

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
MINUTES of MEETING of TUESDAY, MAY 15, 2018
DTB 1058, 2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Present:

Murphy, Steven (Chair)
Alam, Safwan
Bailey, Robert
Barari, Ahmad
Davidson, Catherine
Desaulniers, Jean-Paul
DiGiuseppe, Maurice
Eklund, Mikael (*via teleconference*)
Green, Mark
Kirkwood, Andrea
Kishawy, Hossam
Lauricella, Sharon
Lesage, Ann
Livingston, Lori
Lloyd, Meghann

McGovern, Sue
McMorrow, Thomas
Nugent, Kimberly
Roy, Langis
Scott, Hannah
Sidhu, Tarlochan
Smimou, Kamal
Stoett, Peter
Stokes, Joe
Tokuhiro, Akira
Tuppai, Sai Tejus
Wu, Terry
Dinwoodie, Becky (non-voting)
Foy, Cheryl (non-voting)

Guests:

Ali, Reem
Friedlan, John
Hester, Krista
MacIsaac, Brad
McCartney-Young,
Kimberley
O'Halloran, Niall
Pitcher, Cathy

Regrets:

Clarke, Jessica
Crawford, Greg
Gaber, Hossam
Harvel, Glenn
Hogue, Andrew
Holdway, Doug
Ritchie, Pamela
Taylor, Noreen

1. Call to Order

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

2. Agenda

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

3. Chair's Remarks

(a) Senior Academic Administrator Searches

The Chair reported that a request for proposal was issued for vendors of record for recruitment firms for the Provost and VP Research searches, which closed last Friday. Once a recruitment firm is selected, search committees will be established and consultations will begin. The search committees will be sitting in on the consultation sessions and will work on the searches over the summer.

The Chair thanked everyone who attended his Installation on May 8. It was a memorable day and he thanked all those involved in the coordination of the event. His Installation speech will be made available online. He will continue his listening tour of the university over the next few months.

The Chair invited questions from Council. There was a discussion regarding whether the Provost and VP Research search committees should be involved in the selection of the recruitment firms, since the Committee to Recommend a President was involved in the selection process. C. Foy directed Council to the relevant search procedures posted online in the Policy Library. She confirmed that the process to date has been consistent with the approved search procedures.

4. Minutes of the Meeting of April 17, 2018

B. Dinwoodie shared M. Eklund's comments on the minutes.

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

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising.

6. Inquiries and Communications

There were no inquiries or communications.

7. Provost's Remarks

The Provost discussed the recent event, Reconciliation and the Future of Post-Secondary Education, hosted by the President's Indigenous Reconciliation Taskforce. He also commented on the President's Installation, which was a successful and important event for the university. He thanked everyone involved in organizing the event.

The Provost also reported on the recent event kicking off Oshawa's Teaching City, as well as the Durham Regional Police graduation, which included several UOIT graduates.

(a) Pathways Update – deferred until next month

8. Policy

(a) Policy Framework Review

C. Foy presented the proposed changes to the Policy Framework documents. She referred Council members to the one page handout that was distributed, which sets out additional changes to the recommended consultation paths. Overall, the feedback on the proposed Policy Framework amendments has been positive. She reviewed the extensive consultation that took place during the review.

A number of changes to the policy instruments address the categorization of policy documents (e.g. local policy instruments relate to the ongoing management, work, and operation of the single organizational unit for which they were developed). The changes make it clear that the category of local policy instruments should be narrow and limited in application to one unit. N. O'Halloran highlighted that the authority to approve academic policy instruments rests with Academic Council and, once approved, will be reported to the higher body.

C. Foy responded to questions from Council members. She confirmed that the documents do not contain any changes that have not already been discussed with Council. She advised that one of the items in the parking lot of work to be done is to include on the Policy webpage explanations of what constitutes the Senior Leadership Team, University Administrative Council, and other relevant bodies. She also clarified that Research Ethics Board policy instruments would likely fall in the Legal, Governance, Compliance category under the Policy Framework.

That Academic Council hereby recommends the proposed amendments to the UOIT Policy Framework and associated procedures, as presented, for approval by the Board of Governors.

9. Risk Management

C. Foy provided a brief update on the university's risk management program. The annual Risk Report will be presented at the final Board meeting. Draft risk registers were prepared last year and are in the process of being finalized for the end of the year. The Board is focusing on identifying and finalizing the key strategic risks of the institution. A draft list of key strategic risks will be presented to the Board for discussion and finalization this week.

Concern was expressed about risk management curtailing academic work. The Chair responded that if an organization is effectively managing risk, it will review opportunities in the environment and assess the risks of engaging in those activities as well as the risks of not engaging in those activities. Risk management can help drive strategy.

C. Foy reminded Council that when the Risk Management Policy was passed, there was extensive discussion about its impact on academic work. As a result, there is an explicit statement in the policy that acknowledges that risk is part of what the university does (section 7 - "UOIT is committed to fostering a culture of risk ownership throughout the University. This does not mean that we avoid engaging in activities that have risk or that we avoid risk in our teaching and research and other activities we undertake for the University. It is recognized that both strategic

and operational decisions and the work undertaken by faculty, staff and employees, all inherently involve risk.”)

C. Foy clarified that the Risk Report is not a policy document that would come forward for consultation and the Risk Register is not a public document. The complete Risk Register is not presented to the Board given its operational nature; however, a summary of the operational risks is included in the Risk Report. C. Foy advised that the Risk Register is essentially a management tool that assists each area with managing their respective risks.

10. Committee Reports

10.1 Curriculum and Program Review Committee (CPRC)

J. Friedlan delivered the CPRC report in G. Harvel’s absence.

10.1.1 FOR APPROVAL

(a) Faculty of Social Science and Humanities - New Degree Program Proposal – Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies

T. McMorrow answered questions from Council members. He explained that the program will allow STEM students who might be undecided about their career plans to take liberal arts courses. The program also provides flexibility for students looking to transfer from a program they are unsuited for with minimal loss of credits and time. One of the goals is to foster student success and keep students at UOIT.

MOTION
APPROVED

That Academic Council recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies program.

(b) Office of the Registrar - Academic Regulation Update

(i) Course Selection and Registration Policy

J. Stokes presented the proposed amendments to Council and answered questions. He clarified the number of times a student can retake a course. It was suggested that the word “may” be added to the last sentence in section 10.1 – “may be referred to Faculty Council”. Suggested to change section 15.2 to “normally 3 courses in a term”. J. Stokes clarified that the academic schedule comes to Academic Council for information every year. If there are any concerns, they can be raised at that time.

MOTION
APPROVED

That Academic Council approve the amendments to the Course Selection and Registration Policy.

(ii) Academic Misconduct and Professional Unsuitability Procedure

There was a discussion about where to find the definitions of the key terms in set out in the procedure. C. Foy clarified that the parent policy of the procedure includes the relevant definitions and is included in the general academic regulations. N. O’Halloran added that the definitions are included in the academic calendar and he is currently working with the Registrar’s Office on updating the policy documents to bring the formatting in line with the Policy Framework. This will be a big project. J. Stokes clarified the definition of professional unsuitability.

MOTION APPROVED *That Academic Council approve the amendments to the Academic Misconduct and Professional Unsuitability Procedure.*

(c) Centre for Institutional Quality Enhancement - Undergraduate Alternate Pathways Policy

J. Friedlan summarized the proposal. There was a discussion about the approval authority for an articulation agreement, which is the responsibility of the Provost. B. MacIsaac clarified that if there are any substantive changes proposed to an articulation agreement, they would come forward to Academic Council for approval before the Provost would sign the agreement.

MOTION APPROVED *That Academic Council approve the Undergraduate Alternate Pathways Policy.*

10.1.2 FOR INFORMATION

(a) Office of the Registrar - Rosedale Academy Partnership

J. Stokes provided a brief summary and highlighted their ESL program. Rosedale Academy is a Ministry inspected private school with a good reputation. He responded to questions from Council members.

10.2 Graduate Studies Committee (GSC)

10.2.1 FOR APPROVAL

(a) Faculty of Health Sciences - New Degree Program Proposal - Doctor of Philosophy in Health Sciences

L. Roy presented the new PhD program for recommendation. He summarized the key elements of the program, which builds on the Masters in Health Sciences program, as well as on existing partnerships. The program received strong reviews from external reviewers. There was a discussion regarding the funding for the program, which will primarily come through supervisors and support from the Faculty in terms of scholarships.

A comment was made that it would be nice to see more Faculties involved in the PhD. L. Roy advised that there is a process for graduate faculty appointments and if members of the faculty express interest, they would be considered. While there is money budgeted to fund a teaching only position, the program can be implemented with existing faculty.

MOTION APPROVED *That Academic Council recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of the Doctor of Philosophy in Health Sciences program.*

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

- (i) Master of Health Sciences**
- (ii) Master of Information Technology Security**

L. Roy presented the reports for approval.

That Academic Council approve the 18-month summary reports of the graduate program reviews outlined below:

- *Master of Health Sciences*
- *Master of Information Technology Security*

10.3 Admissions & Scholarship Committee

10.3.1 FOR APPROVAL

(a) Entrance Scholarship Program for 2019-2020

J. Stokes summarized the proposed changes to the entrance scholarship program for consideration. He reported that the landscape has changed in terms of entrance awards over the last year. He asked Academic Council to reduce the number of entrance scholarship awards in order to create experiential learning awards, which would help undergraduates build their portfolios.

Council had a robust discussion of the proposal. B. MacIsaac confirmed that entrance scholarships are fully funded by operational funds. It was suggested that it might be helpful to compare how other institutions fund these types of scholarships, as well as to receive a report on what types of experiential learning awards would be available.

The proposal includes the salary (\$60,000) of a Student Employment Coordinator who would work with the Faculties to find meaningful employment for students and assist with the administration of the program. Concern was raised about retaining those funds for student support. J. Stokes responded that the additional staff member would help establish a unique program that would be attractive to students.

It was noted that the experiential learning component would have value and a request was made for a report detailing what the learning component would look like.

J. Stokes emphasized the opportunity for the university to offer a unique scholarship program and differentiate itself from other institutions. He added that students in need are being funded more than ever before and the university now has the opportunity to focus on merit. There was a discussion about whether other institutions offer merit based entrance scholarships and whether the university's scholarship would be renewable. J. Stokes advised that there is opportunity for renewal of the scholarships and that students would actually receive more money in upper years. Since the University of Waterloo has a similar program, it was suggested to reach out and find out how the program is working. B. MacIsaac advised that the university tested this type of program on a smaller scale several years ago and it proved to be a successful recruiting tool at that time.

The question was raised as to whether other sources of funds could be allocated to create the experiential scholarship program rather than reducing the number of entrance scholarships. B. MacIsaac confirmed that the initiative would be budget neutral as it would be reallocating funds in the current award structure.

J. Stokes advised that if approved at today's meeting, the program would be implemented for 2019. However, if Council does not pass it at today's meeting to allow for further consideration,

the program would be delayed until 2020. He emphasized that there is limited research available on the success of this type of program. He also clarified that the proposal contemplates internal experiential opportunities. In response to concern expressed about the work interfering with a student's course work, J. Stokes advised that the Student Employment Coordinator would work with each Faculty to ensure an appropriate level of work is assigned.

MOTION
APPROVED

That Academic Council table the Entrance Scholarship Program proposal for 2019-2020.

(b) Course Scholarships for 2019-2020

This item was not discussed in light of the outcome of the discussion of the Entrance Scholarship Program for 2019-2020.

10.4 Executive Committee

(a) Draft Governance & Nominations Committee Terms of Reference

C. Foy presented the Terms of Reference for recommendation.

MOTION
APPROVED

That Academic Council recommend the attached Governance & Nominations Committee Terms of Reference, as presented, for approval by the Board of Governors.

11. Registrar's Office – Minor Changes to Undergraduate Calendar

J. Stokes presented the report for information.

12. Other Business

13. Colleagues' Exchange

There being no other business and upon a motion duly made, the meeting was terminated at 4:11 p.m.

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary