

## ACADEMIC COUNCIL

### MINUTES of MEETING of TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2020 DTB 524, 2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

**Present:**

Murphy, Steven (Chair)  
Bliemel, Michael  
Crawford, Greg  
Davis, Owen  
Desaulniers, Jean-Paul  
Gaber, Hossam  
Heydari, Shahram  
Hogue, Jessica  
Hossein Nejad, Mehdi  
Jacobs, Les  
Jones, Ferdinand  
Kishawy, Hossam  
Lesage, Ann (*videoconference*)  
Livingston, Lori  
Lloyd, Meghann  
Mahmoud, Qusay  
Marques, Olga  
Mohany, Atef  
Mostaghim, Amir (*videoconference*)  
Murphy, Bernadette  
(*videoconference*)  
Naumkin, Fedor (*videoconference*)

Nugent, Kimberly  
Partosoedarso, Elita  
Petrie, Olivia  
Pierce, Tess  
Rinaldi, Jen  
  
Roy, Langis  
Scott, Hannah  
Shon, Phillip  
(*videoconference*)  
Stoett, Peter  
Stokes, Joe  
Tokuhiro, Akira  
Woolridge, Lyndsay  
(*videoconference*)  
Wu, Terry

**Staff:**

Atkinson, Kirk  
Dinwoodie, Becky  
Foy, Cheryl  
Hester, Krista  
MacIsaac, Brad  
McCartney,  
Kimberley  
Molinaro, Nichole  
Nokleby, Scott  
O'Halloran, Niall

**Regrets:**

Barari, Ahmad  
Davidson, Catherine  
Habibi, Sarah

Kay, Robin  
Khalid, Osama  
Liscano, Ramiro  
McCabe, Janet  
Rahnamayan, Shahryar  
Sidhu, Tarlochan

Taylor, Noreen  
Williams, Alyssa

### **1. Call to Order**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

### **2. Agenda**

A request was made to add an item for discussion under “Other Business” relating to election nomination forms.

*Upon a motion duly made by J. Stokes and seconded by H. Kishawy, the Agenda was approved as amended.*

### **3. Chair’s Remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone back from Reading Week. He discussed several recent campus events, most notably the Red Dress Campaign. He was pleased to announce that the new building, currently named A5, will be given an Indigenous name. Jill Thompson and Rick Bourque have been in contact with the elders. The naming of a building usually involves a sweat and through that process, the elders arrive at a name that is reflective of the place and community. If members of the community are allowed to participate, it will be broadly communicated. The Chair noted the significance of having the university’s central meeting place given an Indigenous name.

The Chair also discussed the plan for the university to establish an energy initiative, which will be intended to substitute science for ideology. The goal is for the initiative to be pan-Canadian, as we need provincial solutions and technological innovations.

The Chair announced the Ontario Tech Talent Initiative, which will address the skills gap. This gives the university the opportunity to create a separate structure to provide students with options to obtain micro credentials to supplement their university degrees. This presents a particularly exciting opportunity, as it will be established as a for-profit entity and will generate revenue to flow back through to the university. By succeeding with this initiative, Ontario Tech will be the first university in Canada to be proactive about job readiness, which will serve as a huge differentiator for the university.

The Chair also updated Council on the status of the SMA3. The university is currently completing its second submission and nearing the end of the process. This has been more of an economic exercise and less of a strategic one.

He also challenged Council to think about how we can repackage our degrees. Many institutions offer a “pre-med program” and we offer the exact same courses but do not promote them in the same way. He emphasized the importance of always thinking and updating.

(A. Mohany arrived 2:42 p.m.)

A Council member offered support for a multidisciplinary approach towards developing energy solutions. A request was made for further education about the university’s strategic priorities.

#### **4. Minutes of the Meeting of January 28, 2020**

*Upon a motion duly made by F. Jones and seconded by H. Gaber, the Minutes were approved as presented.*

#### **5. Business Arising from the Minutes**

B. MacIsaac responded to a question from the last meeting about the tuition framework including fees for international graduate diplomas that do not yet have any students enrolled. He clarified that the lack of enrolment is by choice and that it will be referred back to the Graduate Studies Committee for further discussion.

There was also a follow up question about obtaining a copy of the new edition of the Democratic Rules of Order for Council members. L. Livingston responded that further to the discussion at the last meeting, the request would be considered from a budgetary point of view and a copy of the rules would be put on reserve in the libraries as a budget friendly option.

#### **6. Inquiries and Communications**

There were none.

#### **7. Provost’s Remarks**

##### **(a) Senior Academic Administrator Search Updates**

The Provost informed Academic Council (AC) that following the upcoming Board meeting, the name of the next Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences would be announced. Also, the new Director of EDI would also be announced next week. The Provost advised that announcements are coordinated with the successful candidates’ current institutions to give the institutions an opportunity to inform key members. The Provost also provided updates on the renewal process for the Dean of the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and search for the next Dean of FEAS.

The Provost also reminded council of upcoming events, including the Black History Month panel session scheduled for Thursday evening and the International Women’s Day event at 61 Charles taking place on the last Friday of March.

She noted that it is the time of year when we come together to celebrate community. Several of those events are Pi Day events from March 11-March 14, 3MT competition March 11-12, and Teaching Awards on March 26.

The Provost responded to questions from Academic Council. She discussed the role of the Director of EDI in relation to the President’s Equity Task Force. It was confirmed that although the initial funding for the role was secured through the Athena SWAN initiative, it is a full-time continuing position. The Director of EDI will be responsible for coordinating EDI initiatives across the university.

### **8. Integrated Academic Plan (IAP)**

L. Livingston thanked everyone for their input into the draft IAP. She explained that the longer version is an internally facing document and will serve as a reminder of the institution’s goals for the upcoming 18 months. She provided an overview of the broad consultation process and the development of the plan. Academic Council had an in depth discussion of the “tech with a conscience” commitment set out in the Executive Summary, as it seemed to relate to only one area. L. Livingston clarified that the commitments set out in the summary are intended to be at a high level and specific examples are captured underneath. L. Jacobs added that the IAP incorporates elements of the strategic research plan, which is a longer, 5-year plan.

There was also a question about whether there is a plan to update the MyCampus platform. L. Livingston advised that we are always considering ways to update our systems.

There was also a discussion regarding the priority of “tech with a conscience” whether STEAM could be incorporated into the document. A concern was expressed that FSSH feels it does not have a voice in the document. L. Livingston responded that the document was developed with the intention that everyone could see themselves in it. There was a discussion regarding how the Faculty of Health Sciences also does not fit into either STEM or STEAM. L. Livingston encouraged member to try not to focus on an acronym but on the substance of the IAP.

A comment was made that the IAP seems to place emphasis on energy in Canada and whether this is appropriately categorized as “tech with a conscience” or should be included as a separate section. There is a link between sustainability and the carbon footprint. Another comment was made that it assists with obtaining funding if grant requests can align with the university’s strategic documents.

(P. Shon arrived 3:10 p.m.)

L. Jacobs advised that the strategic research plan would be coming forward for consultation at the next meeting.

L. Livingston was also asked to clarify the definition of “play” as used in the IAP. She clarified that it was intended to be broadly interpreted as having fun. A comment was also made that we should expand partnerships beyond the region and target global partnerships.

## **9. FEAS Department Proposal**

H. Kishawy presented the proposal and responded to questions from Council members. He confirmed that the department restructuring would assist with accreditation. He also confirmed that there would be no impact on resources. The restructuring makes sense in terms of administrative workload and improved use of resources. H. Kishawy confirmed that the proposed structure would require a new Chair and that the Faculty would have the appropriate resources in place to support the new Chair.

***Upon a motion duly made by H. Kishawy and seconded by O. Davis, pursuant to the recommendation of the FEAS Faculty Council, Academic Council unanimously recommended the revised FEAS departmental structure, as presented, for approval by the Board of Governors.***

## **10. Policy Consultation:**

### **(a) Technology Use Policy**

N. O’Halloran presented an overview of the proposed Technology Use Policy. It was clarified that academic freedom would supersede the policy and that it is not intended to interfere with academic endeavours. N. O’Halloran and C. Foy responded to questions from Academic Council.

With respect to s.10.1, it was clarified that “IT Resources” are information technology resources provided by the University and not external resources (e.g. policy would not apply to Google Doodle poll, Excel, etc.). C. Foy asked for appropriate wording to be used from M. Bliemel.

There was also a question about why the Collective Agreement (CA) is not listed in the Related Documents section. C. Foy explained that the CA should not be included as, legally, it would supersede the policy.

There was also a discussion regarding s.12.1(c) and a member’s concerns about faculty having access to graduate student information through the graduate student portal. C. Foy discussed the application of FIPPA and the obligation of employees not to look at information unless they need to know in the course of their role. It was suggested that the concern be discussed offline with L. Roy.

Academic Council also discussed s. 13(2) and how material would be determined to be obscene, harassing, defamatory, discriminatory, pornographic or hateful. The University’s legal counsel

are always available for consultation. Although the definitions are not black and white, it is necessary to include the provision in the policy.

A question was also asked about the application of sections 12.1(b), 12.2(a) and 12.2(b) to administrative staff accessing their supervisors login information with the permission of the individual. C. Foy suggested that it would be helpful to clarify that the use must be “legal and with permission.”

## **11. Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC)**

### **(a) Program Review 18-Month Final Assessment Report – Bachelor of Science in Nursing**

G. Crawford presented the report.

*Upon a motion duly made by G. Crawford and seconded by H. Scott, pursuant to the recommendation of USC, Academic Council unanimously approved the 18-Month Final Assessment Report for the Bachelor of Science in Nursing Cyclical Program Review.*

### **(b) Major Program Modification - Faculty of Science – Bachelor of Science in Biological Science**

G. Crawford presented the report.

*Upon a motion duly made by G. Crawford and seconded by K. Nugent, pursuant to the recommendation of USC, Academic Council unanimously approved the Major Program Modification to the Bachelor of Science in Biological Science program, as presented.*

### **(c) Minor Program Adjustments:**

G. Crawford was available to answer questions about the information items.

- i. Faculty of Business and Information Technology – Bachelor of Commerce in Technology Management**
- ii. Faculty of Business and Information Technology – Bachelor of Information Technology in Technology Management**
- iii. Faculty of Business and Information Technology – Bachelor of Information Technology in Networking and IT Security and Pathways**
- iv. Faculty of Business and Information Technology –Entrepreneurship Minor for Students Outside FBIT**
- v. Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science and Faculty of Energy Systems and Nuclear Science – Bachelor of Engineering in Nuclear Engineering**

**vi. Faculty of Energy Systems and Nuclear Science – Bachelor of Technology in Sustainable Energy Systems**

There was a discussion regarding the proposal to change the admission requirements for the Bachelor of Technology in Sustainable Energy Systems. A concern was expressed about the possible perception that the university is lowering the standards of the program.

**vii. Faculty of Science – Bachelor of Science in Computer Science**

**viii. Faculty of Social Science and Humanities – Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and Political Science Advanced Entry**

**ix. Faculty of Social Science and Humanities – Bachelor of Arts in Psychology**

**x. Faculty of Social Science and Humanities – Minor program in Sustainability Studies**

**12. Graduate Studies Committee (GSC)**

**(a) Graduate Calendar to Policy Migration Project**

**i. Responsibilities of Graduate Program Directors, Faculty Advisors, Research Supervisors and Graduate Students Policy**

**ii. Graduate Grading System, Research Progress and Academic Standing policy**

**iii. Graduate Academic Appeals Policy**

**iv. Graduate Grade Reappraisal and Review of Research Progress Procedures**

L. Roy presented the proposal. He advised that the regulations are being migrated into the policy library and no major substantive changes were being proposed.

*Upon a motion duly made by L. Roy and seconded by O. Davis, pursuant to the recommendation of GSC, Academic Council unanimously approved the following policies and procedures, as presented:*

*i. Responsibilities of Graduate Program Directors, Faculty Advisors, Research Supervisors and Graduate Students Policy, and*

*ii. Graduate Grading System, Research Progress and Academic Standing Policy, and*

*iii. Graduate Academic Appeals Policy, and*

*iv. Graduate Grade Reappraisal and Review of Research Progress Procedures.*

**(b) Minor Program Adjustments**

**i. Faculty of Business and Information Technology – Master of Information Technology Security**

**ii. Faculty of Science – Computer Science**

**13. USC & GSC**

#### **(a) Undergraduate Calendar to Policy Migration Project - Graduate and Undergraduate Shared Policy**

G. Crawford confirmed that the proposal was a continuation of the migration project. A member noted that a “nasty little UOIT reference” needed to be removed from section 11.3 of the Registration and Course Selection Policy. There was also a discussion about how instructors can instructor confirm that individuals in their class are supposed to be there. J. Stokes confirmed that students auditing courses do appear on an instructor’s student roster. Further, they are working on incorporating photos into SIS and banner. It was also clarified that a “non-registered student” as referenced in section 6.3 is someone who just wants to audit a course and is not enrolled in a degree program. Seniors are mentioned separately due to tuition differential.

*Upon a motion duly made by G. Crawford and seconded by L. Roy, pursuant to the recommendation of GSC and USC, Academic Council unanimously approved the Auditing Courses Policy and the Registration and Course Selection Policy, as presented.*

#### **14. Research Board**

##### **(a) Research Strategic Plan**

L. Jacobs provided an update on the development of the plan. He advised that it includes principles, commitments, and research strengths independent of research priorities. He encouraged members to contact their Faculty’s member on the Research Board for further discussion.

##### **(b) Proposal to Establish Centre for Small Modular Reactors (SMR)**

L. Jacobs introduced the proposal. He informed Council that the Research Board unanimously recommended the proposal. He then introduced K. Atkinson to provide an overview of the proposal. K. Atkinson advised that the SMR opportunities are developing at a rapid pace and that the university must position itself now in order to obtain funding. The university is leveraging its faculty’s expertise in the area. He confirmed that the proposal would not require installing a reactor on campus.

L. Jacobs added that the proposal aligns well with an aspect of the strategic research plan. With respect to the proposed budget, no additional equipment is required. There was a discussion regarding the start-up culture of the SMR world.

*Upon a motion duly made by L. Jacobs and seconded by A. Tokuhiro, pursuant to the recommendation of the Research Board, Academic Council unanimously recommended the Centre for Small Modular Reactors proposal to the Board of Governors for approval, as presented.*



## **15. Other Business**

### **(a) Election Nomination Forms**

H. Scott brought forward a motion to amend the Academic Council election nomination form by removing the declaration statements. She expressed concern that the required statements do not reflect good governance practices and that the requirement is not in line with other universities. She also expressed concern about the chilling effect on the elections process, as if the statements are not checked, a nomination is considered incomplete. The Chair disagreed with the statement that it is not good governance practice. He advised that the matter was discussed by the Governance and Nominations Committee (GNC) and most of the committee members did not have an issue with the statements. H. Scott commented that the statements on the form could be used for censure by CAUT. B. Dinwoodie confirmed that the Academic Council Election Procedures, together with the nomination forms, would be coming forward for consultation at the next Academic Council meeting. If there are concerns/issues raised at the Council meeting, they will be brought back to GNC for consideration.

A question was asked whether a requirement that the final exam must be passed to pass a course is legally binding. Also, whether an instructor could require all course work to be completed in order to pass a course. The questions would be researched and an answer provided.

## **16. Termination**

*Upon a motion duly made by M. Lloyd, the meeting terminated at 4:30 p.m.*

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary