MINUTES OF OCAD UNIVERSITY’S SENATE REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 2016, 3:00 – 6:00pm
ROOM 322, 230 RICHMOND STREET WEST

Present: b.h. Yael (Chair); Annette Blum; Maggie Broda (Board Chair designate); Sara Diamond; Judith Doyle; Deanne Fisher; Richard Fung; Simon Glass; Roderick Grant; David Griffin; Lynne Heller; Johanna Householder; Richard Hunt; Camille Isaacs; Selmin Kara; Martha Ladly; Caroline Langill; Gerald McMaster; Dorie Millerson; Martha Muszycka-Jones; Lewis Nicholson; Gayle Nicoll; Luke Painter; Jill Patrick; Elisabeth Paradis; Helmut Reichenbächer; Ryan Rice; Carol Roderick; Gillian Siddall; Vladimir Spicanovic; Evan Tapper; Natalie Waldburger; Emma Westecott; Ryan Whyte

Regrets: Rushmita Alam; Lillian Allen; Keith Bresnahan; Frederick Burbach; Nicole Collins; Catherine Delaney; Jim Drobnick; Andrea Fatona; Michelle Forsyth; Julian Goss; Chantelle Hope; Jacqueline Lee; Alexander Manu; Gabrielle Moser; Paulette Phillips; John Semple; Jennie Suddick; Marie-Josée Therrien; Viriginia Trieloff

Guests: Susanne Seinader, Director, Centre for Students with Disabilities (Item #6.2.1.); Amanda Hotrum, Director, Office of Diversity, Equity and Sustainability Initiatives (Item #6.2.1.); Kiri Piotrowski, Director, Academic Affair, OCAD Student Union (Item #7)

Secretary: Hillary Barron

Meeting commenced at 3:05pm.

1. Welcome and Updates from the Chair
   The Chair welcomed Dr. Martha Ladly, Digital Futures Transitional Graduate Program Director, to the Senate membership, filling the current Graduate Program Director vacancy. Maggie Broda, President, OCAD U Alumni Association, was also welcomed as voting designate for Board Chair, Dr. John Semple. The Chair congratulated Dr. Gerald McMaster for being named Tier I Canada Research Chair (CRC) at OCAD University. Members were then informed that the Senate Election nomination period for faculty senators closed on Friday, February 26, 2016 and the election will open on Monday, March 7, 2016 for Faculty Area Senators with Faculty At-Large elections to follow.

   The Chair referenced the various information reports from the standing committees of Senate, noting that the Senate Undergraduate Studies and the Senate Graduate Studies Committees did hold meetings in February and therefore no reports were included. The
Chair informed members of the report she produced from various meetings and consultation sessions with Program Chairs and Graduate Program Directors, noting that she will bring it forward to the next Senate meeting after it is presented to the Senate Executive Committee. She informed members that she met with the Graduate Program Directors to discuss the future structure of Graduate Studies. She also informed members that she met with the University Registrar and Assistant Registrar, Scheduling to discuss curriculum timelines and faculty assignments and that the Registrar will meet with Chairs to discuss issues with access for required student information.

Lastly, the Chair notified Senators that the next Senate meeting, on March 21, 2016, is one week ahead due to the Easter holiday, noting the quick turnaround time for committee business to come to Senate.

2. **Approval of the Senate Agenda of February 29, 2016**
The Chair put forward the agenda for February 29, 2016, as a motion for approval.

   **Motion to approve**, moved by Sara Diamond, seconded by Helmut Reichenbächer.  
   **Motion carried**, unanimously.

3. **Approval of the Consent Agenda Information Items and Senate Meeting Minutes from January 25, 2016**
The Chair put forward the Consent Agenda and Senate meeting minutes from January 25, 2016, as a motion for approval.

   **Motion to approve**, moved by Helmut Reichenbächer, seconded by Elisabeth Paradis.  
   **Motion carried**, with 30 in favour, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

4. **Information Update from the President and Vice-Chancellor**
President Diamond noted that she will provide an update on the Graduate Studies Task Force in the in-camera session of the Senate Executive Committee Business item on the agenda. President Diamond provided a preliminary report on the agenda for the next Joint Board-Senate Liaison Committee meeting, which will include a look at the budget assumptions as well as multi-year academic planning and its relationship with budget forecasting. President Diamond highlighted that the agenda for the Joint Committee will be focused to encourage more substantive conversation. She also informed members of the aim to have a full meeting of the Board of Governors and Senate on May 30, 2016 so more faculty will be on campus but that the date of June 20, 2016 should still be held. This meeting will include a conversation regarding the university’s vision and mission.

5. **Academic Planning Update**
The Vice-President, Academic presented a progress report. She reminded members that the Academic Planning Steering Committee was struck by the Senate Academic Policy and Planning Committee in December with its first meeting on January 20, 2016 and that it will
continue to meet at least bi-weekly until a first draft is completed. She reviewed the steering committee membership and the principles guiding the process in developing the plan. Next, each of the six phases of the planning process and their timeline was detailed: Phase One: Setting the Context; Phase Two: Creating the First Draft of the Academic Plan; Phase Three: Consultation Period; Phase Four: Revisions Based on Consultation; Phase Five: Second Consultation Period; Phase Six: Final Revisions and Submission to Final Draft to Senate and the Board of Governors. Lastly, after governance approval, it was stated that the individual units will develop plans. These more detailed plans would identify actions that will support each goal and priority, leading to more detailed and accurate costing.

Discussion:
The Chair suggested that an extra meeting of Senate occur in December 2016 dedicated to the review of the final draft of the Academic Plan. Discussion ensued regarding how the President’s Task Force on Underrepresentation will impact the Academic Plan. It was confirmed that the work of this task force will inform priorities that will emerge from Academic Plan.

6. Senate Committee Reports
6.1. Senate Executive Committee (SEC)
   The Chair called for a motion to move to an In-Camera session.

   **Motion to move to an in camera session**, moved by Richard Hunt, seconded by Richard Fung.
   **Motion carried**, unanimously.

IN CAMERA SESSION
Commenced at 3:38pm.

The following business was discussed In Camera:

   6.1.1. Recommendation for the Appointment of the Graduate Program Director for the MDes Design for Health Program
   6.1.2. Update and Discussion on the Work of the Graduate Studies Task Force

REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING OF SENATE
Commenced at 4:27pm.

6.1.3. Timelines for Curriculum Approval at Senate
   The Chair introduced the recommendation approved by Senate Executive Committee and called for a motion for approval.

   **Motion to approve** that all curriculum changes are approved at the last Senate meeting of the fall term and that faculties are encouraged to undertake
curriculum planning in the spring, moved by Richard Hunt, seconded by Elisabeth Paradis.
Motion carried, with 32 in favour, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

6.1.4. Special Topics
The Chair reported that stemming from her consultations with the Graduate Program Directors and Program Chairs, the SEC has prioritized two items from the list of special topics:

a) Interdisciplinarity and Student Experience at OCAD University: What are the ideal pathways for students in relation to their respective program areas? (March or April Senate)

b) Practice-based Research and Research Creation (April or May Senate).

The Chair noted that the first topic can also be addressed in terms of the structure of graduate programs that are interdisciplinary as well as interdisciplinary minors and majors within the Faculties for a more cross-university discussion. She suggested that this discussion occur at the March Senate meeting and called for volunteers. The following volunteers were identified to join Caroline Langill in leading the discussion: Emma Westecott, Martha Ladly, Judith Doyle, Lynne Heller, Ian Clarke and in her absence, consent was confirmed for Paulette Phillips to participate.

For the second topic, the following volunteers were identified to join Helmut Reichenbächer in leading the discussion: Judith Doyle, Emma Westecott, Martha Ladly, Dorie Millerson and Natalie Waldburger. The Chair referenced additional special topics and invited members to submit more topics to Hillary Barron.

6.2. Senate Academic Policy and Planning Committee (SAPPC)
6.2.1. Policy on Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities
The Chair invited Susanne Seinader, Director, Centre for Students with Disabilities and Deanne Fisher, Associate Vice-President, Students to present the policy and it was noted that Amanda Hotrum, Director, Office of Diversity, Equity and Sustainability Initiatives would speak thereafter. Members were provided with some context and background, including an overview of legal documents that were referenced in developing the policy. It was emphasized that the policy fills an existing gap and is the institutions way to articulate legislative requirements. The policy development process was reviewed in terms of the committee review and other consultations that occurred. A high level overview of each section of the policy was also presented including the strengthened roles and responsibilities section and a new section on resolving concerns, which the Ontario Human Rights Commission recommends in terms of having an appeals process. Lastly, members were informed that the next step is a procedural review and communications plan to ensure internal procedures align. Strategies to
communicate the policy were outlined. Amanda Hotrum congratulated the Centre for Students with Disabilities, Deanne Fisher and others who were involved. She commended the policy for having a progressive understanding of human rights law and aligning closely with the human rights guidelines. The Chair then presented the revised policy to members and called for a motion for approval.

**Motion to approve**, moved by Gillian Siddall, seconded by Vladimir Spicanovic.

**Discussion**: Members debated the merits of including Class Assistants, Technicians and Teaching Assistants within the language of the policy since students spend a great deal of time with these groups of instructors. It was acknowledged that this is a procedural issue that needs to be addressed in order to enable studio staff access to information as well as guidance and support.

Challenges in delivering accommodations from a fiscal point of view were discussed in terms of how they can be addressed in a more realistic way. Members were informed that the policy discusses responsibility of accommodating students as an institutional responsibility and therefore not resigned to a single departmental budget. Furthermore, interim accommodations should be provided while planning and budgeting to provide the best case scenario for students. In relation it was stated that there is a working group looking at how to effectively use space at 205 Richmond and the Vice-President, Finance and Administration is exploring what investments are needed to update the elevator, for example, which is a significant barrier for students and staff with disabilities.

Regarding the communications plan, it was suggested that workshops also be available in areas such as how accommodations letters are dealt with in a studio setting. It was reported that this type of training has already occurred such as at the recent Teaching Expo where faculty members themselves shared their successes, challenges and different approaches in this area. Susanne also offered to visit individual Faculties to facilitate an understanding of the policy.

Section 3.7b) of the policy was highlighted in terms of what an essential requirement is and what can be accommodated within a studio environment. Susanne highlighted that this as a critical aspect of the accommodations process and encouraged faculty members to start a discussion with their Chairs and Associate Deans to define language to articulate the qualities of studio education that are considered essential. A simple accommodation such as attendance was raised as one of the most challenging since it is an important part of the learning experience in studio education.
From an academic standards perspective, it was suggested that accommodations be measured against learning objectives of the course, which can be likened to essential requirements of the course. Discussion ensued regarding personal challenges with navigating accommodation requests in studio classes. It was reiterated that part of the challenge is that one must provide individualized accommodations and faculty are the experts in what they deliver and therefore are instrumental in identifying a range of solutions for students. President Diamond clarified that learning outcomes are not the same as methods to achieve those objectives and it is possible to have different methods to accommodate. She suggested the creative use of technology in the classroom to enable different types of engagement such as blended learning.

It was underlined that Associate Deans need to be involved at an early stage as they work most closely with the policy and know how to negotiate it with students such as with accommodations for attendance. Susanne acknowledged that this would be included within the upcoming communication strategy. Faculty workload implications were also raised and it was suggested that this aspect needs to be a central part of the discussion going forward. The concern was acknowledged but members were reminded that this is a policy about providing accommodations and suggested that there may be other avenues to address those issues.

The Senate returned to the issue of recognizing Class Assistants, Technicians and Teaching Assistants within the policy and it was argued that the policy be inclusive by including a broad definition of instructor in the definitions. An amendment to the policy was proposed:

**MOTION AMENDED:** THAT the definition for Instructor be added to the Appendix section of the policy as follows, “Instructor, which may include faculty, technicians, and class assistants as appropriate to a given situation.” be added to the Appendix section under the definition of “Instructor”,

**Motion to amend**, moved by Dorie Millerson, seconded by Carol Roderick.

**Discussion:** Members discussed how this group of instructors could be included within the communication plan to receive adequate training. It was also noted that the request for inclusion comes directly from the technicians.

**Amendment carried**, unanimously.

The Chair then called the question for the original motion for the approval of the Policy on Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities.
Motion carried, as amended, unanimously.

6.2.2. SAPPC Business Report
The Committee Chair referred to the information item regarding the establishment of a sub-committee to explore indigenizing governance at OCAD University and other opportunities for indigenizing the university.

6.3. Senate Academic Standards Committee (SASC)
  6.3.1. Revisions to the Academic Calendar for 2016/17
The Chair called for a motion for approval.

Motion to approve to approve that a study day be inserted after the first day of classes in fall 2016, that a study day be inserted after the last day of classes on the Monday in winter 2017 and that a study day also be used as a makeup day in the unforeseen closure of the institution, moved by Gayle Nicoll, seconded by Elisabeth Paradis.

Discussion:
Members were reminded that the 2016/17 academic calendar had already been approved by the Senate and that a minor revision is being proposed to this existing calendar. It was stated that the university currently has no provision next year for possible disruptions to classes due to external factors and that it is very difficult to reschedule classes, etc. on an ad hoc basis.

Discussion ensued regarding the impact of having critiques scheduled on a Saturday and the availability of faculty and students on the weekend as well as placing students in a position to ask for accommodation for religious reasons. It was pointed out, however, that exams have been held on Saturdays for several years at the institution. An alternative was presented to move the final critique day to Monday, December 19, 2016. The Chair called for a motion for approval of the amendment.

Motion to approve the amendment that the final critique day is moved from Saturday, December 17, 2016 to Monday, December 19, 2016, and that grade submission date be moved forward a day, moved by Dorie Millerson, seconded by Johanna Householder.

It was debated why exams and critiques were being treated differently in this regard. In addition, the various criteria used to establish the approved calendar was reviewed. Members were also informed that a different approach to the assessment period will be presented for approval at the next senate meeting. Motion carried, with 21 in favour, 4 opposed, 8 abstentions.
The Chair called the question on the academic calendars as amended. 

**Motion carried**, as amended, with 24 in favour, 0 opposed and 9 abstentions.

6.3.2. Business Report from SASC

Members were referred to the brief information update concerning the upcoming business for approval: academic calendars 2017/18 and onwards and revisions to policy 1014: Academic Misconduct for Undergraduate and Graduate Students.

6.4. Senate Quality Assurance Committee (SQAC)

6.4.1. Business Report from SQAC

The Committee Chair referred to the information report outlining updates on the IQAP policy revisions, cyclical program reviews, external reviewer nomination process and working group on final assessment reports.

7. Report from the Student Experience Working Group (SEWG)

Kiri Piotrowski, Director, Academic Affairs of the OCAD Student Union, and former member of Senate, provided an update on ongoing projects of the SEWG. She reminded members of the SEWG presentation to Senate in March 2015 regarding dissatisfaction with their studio space and access to facilities. She referred to the list of projects and the goal to make them a reality such as continuous availability of workspace in the Great Hall and encouraged faculty to support these goals in terms of aiding in communication, awareness and overall community building. Members were informed of the next SEWG meeting on March 28, 2016 at 2:00pm on the 10th floor of 230 Richmond Street West, which will be focused on communication and community building and will include the Director, Marketing and Communications as well as program assistants.

Discussion ensued regarding ways to effectively communicate to students through various media platforms. Kiri acknowledged this problem and spoke of the need for a more centralized method of communication for students. The Chair thanked Kiri and the SEWG for their efforts to improve communication and foster community at the OCAD University.

8. COU Academic Colleague Report

Vladimir Spicanovic reported that he COU Academic Colleagues met twice since the last Senate report in November. He provided highlights including discussions on the University Funding Formula Review and important issues around costing as well as growth and data. It was also reported that OCAV have established a task force on quality indicators of undergraduate student experience. In addition, he spoke of Bill 132 and the obligation for Ontario universities to have a policy in place regarding sexual violence within a six month period.

Members were then encouraged to visit the eCampus Ontario portal (www.ecampusontario.ca) where 13,000 online courses and programs are currently being offered and were informed of the OSAP new student assistant fund providing free tuition to
low income families. Lastly, Vladimir spoke about the ongoing focus of experiential learning as a chosen topic of the Academic Colleagues where they will present a practical set of recommendations to the executive heads at the next meeting in April.

9. Other Business
   It was announced that the Environmental Design program, with its new Interior Design specialization, has received full accreditation for six years by the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA).

10. Adjournment
    Motion to approve, moved by Emma Westecott, seconded by Richard Hunt.
    Motion carried, unanimously at 6:00pm.