenda

The Chair advised that item 11.1 will be deferred and will be considered at a later date together with related policies concerning conduct. He also informed Council that there is no CPRC report this month as the Committee due to lack of quorum at the last meeting.

The Agenda was approved as amended.

3. Chair's Remarks

The Chair discussed the installation of the new Chancellor and how it was a great event in the life of the University. The Chancellor is already engaged and active in the life of the University and he looks forward to seeing her at Convocation and other events going forward.

4. Minutes of the Meeting of April 19, 2016

The Minutes were approved as presented.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

B. Dinwoodie clarified that the term of faculty members on Academic Council runs from July 1 – June 30 and for student members from September 1 – August 31.

6. Inquiries and Communications

The Chair asked M. Green to deliver his COU report. It was his last report as the COU Academic Colleague. He has been involved with the COU for 11 years. He reported on the recent presentation regarding COU's new strategic communications. The impetus for the plan is that colleges are doing a good job of marketing the message that a college education is better at securing jobs for students. He discussed the relative spending of COU on annual advertising as compared to Colleges Ontario and how that influences the media.

He discussed the process used by the strategy group in developing its recommendations. He also discussed the proposed advertising slogan. COU is going to continue to consider the strategy and will think carefully about the message and how it will be communicated. It is important for universities to have a unified voice and to raise their public profile.

7. Provost's Remarks

The Provost advised Council of a situation with The Student Association at Durham College & UOIT (SA) and potential non-compliance with the SA's corporate articles. UOIT expressed the concerns regarding the potential breach to the SA and is awaiting a response before deciding on a course of action. The SA has a deadline within which to either become compliant or provide the rationale for the deviation from the articles. There was a discussion regarding the University's options in the event the SA is non-compliant. UOIT's position differed from that of Durham College's response. The Council also discussed the allegations regarding the recent SA election.

8. New Building Plan

The Chair invited D. Saucier to deliver a presentation on the new building. D. Saucier reviewed the options that will be presented to the Board for approval, as well as the proposed costs of the building. She defined NASM (Net Assignable Square Metres) and clarified that the space accounted by elevator shafts and stairwells are not included. She advised that Durham College will be replacing the Simcoe Building and, as a result, we will be losing 800 NASMs. This will further reduce our NASMs below the COU recommended standard.

She provided an overview of the new building project's goals. We want flexible space that is easier to reconfigure as pedagogy changes and the institution's needs for space change. She emphasized that there is still space for the CARIE building. The proposed new building will be slightly smaller than the ERC building and will only be suitable for dry labs or classrooms. Encouraging people to use the crosswalks has been incorporated into the design of the building.

The addition of another building will allow us to increase FTEs and NASMs. She reviewed the proposed allocation of the new space and clarified that the allocation applies to only the first 2 floors. She discussed the building options that were considered and why this option was preferred. She provided Council with the project timeline. It will be a fast build and will allow us to make significant gains in scheduling and improve student experience. The Board has approved the design phase and will be deciding whether to proceed with construction at the June meeting.

There was a discussion regarding whether UOIT will gain any space back when the new structure replacing the Simcoe Building is completed. There was also a discussion regarding how the construction of UOIT's new building will be funded. C. Elliott explained that it will be funded using the capital reserve.

D. Saucier answered questions regarding the building. She clarified that it was always part of the Campus Master Plan to start building on the north side of Conlin. The building will be LEED Silver at a minimum and sustainability will be an important feature. A concern was raised about the walking time between buildings. T. McTiernan answered questions regarding the plan for the CARIE building.

9. 2016-2017 Budget

The Chair invited D. Saucier to start the 2016-2017 budget presentation. She reviewed the role of Academic Council with respect to the budget and, in particular, the Academic Council Executive Committee. A commitment was made to deliver a budget presentation to Academic Council twice a year. She then invited C. Elliott to continue the presentation.

C. Elliott reviewed the resource allocation model and the 2015/16 budget process. The objective of resource allocation is to increase the amount of funds allocated to the academic side of the University. He gave an overview of the resource allocation to faculties. He went through the 2016-17 budget numbers and explained the concept of carry forwards. He advised that the University has reduced capital spending and is using contingency funds in order to balance the budget for next year.

C. Elliott discussed the University's restricted funds and explained why restricted funds are included in budget planning. He provided a comparison of the expense components by group in 2015-16 and 2016-17. C. Elliott answered questions regarding the capital related restricted funds and allocation of the surpluses.

D. Saucier provided an update on the achievements in 2015-2016 towards the strategic priorities. She also discussed the highlights for 2016-17 and the gains that will be made across the faculties. She reviewed the student to faculty ratios and presented the core performance targets. UOIT's NSSE scores are declining over time, which might be related to space and scheduling of classes. As the competition for students becomes fiercer in the GTA, we must ensure we continue to attract high quality undergraduate and graduate students.

She proposed setting up a budget information group composed of up to 2 members from each faculty. C. Elliott confirmed he is more than willing to discuss the budget in further detail with anyone who is interested.

C. Elliott answered questions regarding the estimated enrolment for 2016-17. B. MacIsaac discussed the percentage allocated to administrative costs at UOIT in comparison to other institutions.

(P. Drayson left the meeting at 4:21 p.m.)

The Chair invited members to contact C. Elliott offline with any further questions.

10. Committee Reports

10.1 Graduate Studies Committee

10.1.1 Doctor of Philosophy in Criminology and Social Justice – New Program Proposal

L. Roy summarized the rationale for the new program. The program is true to UOIT's commitment to interdisciplinary study and meets the standards of excellence one would expect. The program also meets the market needs for PhDs in this area. The proposal is financially sound as it builds on existing infrastructure. The initial intake will be 3 PhD students each year. The program also fits within the areas of institutional growth. T. McTiernan reminded Council that UOIT has an excellent reputation for the Masters in Criminology. N. Ammar added that she is looking forward to the work that will be done through the program.

MOTION *That Academic Council approve the proposed Doctor of Philosophy in Criminology and Social*
 CARRIED *Justice.*

10.2 Executive Committee

10.2.1 Academic Council Governance

a) Board By-Law Review Project Update

B. Dinwoodie provided Council with an update on the progress being made on the Board By-Law Review Project. The working group has met four times and completed a review of section 8 of the By-Law.

b) Appointment of CPRC Member

That pursuant to the nomination received from the Curriculum and Program Review Committee and the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and in accordance with the Curriculum and Program Review Committee's Terms of Reference, the Council hereby appoints the following faculty member to serve on the Curriculum and Program Review Committee as a temporary replacement for Kimberley Clow:

- *Alyson King, Faculty of Social Science and Humanities*

11. Other Business

None.

12. Colleagues' Exchange

The meeting was terminated at 4:33 p.m.

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary

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

MOTION
CARRIED