



ACADEMIC COUNCIL

MINUTES of MEETING of TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 2019
DTB 524, 2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Present:

Steven Murphy (Chair)
Bailey, Robert
Bliemel, Michael
Davidson, Catherine
Crawford, Greg (*teleconference*)
Desaulniers, Jean-Paul
Easton, Brad
Eklund, Mikael
Gaber, Hossam (*teleconference*)
Habibi, Sarah
Harvel, Glenn
Hector, Sonia
Heydari, Shahram
Hogue, Andrew
Hogue, Jessica
Holdway, Doug
Jones, Ferdinand (*teleconference*)
Kirkwood, Andrea
Kishawy, Hossam
Lesage, Ann
Livingston, Lori (*teleconference*)

Lloyd, Meghann
Marques, Olga
McCabe, Janet
Nugent, Kimberly
Partosoedarso, Elita
Petrie, Olivia
Pierce, Tess
Roy, Langis
Shon, Phillip
Sidhu, Tarlochan
Stoett, Peter
Stokes, Joe
Tokuhiko, Akira
Tuppal, Sai Tejus
Williams, Alyssa
Wu, Terry

Guests:

Ariss, Rachel
Babb, Shay
Beaver, Art
Dinwoodie, Becky
Hester, Krista
Leckey, Heather
MacIsaac, Brad
McCartney, Kimberley
McLaughlin, Christine
Molinaro, Nichole
Pitcher, Cathy
Saeedi, Sehrish

Regrets:

Kay, Robin
Liscano, Ramiro
Mahmoud, Qusay
Mohany, Atef
Mostaghim, Amir
Rinaldi, Jen
Scott, Hannah
Taylor, Noreen
Woolridge, Lyndsay

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

2. Agenda

M. Eklund moved to add an item under Other Business to discuss the Scantron Report, which was circulated to Academic Council following the March meeting.

Upon a motion duly made by G. Harvel and seconded by O. Khalid, the Agenda was approved, as amended.

3. Chair's Remarks

The Chair wished everyone a happy end of term. The university has many things to celebrate. He congratulated S. Habibi on representing the university in the provincial 3MT event last week. The Chair also discussed the recent announcement of the strategic partnership between the university and OCAD.

(a) Senior Academic Administrator Search

The Chair informed Council that the VP Research search committee conducted interviews last week. He will continue to keep the community updated.

(b) 2019 Honorary Degree Recipients

The President provided an update on behalf of the Honorary Degrees Committee. After reviewing the outstanding nominations received from the university community and recommended by the Honorary Degrees Committee, he was pleased to report that this year's honorary degree recipients have been confirmed. He thanked the committee for their thoughtful consideration of the nomination packages. As a reminder, the faculty members of the committee were appointed by Academic Council in November 2018 following an open call for expressions of interest.

The President announced the 2019 Honorary Degree recipients and provided a brief overview of each individual's accomplishments. The 2019 recipients are:

- **Al Libfeld** - Thursday, June 6, 9:30 am ceremony - Faculty of Energy Systems and Nuclear Science & Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science
- **Kate Beirness** - Thursday, June 6, 2 pm ceremony - Faculty of Business & Information Technology & Faculty of Science
- **The Honourable Beverley McLaughlin** - Friday, June 7, 9:30 am ceremony - Faculty of Education & Faculty of Social Science and Humanities
- **Annette Verschuren** - Friday, June 7, 2 pm ceremony - Faculty of Health Sciences

4. Minutes of the Meeting of March 26, 2019

M. Eklund requested an addition to the minutes under the discussion of the Student Sexual Violence Policy and Procedures and whether the relevant Ontario Regulations require Academic Council to approve amendments to the policy and procedures.

(S. Tuppal arrived at 2:41 p.m.)

Upon a motion duly made by B. Easton and seconded by O. Khalid, the Minutes were approved, as amended.

5. Business Arising from the Minutes

(a) Scantron Report

A member expressed concern regarding the length of time it took to look into the scantron issue, which was raised in March 2017. He also expressed concern about the composition of the group reviewing the scantron alternatives, as well as the lack of consultation. There was a request to include this as an item on next month's agenda. The Provost confirmed that he will look into the review and consultation processes and report back to Council at the next meeting.

6. Inquiries and Communications

There were none.

7. Provost's Remarks

The Provost congratulated the award recipients who were honoured at the Teaching Awards event several weeks ago. He also encouraged everyone to attend the Equity Conference taking place on April 30, as well as the Research Awards being celebrated on May 8. He confirmed that the 2019-2020 budget is being presented for approval at the Board meeting on April 24.

8. Indigenous Education Advisory Circle (IEAC) Consultation & Communication Protocols

The Provost thanked the Co-Chairs of the IEAC, Rachel Ariss and Art Beaver, for their work on the protocols being presented. He discussed the importance of consulting with the IEAC when developing Indigenization projects. There are two bodies, the IEAC and the Indigenous Reconciliation Taskforce (IRT). The IRT focuses more on the operations of the university. It is important to articulate the consultation process at the university. In developing the proposed protocols, the IEAC consulted with the IRT, CIQE, and the Senior Academic Team.

R. Ariss and A. Beaver provided additional background to the proposed protocols. By consulting with the IEAC, this helps recognize the authority of Indigenous voices to speak about themselves. Further, by bringing proposals to the IEAC, it shows willingness to build relationships. R. Ariss discussed the composition of the IEAC. A. Beaver also noted that it is important to consult with the IEAC when inviting Indigenous individuals to speak. A. Beaver shared his excitement at seeing the university moving forward with this process. R. Bailey added that the goal is true engagement.

The Chair thanked R. Ariss and A. Beaver for their work on the IEAC.

R. Ariss and A. Beaver responded to questions from Council members. R. Ariss confirmed that faculty consultation with the IEAC is already taking place, but there is currently no formalized process. The protocols are intended to make the process easier and to make people aware of the IEAC. A suggestion was made to clarify on page 3 that the mandatory consultation applies when developing or modifying modules focused on Indigenous perspectives. There was general agreement on the importance of communicating the implementation of the IEAC Consultation & Communication Protocols.

Upon a motion duly made by R. Bailey and seconded by G. Harvel, Academic Council approved the protocol for consultation on incorporating Indigenous content into academic and

continuing education programs and courses as described in the “Indigenous Education Advisory Circle Consultation & Communication Protocol”.

(R. Ariss & A. Beaver left at 3:08 p.m.)

9. Policy Consultation:

9.1 Student Accommodations Directives

(a) Use of Memory Aids and Use Of Audio Recording of Lectures

H. Leckey presented the directives to Council. The directives were developed in consultation with third party experts in accommodations and keeping in mind best practice guidelines. H. Leckey invited comments from Council.

Audio Recording of Lectures:

Comments and questions of Council members included:

- s. 6.3 – can this task be delegated to student volunteers? H. Leckey clarified that the expectation would not necessarily be on the faculty member to transcribe the discussion – the expectation would be for the faculty member to engage in a conversation about what the best form of alternative method would be (e.g. meeting with professor during office hours, peer note taker, etc.); suggestion was made to consider softening the language from “must” to “should”
- consider changing “students with disabilities” to “students requiring accommodations”
- in large classes, how can a professor determine whether a student is recording a lecture due to accommodations? H. Leckey clarified that the directive only applies to audio recordings by students requiring accommodations
- concern about the burden being placed on faculty under the directives, particularly when have large class sizes
- s. 6.4 – students required to destroy audio recordings at end of semester – suggestion that university should consider applying this generally to all students who record lectures
- as a parent of a student who requires accommodations & who attended Ontario Tech, there is a real need for these types of accommodations & important to recognize how these strategies help students
- it is our duty to accommodate students to ensure they have an experience that is the same as students who do not require accommodations – rather than softening the language in the directives, should look at ways of helping faculty provide these accommodations
- suggestion that faculty’s extra workload should be recognized
- it was suggested that the general recording of lectures should be brought back for further discussion

Memory Aids:

- there was some concern expressed about the seven day deadline for a student to submit a memory aid - anticipate challenges for students to submit an aid for approval seven days in advance of an exam

- H. Leckey clarified that the directive is trying to be responsive to concerns of faculty and students by providing guidelines as to what a memory aid should look like - faculty, as the experts in course content, are relied upon as to what constitutes a memory aid & to determine whether the proposed content is appropriate
- concerns were raised about the lack of training in memory aids for faculty members – it would be beneficial to have additional resources available to support faculty in approving memory aids; H. Leckey confirmed that Student Accessibility Services (SAS) is available to consult with faculty regarding memory aids
- s. 6.1.2 – is there a language component to a memory aid? is it required to be in English or French? H. Leckey responded that the student must ensure the professor can understand it
- s. 6.3.2.2 – student to remove content deemed inappropriate – constitutes a lot of work for the faculty member
- H. Leckey confirmed that accommodations planning is a partnership among SAS, faculty and students – s. 7 – provides instructors with the opportunity to deny the memory aid if it gives the student a clear academic advantage
- asking students to create memory aids/cheat sheets can serve as an effective memory aid/study tool – could serve students well to ask them to do this
- might be helpful if the definition of memory aid was at the beginning of the directive

(K. Nugent left at 3:43 p.m.)

- important for students working with SAS to better understand what a memory aid is
- there is pedagogical value in creating a cheat sheet/memory aid – it can help students feel more comfortable during an exam

Committee Reports

10. Curriculum and Program Review Committee (CPRC) & Graduate Studies Committee (GSC)

(a) Review of Categorization of Course and Program Nomenclature Guidelines

G. Harvel provided an overview of the proposed changes. He explained that the amendments include removing references to UOIT. L. Roy clarified the guidelines are being changed to a directive to ensure they are no longer optional, which will provide consistency. Many of the changes are primarily housekeeping. A suggestion was made that the language in ss. 7.1(a) and 7.2 should mirror each other. There was agreement to call it “examining committee” at the Master’s level. There was also a discussion regarding the requirement to include a provision that allows a course to be taught as a lab only.

Upon a motion duly made by G. Harvel and seconded by L. Roy, pursuant to the recommendation of CPRC and GSC, Academic Council approved the categorization of the Course Nomenclature and Program Nomenclature policy instruments as directives, and the inclusion of the LBO – Lab Only Schedule Type in the Course Nomenclature Directives.

11. Graduate Studies Committee

(a) Final Assessment Report – Materials Science Program Review

L. Roy explained at which step they are in the process. He confirmed that seven of the recommendations in the action plan have been completed.

Upon a motion duly made by L. Roy and seconded by B. Easton, Academic Council approved the 18-Month Follow-Up Final Assessment Report for the Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy in Materials Science Program Review, as presented.

12. Governance & Nominations Committee (GNC)

(a) Reappointment of COU Academic Colleague

B. Dinwoodie presented the nomination from the GNC for approval. She responded to questions regarding the process of reappointment. A member expressed disagreement with the interpretation of what constitutes a “renewable term”, as set out in the report to Academic Council dated January 19, 2016 (included in the meeting material). His interpretation would have required another election for the role. There was a discussion regarding the distinction between “eligible for renewal” and “eligible for re-election”.

Upon a motion duly made by R. Bailey and seconded by L. Roy, pursuant to the recommendation of the Governance and Nominations Committee, the Academic Council reappointed Ramiro Liscano as the COU Academic Colleague for a final term of July 1, 2019 until June 30, 2022.

M. Eklund and S. Heydari abstained.

(b) CPRC Terms of Reference Review

B. Dinwoodie presented the proposed CPRC Terms of Reference for consultation. Comments from Council included:

- would like to see greater representation of Academic Council members on the standing committees
- consider electing a faculty member of the committee to serve as Chair

The feedback will be shared with the GNC for further consideration.

13. Registrar’s Office

(a) Graduation for Winter Term 2019

Upon a motion duly made by J. Stokes and seconded by M. Lloyd, pursuant to the recommendations of each Faculty and the Registrar, Academic Council confirmed the eligibility for graduation of those students who have fulfilled all degree requirements at the end of the Winter term 2019 and recommended the conferral of degrees by the Chancellor.

L. Roy abstained.

14. Other Business

Upon a motion duly made by J. McCabe, the meeting terminated at 4:18 p.m.

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary