

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MINUTES of MEETING of TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 2018
DTB 524, 2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Present:

Murphy, Steven (Chair)
Alam, Safwan
Bailey, Robert
Barari, Ahmad
Clarke, Jessica
Crawford, Greg
Davidson, Catherine
Desaulniers, Jean-Paul
DiGiuseppe, Maurice
Eklund, Mikael
Gaber, Hossam
Green, Mark
Hogue, Andrew
Holdway, Doug
Kirkwood, Andrea
Kishawy, Hossam
Lauricella, Sharon

Livingston, Lori
Lloyd, Meghann
McGovern, Sue
McMorrow, Thomas
Nugent, Kimberly
Roy, Langis
Sidhu, Tarlochan
Smimou, Kamal
Stoett, Peter
Stokes, Joe
Tokuhiro, Akira
Tuppal, Sai Tejus
Wu, Terry
Dinwoodie, Becky (non-
voting)
Elliott, Craig (non-voting)
Foy, Cheryl (non-voting)

Guests:

Ali, Reem
Boujos, Kristen
Bright, Ken
Bruno, Jamie
Harduar, Nadia
Harvel, Glenn
Hester, Krista
Liscano, Ramiro
Maclsaac, Brad
Molinaro, Nichole
O'Halloran, Niall
Perry, Barb
Petrie, Olivia
Pitcher, Cathy
Secord, Krista

Regrets:

Asiedu-Boateng, Peter
LeSage, Ann
Ritchie, Pamela
Scott, Hannah
Taylor, Noreen

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

2. Agenda

C. Foy requested a deferral of item 10 until the next Council meeting to allow an opportunity for the matter to be discussed by the Curriculum & Program Review Committee.

Upon a motion duly made, the Agenda was approved as amended.

3. Chair's Remarks

The Chair invited everyone to introduce themselves. He expressed excitement at chairing his first meeting of Academic Council and discussed his experience during his first few weeks at the university. His goal for the first few weeks is to better understand the university's areas of strength and distinctiveness, and to learn which areas could be enhanced. He commented on how surprised he was by the hidden assets of the university. His introduction to the university has been a fun experience. He was particularly impressed by the university's Open House held at the beginning of March and noted the tremendous engagement of the staff and commitment of the faculty and students.

He stated that Academic Council is a crucial body since it functions as the heart of the academic enterprise. He commented that as the academy becomes increasingly busy, the members become less present on campus. It is important to engage faculty and re-energize people about the institution. As an observer, he questioned whether Academic Council is working as strategically as it can. He emphasized the importance of engaged discussion and addressing matters in a strategic manner. While it remains important to consider and approve items, it is just as integral to make time for strategic discussions. He emphasized that he wants to hear what all Council members have to say. He shared his experience of senates at other institutions and observed how meetings could be dominated by a few voices. He encouraged all Council members to participate and share their views.

4. Minutes of the Meeting of February 27, 2018

M. Eklund asked for an additional statement to be added to the end of section 7(b): "and that in an earlier provostial search, there were elected and appointed committee members."

Upon a motion duly made, the Minutes were approved as amended.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

(a) Co-Curricular Week

J. Stokes discussed the proposed change to the co-curricular week. He noted the concerns about having only a 2 day co-curricular week. The university is considering introducing Thanksgiving week as a Fall Study Break instead of the shorter co-curricular week.

Concern was expressed about exams going later into December, which would result in increased pressure on professors to submit grades before the winter break. J. Stokes advised that the exam period would be reduced to 9 days and the turnaround time for grades would be the same as what was expected in December 2017. It was suggested to consider releasing grades following the winter break instead of before.

There was a brief discussion regarding whether the proposal was coming forward for consultation or approval. J. Stokes advised that although the item was considered

administrative and was coming forward for consultation, if Council was not supportive of the change that their concerns would have a significant influence on the ultimate decision.

J. Stokes referred to the empirical studies that have been completed regarding a fall reading week. There is evidence to support that a full fall reading week does reduce the stress of students.

A comment was made about the difficulty of scheduling labs under the current system. Concern was also expressed about delivering grades to students before the winter break - students are unable to speak to anyone about their grades for two weeks and brood about grades over the holidays. It was suggested that delivering final grades in January would be preferable so that students would be able to speak to someone.

L. Livingston strongly supported the proposal from a student mental health perspective. There was also a discussion regarding whether a shortened exam period would place additional stress on students. J. Stokes advised that Durham College is changing to a 3-day exam period next year, which would allow for discussions regarding additional space for writing exams. It was also suggested to consider scheduling case based exams earlier in the exam period since they require more time for evaluation. There was a recommendation made for scheduling to work with the Faculties as much as possible to develop the exam schedule. S. Alam expressed his support for having a full fall reading week since a 2-day is used more for catching up on school work as opposed to a proper break.

There was also a discussion regarding the timing of the proposed fall reading week and whether it should be later than Thanksgiving week. J. Stokes advised that 14 of 21 Ontario universities use the Thanksgiving week for the fall break.

Overall, Council expressed support for the proposal.

(b) Faculty Council Membership

B. Dinwoodie referred to the membership lists that were included in the material. She confirmed that the updated lists were approved by the Academic Council Executive Committee and that the lists are now consistent with the Faculty Council Terms of Reference.

(c) Risk Management Work Plan

C. Foy referred Council to the work plan in the material, which was a follow up from last month's Risk Management update.

6. Inquiries and Communications

(a) COU Academic Colleague Report

R. Liscano referred to the report included in the meeting material and invited questions. He discussed the upcoming meeting between the Academic Colleagues and the Executive Heads in April.

7. Provost's Remarks

The Provost advised that there is a call for members of the Advisory Committee on Student Sexual Violence Prevention and Support Committee in this week's Weekly Report. There is also an opportunity to provide comments online on the Policy on Sexual Violence for Students and Procedures for Responding to Incidents of Sexual Violence.

He reminded Council that the 3 Minute Thesis finals will be taking place the next day and the Research Awards and Teaching Awards are scheduled for the following week.

(a) University Administrative Council (UAC)

R. Bailey discussed the role of the UAC. He noted that some administrative issues benefit from broader consultation. He reviewed the composition of the UAC and provided several examples of what the UAC discusses. Essentially, UAC meetings provide an opportunity to discuss administrative issues that cut across the institution. The President receives reports from the UAC at meetings of the senior leadership team and discusses the reports with the team. R. Bailey confirmed that items discussed by UAC that are relevant to either the Board of Governors or Academic Council are brought forward to the appropriate governing body for discussion.

There was some concern expressed that UAC is a parallel structure to Academic Council and that Academic Council should be more involved in the administration of the university. Further, there is a significant presence of administration on Academic Council, which is not reciprocated by faculty representation on UAC. R. Bailey discussed the distinction between governance and administration. The President holds the ultimate authority with respect to the administration of the university. Neither the Board nor Academic Council should be involved in the day-to-day administration. A member commented that collegial governance means that faculty should be involved in governance and administration. R. Bailey added that senior academic administrators do not cease being faculty upon becoming administrators.

8. 2018-2019 Budget Update

C. Elliott delivered a presentation on the 2018-2019 draft budget. He reviewed the strategic planning and budgeting process, as well as the key budget assumptions. He highlighted the planned reserve in the budget, which includes \$2.5M for new building/capital renewal, \$1M general contingency for operations and \$1M for university priority fund initiatives.

C. Elliott reviewed the 2018-2019 draft operating statement. After allocating base expenses, there remains approximately \$14M before asks. He discussed a number of increased expenses such as the impact of compliance with Bill 148 (classified as a non-discretionary expense).

R. Bailey outlined priorities set out in the Integrated Academic Plan and Strategic Plan in the context of the budget. He presented the increase in faculty positions proposed in the draft 2018-2019 budget. Revenue is forecast to increase by \$11.3M in 2018-19. Of that amount, over 75% will be allocated to take care of current faculty and staff as well as incremental positions. All three divisions (academic, academic support and administration) saw increases to their budgets; however, as in the past four years the goal is to strategically allocate a greater proportion of the budget to academic expenses.

B. MacIsaac responded to a question regarding the ratio of staff to faculty. He stated that there are few statistics available regarding this ratio. Of the numbers available, the institutional average is in the 3 to 3.4 range for staff for every faculty member. At UOIT, the ratio is just under 2 to 1, which can be partially attributed to the shared services with Durham College.

R. Bailey discussed how they are moving towards the integration of the SMA, Strategic Plan and Integrated Academic Plan into the budgeting process.

C. Elliott identified future funding opportunities, including increased investment in the following noting that we are currently funding these but see in our next few years these may require greater emphasis:

- supporting student engagement;
- attracting & retaining highly qualified personnel;
- university recognition/reputation;
- organizational effectiveness;
- technology; and
- space, infrastructure, & capital refurbishment

9. Committee Reports

9.1 Curriculum and Program Review Committee

9.1.1 FOR APPROVAL

(a) Centre for Institutional Quality Enhancement - Cyclical Program Review Final Assessment Summary Reports:

G. Harvel provided an overview of the review process and presented the reports for approval.

(i) Bachelor of Science in Health Physics and Radiation Science

MOTION
APPROVED

That Academic Council approve the summary report of the Bachelor of Science in Health Physics and Radiation Science program review.

(ii) Bachelor of Science in Nursing

MOTION APPROVED *That Academic Council approve the summary report of the Bachelor of Science in Nursing program review.*

(iii) Bachelor of Arts in Legal Studies (18-month follow-up)

MOTION APPROVED *That Academic Council approve the summary report of the Bachelor of Arts in Legal Studies 18-month follow-up report.*

(iv) Bachelor of Science in Health Physics and Radiation Science (18-month follow-up)

MOTION APPROVED *That Academic Council approve the summary report of the Bachelor of Arts in Legal Studies 18-month follow-up report.*

(b) Faculty of Social Science and Humanities - Program Proposal: Minor in Sustainability Studies

There was a discussion regarding the possibility of students selecting all first-year courses as their electives and whether that would provide sufficient depth for the minor. In response, it was noted that two third-year courses are mandatory to complete the minor. P. Stoett also added that breadth is also key for the minor program, ensuring students are exposed to a variety of sustainability courses. There are a number of prerequisites for several of the courses and students will have to work with their advisors to develop a program map. P. Stoett advised that the list of courses was developed in consultation with academic advisors and more nuanced program maps can be developed over time.

R. Bailey acknowledged and applauded the Faculty for developing the minor as it will be a great opportunity for the university's students.

MOTION APPROVED *That Academic Council approve the new Minor in Sustainability Studies.*

(c) Faculty of Social Science and Humanities Bachelor of Arts – Degree Requirements for a BA from the Faculty of Social Science and Humanities

MOTION APPROVED *That Academic Council approve the regulations governing the requirements for a Bachelor of Arts degree from the Faculty of Social Science and Humanities.*

9.1.2 FOR INFORMATION

(a) Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science - Bachelor of Engineering in Software Engineering – Minor Program Adjustment

(b) Faculty of Social Science and Humanities - Bachelor of Arts – Double Major Requirements

(c) Faculty of Social Science and Humanities Bachelor of Arts in Legal Studies – Minor Program Adjustment

9.2 CPRC and Graduate Studies Committee

9.2.1 FOR APPROVAL

(a) Final Examination Directives

L. Roy provided a brief summary of the final examination directives.

There were comments made on the wording in Sections 10.1(c), (d) (e). A recommendation was made to change the wording from “remove evidence” to “collect evidence”, as well as to specifically refer to unauthorized material and devices in section 10.1(d) instead of referring to the “violation”. J. Stokes clarified that the directives are a compilation of several documents and are simply being formalized and incorporated into the policy framework. In response to a question, J. Stokes confirmed that proctors should refer to this document for guidance.

A suggestion was also made to revise section 6.2 to state that students’ ID cards must be checked at the exam and not prior to the start of an exam.

MOTION APPROVED *That Academic Council approve the Final Examination Chief Proctor and Emergency and Disruption Directives.*

9.3 Research Board

(a) Proposal for Centre on Hate, Bias and Extremism Research, Resilience, Praxis

D. Holdway presented the proposal for consideration and informed Council that the proposal was unanimously recommended by the Research Board.

B. Perry discussed the strengths of the proposal, including the commitment from people across Faculties, making it truly interdisciplinary. In addition to research, one of the goals of the Centre is to leverage the knowledge created to intervene in extremism. It will be a multi-faceted Centre.

A member commented that the Centre would be an important move for UOIT. As a smaller university, UOIT cannot be everything to everyone but can excel in a few key areas. P. Stoett added that it is a niche that can be filled by the university and the establishment of the Centre will provide opportunities for students at every level. There was overwhelming support for the proposal.

MOTION APPROVED *That Academic Council recommend the Centre on Hate, Bias and Extremism Research, Resilience, Praxis proposal for approval by the Board of Governors.*

The approval of the recommendation was greeted with applause.

9.4 Executive Committee

(a) CPRC Nomination

B. Dinwoodie presented the nomination for approval.

That pursuant to the nomination received from the Faculty of Education and the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and in accordance with the Curriculum & Program Review Committee's Terms of Reference, Academic Council hereby appoints the following faculty member to serve on the Curriculum & Program Review Committee until June 30, 2018:

- Roland van Oostveen, Faculty of Education

(b) 2018-2019 Election

B. Dinwoodie delivered an update on the nominations for the spring election. She confirmed that the nomination period had been extended and quite a few student nominations were received just before the deadline on Friday. Several positions on Council did not receive any nominations.

(c) Location of Academic Council Meetings 2018-2019

B. Maclsaac discussed the options available for Council meeting locations for next year in anticipation of the larger membership of Academic Council. He advised that it is possible to reconfigure a room in the J Building, which would be large enough to accommodate Council meetings.

There was a suggestion to hold all Council meetings in the Boardroom downtown. Another member remarked that rooms in the J Wing are not ideal classrooms and that using those rooms as meeting space would probably be more appropriate. B. Maclsaac informed Council that SIRC was considered and the available space will be used for classes. A question was raised about the level of noise from kinesiology labs in the adjoining rooms in J Wing. B. Maclsaac responded that the kinesiology labs would likely not interfere.

10. Policy

(a) Approval of Undergraduate Academic Regulations under the Policy Framework – deferred

11. Other Business

A comment was made that it might be beneficial to have a discussion at the Faculty level for program proposals that impact a number of different Faculties. It was suggested that CPRC and GSC minutes could be made publicly available. N. Molinaro confirmed that the CPRC and GSC meeting material and minutes are publicly available. She will provide the link to B. Dinwoodie for circulation.

MOTION
APPROVED

L. Roy encouraged members to attend the 3 Minute Thesis finals. He also referenced the university's Pi Day initiative. S. McGovern provided an update on the success of Pi Day. She advised that they received positive feedback from students. Pies were delivered to donors and corporations have already been talking about participating in the next Pi Day. Money was raised for student support and the Faculty of Engineering & Applied Science won the photo competition. The Chair congratulated S. McGovern on the event and she received a round of applause.

12. Colleagues' Exchange

Upon a motion duly made, the meeting terminated at 4:22 p.m.

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary

DRAFT