



**ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MINUTES
MEETING OF TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2016**

Present:

Tim McTiernan (Chair)
Reem Ali
Pietro-Luciano Buono
Carla Cesaroni
Greg Crawford
Brian Cutler
Becky Dinwoodie
Craig Elliott
Maurice DiGiuseppe
Pamela Drayson (*via teleconference*)
Mikael Eklund
Cheryl Foy
Hossam Gaber
Brenda Gamble
Andrew Hogue
Andrea Kirkwood
Hossam Kishawy

Sharon Lauricella
Lori Livingston
Brad MacIsaac
Qusay Mahmoud
Kimberly Nugent (*via teleconference*)
Michael Owen
Andre Pinsonnault
Pamela Ritchie (*via telconference*)
Langis Roy
Hannah Scott
Mahmoud Shaaban
Tarlochan Sidhu
Kamal Smimou
Victoria Smye

Guests:

Mariam Abonokerah
Kristen Boujos
Miles Bowman
Krista Hester
Ramiro Liscano
Olivia Petrie
Reina Rexhmataj

Regrets:

Robert Bailey
Mark Green
Susan McGovern
Mayur Patel
Deborah Saucier
Noreen Taylor

1. Call to Order

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

2. Agenda

Due to the large number of items on the agenda, the Chair suggested reordering several of the items. All of the items requiring approval from the Graduate Studies Committee, Executive Committee and the Conferral of Degrees for Fall 2016 will be considered following the Provost's Remarks. The presentation on budget assumptions will be after the election of the presidential search committee nominees, assuming sufficient time.

The agenda was approved as amended.

3. Chair's Remarks

In the interest of allowing additional time for discussion, the Chair kept his remarks brief. He congratulated the UOIT Women's Soccer Team for winning the OUA championship and taking the bronze in the national championship. He noted that the match they lost against Laval went into overtime and Laval went on to win the national championship.

4. Minutes of the Meeting of October 18, 2016

The Secretariat received notice of one correction – change of “above our funded targets” to “below our funded targets” in the enrolment planning section.

The Minutes were approved, as amended.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

None.

6. Inquiries and Communications

The Chair advised that a request was received from students to address Academic Council about the student sexual violence policy at today's meeting. He noted that there is no provision or procedure set out in the By-law or Academic Council Handbook to deal with requests for delegations. Although the request was received following the approval of the agenda by the Academic Council Executive Committee (ACX), the request was approved through e-mail by ACX and the delegation will present during this agenda item as “Communications to Council”.

6.1 COU Update

The Chair invited R. Liscano to provide Council with a COU update. R. Liscano confirmed that it is his first year as the COU Academic Colleague. He provided a brief overview of the function of COU. He advised that one of the major topics for discussion this year is to better communicate learning outcomes. He reported that at the last COU meeting, the Academic Colleagues also met with the COU Executive Heads. There was a discussion of experiential learning and how it requires training of faculty since it does not really form a part of faculty's career progression.

They also discussed how faculty members can help students appreciate all of the skills they have learned while at university and how to better articulate those skills to potential employers.

There was a major drive last year by COU to promote Ontario universities to Ontario residents. R. Liscano referred members to <http://ontariosuniversities.ca/>, which has a survey to be completed.

6.2 Delegation Regarding Sexual Violence Policy

The Chair invited R. Rexhmataj to speak to Council. R. Rexhmataj thanked Academic Council for approving her request to speak at the meeting. She informed Council that she has been involved in the working group on the policy on campus since May 2015. She discussed presenting her concerns at the last Board of Governors meeting and advised that since then, she has seen meaningful changes to the policy that take into account student feedback. She noted that the multiple drafts are evidence of the collaborative process.

While she was encouraged by these changes, she expressed her remaining concerns with the policy. She also presented the Chair of Academic Council with an open letter to Council (attached as “Appendix A”). The Chair confirmed receipt of the letter.

R. Rexhmataj proceeded to share her concerns, which included:

- lack of infrastructure on campus to address sexual violence;
- lack of clarity of the two policies & procedures at UOIT & Durham College;
- concern that bureaucracy of the process will deter survivors from coming forward;
- problem with support services – location, underfunding, counsellors are overbooked;

R. Rexhmataj referred to the resources available on campus – specifically, faculty who specialize in these areas. She also noted the resources available in the community to assist with victims of sexual violence. She referenced recommendations set out in an article with respect to policy best practices.

R. Rexhmataj introduced M. Abonokerah to speak to Council. M. Abonokerah presented her concerns with the policy, including unfriendly language contained in the policy. Further, there are certain points in the process where the survivor is not made aware of the status of the process.

The Chair thanked R. Rexhmataj and M. Abonokerah for presenting their concerns to Academic Council.

7. Provost’s Remarks

The Provost was absent.

8. Budget Assumptions

Deferred due to time constraints.

9. Policy on Sexual Violence for Students and Procedures for Responding to Incidents of Sexual Violence

T. McTiernan introduced the policy for discussion. He advised that there has been additional consultation and discussion on the drafts of this policy and the drafts have been modified as a result of the consultation. The university recognizes the importance of having a stand-alone policy that focuses on the survivors. The policy is now stand-alone and attempts to make it as clear as possible how to pursue a complaint.

There is a policy working group, which includes students. Student comments have also been collected online. There has been a request for adequate resources on campus and the university will be establishing as quickly as possible a "Safe Disclosure" office, which will relate to a broad range of issues. There is a legal obligation to review the policy annually and this commitment will be fulfilled by conducting an early review of the policy over the first 3 months of 2017.

The Chair invited M. Bowman to discuss the policy. M. Bowman provided a summary of the feedback received through the online forum. Some of the main themes of the comments included:

- lack of awareness of resources available;
- distinction between the policy and the implementation of it;
- desire to bring greater awareness to women & their vulnerability to sexual violence;
- improved communication;
- improved infrastructure for receiving students in crisis;
- desire for protection of members in the community; and
- more protections around rape shield.

M. Bowman then discussed the changes made to the policy after taking the feedback into consideration. He advised that the policy has been written taking into account the point of view of an individual interacting with the policy and allows the individual to choose how they are referred to (e.g. "survivor"). O. Petrie has already started working on developing the programming for implementing the policy. The plan is to provide an independent office to help deal with sexual violence cases. This office will provide a safe disclosure space and minimize an individual's contact with others.

In response to the concern about improved communication, there will be an independent sexual violence portal developed. Provisions in the policy have been added to allow support people to come into the safe disclosure space to provide translation services. There has been clarifying language added around reporting, which minimizes obligations but imposes positive pressure.

M. Bowman clarified that the version of the policy that was circulated to Academic Council was the same version that was posted online on November 8, which has been available since then.

M. Bowman responded to questions from Academic Council. There were concerns expressed regarding the language requiring a discloser to report it. There was also discussion regarding the ambiguity of who is responsible for implementing the policy. M. Bowman referred to section 25

of the policy, which will include a hyper-linked term that will allow individuals to directly reach out to the appropriate office.

In response to concerns raised about compliance with the relevant legislation, C. Foy advised that she has been working closely with M. Bowman and that the university has engaged outside counsel to review the policy and procedures to ensure compliance. Further, the Board will require compliance certification and C. Foy would not certify the policy without being confident that it is compliant.

There was a discussion regarding the type of training that will be provided for counsellors.

It was confirmed that the Student Code of Conduct will have to be amended to be consistent with the policy. A question was raised regarding the non-academic appeal process. It was encouraged that a decision of the Provost not be appealed to the Associate Provost due to the perceived conflict of interest. M. Bowman confirmed he is working on that piece together with legal counsel. As a matter of practice, the Provost has composed the Non-Academic Appeals Panel from members of the Academic Appeals Committee.

The Chair commented that the additional consultation over the past few weeks has been very valuable and reminded Council that the policy will be reviewed again in May by the Board. Further, the training of staff will be a priority.

A suggestion was made that paragraph 49 be updated with language that confirms that if a respondent chooses not to respond, it will not be interpreted as an admission of guilt.

MOTION CARRIED *That Academic Council recommend the Policy on Sexual Violence for Students and Procedures for Responding to Incidents of Sexual Violence for approval by the Board of Governors subject to minor amendments.*

M. Bowman asked H. Scott and M. Eklund to provide their written comments on the next draft of the policy document.

10. Policy and Procedures to Prevent and Respond to Violence, Harassment and Discrimination in the Workplace

C. Foy presented the policy and procedures to Academic Council. She confirmed that the plan is to address the other aspects of the violence-related policies in the Spring. Comments were received online that have been reflected in the redlined version of the policy documents that were circulated. They will be consulting the Joint Health and Safety Committee (JHSC) on Friday, as well.

A comment was made that since there is a stand-alone sexual violence policy for students, why isn't there a stand-alone policy for faculty, as well. Sexual violence requires a different set of resources and competencies and the current psychological services available on campus for faculty is minimal. Lack of resources and lack of infrastructure are a concern. C. Foy responded that is the purpose of the umbrella policy. Although there is a separate policy for students, it

does not preclude a member of faculty from seeking assistance through those resources. The stand-alone policy is meeting the university's legislative requirements. Further, the workplace violence policy documents include everything in the policy so that employees know where to go. Also, employees have access to resources that students don't (e.g. EAP program).

There was a question regarding the general violence umbrella policy and its status. T. McTiernan advised that a clear framework will be provided to show how all the pieces fit together.

There was a discussion regarding how sexual violence is a form of harassment as opposed to a form of violence. A request was made to have the policy reviewed by the JHSC and then be brought back to Council for recommendation. C. Foy clarified that the intent is to keep the policy and procedures open for review for the first 3 months of the new year.

A suggestion was made to strengthen the definition of "bullying". C. Foy confirmed that a definition of workplace bullying would be added.

C. Foy thanked Council members for their feedback and agreed to coordinate a special consultation session before the end of the month to obtain further input on the policy documents. With respect to the timing of approval, C. Foy advised that it is important for the Board to consider the policy and procedures for compliance purposes. She reiterated the commitment to review the policy again in early 2017.

11. Committee Reports

11.1 Curriculum and Program Review Committee

11.1.1 FOR INFORMATION

- (a) Faculty of Health Sciences - Bachelor of Health Science in Medical Laboratory Science – Minor Program Adjustment**
- (b) Faculty of Social Science and Humanities - Bachelor of Arts in Forensic Psychology – Minor Program Adjustment**
- (c) Faculty of Social Science and Humanities - Bachelor of Arts in Legal Studies – Minor Program Adjustment**

12. Graduate Studies Committee

12.1 Graduate Studies Regulations – Amendments – discussed following the Sexual Violence delegation

(a) Appointment of Supervisory Committee

L. Roy discussed the proposed amendments. He explained that the changes are being made to provide greater clarity and improvements for graduate students. There was concern that too much time spent was being spent by graduate students in their program before having a sit-down with a thesis advisor to provide guidance.

There was a discussion regarding how this provision would be enforced. L. Roy confirmed it would be done in a collegial manner. They will work together with those responsible for the student's program to determine whether there are any issues. The goal is to help improve a student's chances of success in the program by establishing good communication with a student right away.

L. Roy clarified that the policy sets the expectations and gives faculty something to point to in order to get the conversation started. These changes came through the GPD committee and GSC and met their requirements. In terms of enforcing the amendment, the Graduate Studies office is expanding and will be focusing on encouraging compliance with these policies. They will also be working on a "graduate student handbook" to assist students in understanding the policy. C. Cesaroni remarked that this change was proposed in order to protect students.

MOTION
CARRIED

That Academic Council approve the changes to the Appointment of Supervisory Committee section in the Graduate Academic Calendar as proposed in the attached documentation.

M. Eklund abstained.

Approved.

(b) Repeating Courses

L. Roy provided the background for the changes to this section of the Graduate Academic Calendar and clarified the categories of dismissal. The intention is to be clear about the expectations for students and provide them with an honest assessment of how they are performing. He confirmed that if there are extenuating circumstances, they will be considered.

MOTION
CARRIED

That Academic Council approve the changes to the Repeating Courses section in the Graduate Academic Calendar as proposed in the attached documentation.

M. Eklund opposed and M. Shaaban abstained.

(c) English Language Proficiency

L. Roy presented the proposed amendments to Council. He explained that the changes are responding to students who previously met the English language proficiency requirements but did not succeed academically or could not perform well as teaching assistants.

A request was made for any statistics on the number of students who have been dismissed for non-performance. L. Roy clarified that faculties are free to impose more stringent language requirements if they prefer.

(K. Nugent left the meeting at 3:15 p.m.)

L. Roy advised that if there is a reasonable belief that a student will function well in our institution or there is evidence a student is fluent in English, a student can establish proficiency

in other ways – the policy does allow for exceptions. Concern was expressed that the amendment makes the provision too restrictive, specifically the provision requiring completion of an undergraduate or graduate degree within the past three years as evidence of proficiency. A suggestion was made to refer to the corresponding policy at the University of Toronto.

There was a broader discussion regarding English language proficiency for employees (teaching assistants), as well as the exception provided for Canadian institutions with French as the official language of instruction. Council had a very engaged discussion regarding the amendments and expressed several concerns regarding the perceived restrictive consequences.

MOTION CARRIED *That Academic Council table the motion and refer the amendments back to the Graduate Studies Committee for further consideration.*

12.2 FOR INFORMATION

- (a) Faculty of Science - Master of Science in Modelling and Computational Science – Minor Program Adjustment**
- (b) Faculty of Science - PhD in Modelling and Computational Science – Minor Program Adjustment**
- (c) QE Scholarships for Graduate Research Exchanges Internal Guidelines**
- (d) Ontario Graduate Fellowship Fund (OGFF) internal guidelines**

13. Executive Committee

13.1 Academic Council Governance

13.1.1 Temporary Replacement Nominations Due to Early Departures

Deferred due to time constraints.

13.1.2 COU Academic Colleague Alternate Nomination

Deferred due to time constraints.

14. Presidential Search Process

14.1 Presidential Search Committee Nominees

In order to ensure faculty representatives from 3 different Faculties were selected and to maintain the confidentiality of the selection process, Academic Council selected 3 Faculty Representatives by ballot. C. Foy reviewed the ballot rules, which included:

- 3 ballot rounds;
- only 1 candidate selected per round;
- candidates who are also members of Academic Council not eligible to vote unless successfully chosen during one of the first 2 rounds - to ensure Academic Council members not given an unfair advantage over non-Academic Council members; and
- if a candidate selected from a Faculty that has more than one candidate, remaining candidates for that Faculty ineligible for selection in the successive rounds.

After four rounds of voting (due to a tie during the first round of balloting), Academic Council selected the following individuals as the faculty representative nominees for the Committee to Recommend a President:

- Glenn Harvel
- Mike Eklund
- Hannah Scott

15. Conferral of Degrees for Fall 2016

MOTION CARRIED *That Academic Council authorize the granting of degrees to those students who have fulfilled all degree requirements at the end of the Summer term 2016 and who have been recommended for graduation by their Faculty effective January 13, 2017.*

16. International Travel Policy & Procedures

Deferred due to time constraints.

17. Other Business

None.

18. Colleagues' Exchange

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary