MINUTES OF OCAD UNIVERSITY’S SENATE REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2014, 3:00 – 6:00pm
ROOM 8322, 230 RICHMOND STREET WEST

Present: Keith Rushton (Chair); Lillian Allen; Tom Barker; Christine Bovis-Cnossen; Keith Bresnahan; Frederick Burbach; Nicole Collins; Sara Diamond; Rosemary Donegan; Jim Drobnick; Paul Epp; Andrea Fatona; Richard Fung; Kate Hartman; Bruce Hinds; Richard Hunt; Simone Jones; Selmin Kara; Caroline Langill; Laura Millard; Alexander Manu; Gerald McMaster; Lewis Nicholson; Gayle Nicoll; Elisabeth Paradis; Jill Patrick; Steve Quinlan; Charles Reeve; Helmut Reichenbächer; Lenore Richards; Margaux Smith; Vladimir Spicanovic; Peter Sramek; Dot Tuer; Natalie Waldburger; Michèle White; bh Yael

(non-voting) Carole Beaulieu; Ian Clarke; Deanne Fisher; Anda Kubis; Colette Laliberté; Claudette Lauzon; Jana Macalik; Michael Prokopow; Colleen Reid; Alan Simms; Evan Tapper

Regrets: Catherine Delaney; Judith Doyle; Michelle Forsyth; Simon Glass; Archie Graham; Anne Jackson; Simran Kaur; Sandy Kedey; Tony Kerr; Kiri Piotrowski; Nick Puckett; Ryan Rice; Virginia Trieloff

Secretary: Natalie Nanton

1. Welcome and Updates from the Chair – Keith Rushton
   Members were informed that the faculty membership of the Senate is complete with the addition of the new senators Nicole Collins in the Faculty At-Large category and Selmin Kara and Gerald McMaster in the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences and School of Interdisciplinary Studies category. The Chair also reported on the Senate Executive Committee’s further review of Senate Graduate Studies Committee membership, stating that the membership was approved as originally presented by the Senate Annual Nominating Committee.

   The following new student senators for the 2014/15 academic year were also announced: Anne Jackson; Simram Kaur; Kiri Piotrowski and Margaux Smith. Lastly, the Senate was informed of the membership on the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Action Plan and its scheduled meetings of October 3, 2014; October 15, 2014; and October 22, 2014.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   The Chair reviewed the agenda and called for a motion for approval.
   Motion to approve, moved by Elisabeth Paradis, seconded by Simone Jones.
   Motion carried, with 36 in favour, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

3. Approval of the Consent Agenda Information Items and Minutes
   The Chair presented the consent agenda and called for a motion for approval.
   Motion to approve, moved by Michèle White, seconded by Steve Quinlan.

   Discussion arose regarding a report in the press on a decrease in student enrolment across Ontario universities with a focus on OCAD University. It was questioned whether this decrease was connected to the loss of the Director, Admissions & Recruitment. Vice-President, Academic, Christine
Bovis-Cnossen explained that there had been a decline in enrolment across the province and perspectives are skewed when these percentages were attached to a small institution like OCAD University. She further reported that all universities have seen a drop in their first year enrolments, resulting from changing demographics. She noted that the university has had an increase in enrolments of advance standing students, and that the Honours BA program in Visual and Critical Studies had notably done well for a new program. Discussion ensued regarding the nature of the changing demographics as it affects post-secondary education. President Diamond further commented on recruitment efforts for the Digital Futures program and the BA program since both require a different kind of student than has historically attended the university. In addition, it was noted that official enrolment numbers were not yet available to report.

An addition to the minutes of the consent agenda was made to add to a footnote in the minutes stating that Professor Jim Drobnick had not served for the past two years on the Senate Graduate Studies Committee.

The presidential review process was then raised regarding the unresolved concern of how the process was executed, the lack of trust created between both bodies and the role of the Chair of the Board of Governors in conducting the review process. Members discussed Senate and Board relations as a top priority to be addressed, including further discussions about the university’s bicameral governance in the upcoming Board/Senate Liaison Committee meetings. The Senate then discussed the nomination and appointment process for both internal and external vacancies on the Board’s membership and the government’s role in approving some of these appointments.

The Chair returned to the consent agenda motion on the table for a vote. Motion carried, with 36 in favour, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

Concern was continued to be expressed on the manner in which the presidential review process was conducted resulting in a motion being proposed of no confidence in the way the Board Chair lead the review.

**NEW MOTION**

Whereas the Board of Governors, under the leadership of Chair Ian Tudhope refused to consider its approach to the Presidential Review, despite being presented repeatedly with the Senate’s concerns and with clear evidence that these concerns reflected concerns of the faculty community;

Whereas the Board of Governors, under the leadership of Chair Tudhope, failed to establish the trust of faculty members in the Presidential Review and, consequently, we believe that the Presidential Review was flawed, its outcome predetermined, and that fear of retribution prevented the airing of honest criticism;

Whereas the Board of Governors, under the leadership of Chair Ian Tudhope, by all of the above, disregarded the bicameralism at the core of the University’s governance and the place of Senate and Faculty members in the governance of the university and;

Therefore be it resolved that the Senate has no confidence in Chair Tudhope’s leadership regarding the Presidential Review Committee.

**Motion to approve**, moved by Frederick Burbach, seconded by Michèle White.

**Discussion:**

It was stated that the concern expressed by the Senate and the broader community about the review process was not registered by the Board of Governors and calls into question the university’s bicameral governance. The motion was further highlighted to express the Board’s lack of respect for the Senate.
The impact of the motion on the relationship between the Board and Senate was debated. A need to move forward was expressed as some saw the motion as damaging and having the potential to alienate the two bodies. It was also noted that the Board Chair would be completing his term in November. Furthermore, the achievements and support that the Board Chair had brought to the university over the past six years were cited and concern was expressed around the impact of the motion on the incoming new leadership of the Board.

At the request of new senators, the events at Senate during the presidential review process were reviewed including the memos sent to the Board as well as information about the survey that the OCAD Faculty Association conducted regarding the President’s performance. The lack of action performed by the Board regarding these communications and information was emphasized.

A point of order was then raised on procedures for the substantive motion being proposed. Senate Bylaw Article 8.8.9 was cited highlighting that the motion on the table should have been provided in writing in advance to Senate, through the Senate Executive Committee for consideration or submitted to the Senate Secretary. Furthermore, following Senate Bylaw Article 8.8.10 it was pointed out that the motion should be placed under the Other Business section of the agenda as a notice of a motion unless the majority of Senate considers its timeliness warranted, thus waiving the normal requirements of notice.

The Chair called for a motion for approval to waive the normal requirements of Bylaw Article 8.8.9 Notice for a Motion, clarifying that if it is defeated, the motion could return to the next meeting of Senate.

Motion to approve, moved by Paul Epp, seconded by Lewis Nicholson. Motion carried by paper ballot.

The Chair stated that the motion would be further considered in other business of the agenda.

4. Information Updates from the President


President Diamond reported that OCAD University hosted MPP Peggy Sattler, NDP Critic for Training, Colleges and Universities and Research and Innovation. She noted that MPP Sattler is an advocate for paid student internships and was pleased with OCAD University’s alignment on this topic through the Experiential Learning Program policy recently passed at Senate. President Diamond highlighted the other key priority issues discussed including support for capital investment at OCAD U; support for changing the BIU weighting; and extending the university’s degree granting capacity. The majority Liberal government was then discussed in terms of their strong focus on measuring outcomes and success, as exemplified with the Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA), and the need to work with the sector to ensure OCAD University’s SMA is appropriately administered. She referenced OCAD U’s ERP implementation (Project Chroma) as playing a very important role in providing more specific metrics needed to present to the ministry.

Two main discussions arising in government were highlighted: 1) What the tuition framework in Ontario will be in the next number of years; and 2) What will happen with the funding formula. President Diamond further highlighted that another significant issue consistently raised is inflation and how the cost of university expenses can be contained. Additional themes arising in government that were identified to be of concern are access and affordability. President Diamond noted that she is striving to make quality one of the criteria and not only growth. President Diamond also reflected on the government at the federal and potential funding plans where specific opportunities could be gained by OCAD University. Other topics highlighted included the controversy on the Canadian foreign workers policy and how that affects the institution and priorities going into the next budget. Lastly, she briefly highlighted the recent mayoral debate and invited questions.
5. Reports from the University Registrar – Elisabeth Paradis

5.1. Approval of Undergraduate and Graduate Spring/Summer 2014 Grades
The University Registrar reviewed the grade report and the Chair called for a motion for approval.  
Motion to approve, moved by Rosemary Donegan, seconded by Lenore Richards.  
Motion carried, unanimously.

5.2. Annual Report on Academic Misconduct
The University Registrar reviewed the report outlining that there were more misconduct cases than in the past, which she explained could be due to underreporting. She also highlighted that there were more suspensions this year than in previous years and one expulsion. It was suggested that it would be useful for the Registrar to report the number of multiple offences that have occurred.

6. Senate Committee Reports

6.1. Senate Academic Policy & Planning Committee (SAPPC) – Christine Bovis-Cnossen

6.1.1. For Approval:

6.1.1.1. Woodsworth Academic Bridging Agreement
The Committee Chair presented the agreement and the Senate Chair then called for a motion for approval. 
Motion to approve, moved by Christine Bovis-Cnossen, seconded by Simone Jones.

Discussion:  
The 63% GPA requirement for the Woodsworth program was raised and it was questioned whether there would be an additional test to assess a student’s language proficiency when entering OCAD University. It was clarified that the program is targeted to students wanting a pathway into university who do not have the formal requirements normally obtained through high school. The idea that the university could be competing for students through this program was raised since direct admission is offered to the University of Toronto through the Woodsworth program while students still need to apply for admission to OCAD University. It was explained that the goal would be for OCAD University to have its own program of this nature but currently it does not have the resources. 

Motion carried, unanimously.

6.2. Senate Undergraduate Studies Committee (SUSC) – Michèle White

6.2.1. For Information:

6.2.1.1. Establishment of Working Group on Course Delivery Types
The Committee Chair informed the Senate of the activities of the working group and invited members to contribute for discussion through the SUSC secretary, Jason Northway-Frank.

6.2.1.2. Approved Proposal for Cross-faculty Membership on Faculty Curriculum Committees
The Committee Chair clarified that the motion for cross-faculty appointments on faculty curriculum committees should be put forward for Senate approval. The Chair called for a motion for approval to the following proposal:

In order to encourage collaboration, exchange, and increase effective communication, each faculty curriculum committee will include one voting member from each of the other two faculty curriculum committees:
a) The Faculty of Art curriculum committee shall include one member from the Faculty of Design curriculum committee and one member from the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences and School of Interdisciplinary Studies curriculum committee.

b) The Faculty of Design curriculum committee shall include one member from the Faculty of Art curriculum committee and one member from the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences and School of Interdisciplinary Studies curriculum committee.

c) The Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences and School of Interdisciplinary Studies curriculum committee shall include one member from the Faculty of Art curriculum committee and one member from the Faculty of Design curriculum committee.

**Motion to approve**, moved by Michèle White, seconded by Christine Bovis-Cnossen.

**Discussion:**
The timeline for implementation was discussed given the current conflicting schedules of the faculty curriculum committees. It was pointed out that the information regarding the proposal had not been communicated to the individual curriculum committees for discussion. It was therefore requested that the motion be tabled until that occurs. The Chair called for a motion to table the approval of the proposal.

**Motion to table**, moved by Gayle Nicoll, seconded by Caroline Langill. **Motion defeated** with 8 in favour, 9 opposed and 0 abstentions.

It was further argued that due to logistics, the proposal could not be implemented until next term. The Committee Chair informed members that discussions surrounding the idea of cross-faculty appointments to these committees were fully discussed at the May 8, 2014 SUSC meeting and that it was not the committee’s intent to proceed if it could not be realized logistically. It was agreed to amend the motion to be implemented by January 2015.

**Motion carried**, as amended, unanimously.

6.3. Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC) – Helmut Reichenbächer

6.3.1. For Information

6.3.1.1. Establishment of Policy and Assessment Working Group
The Committee Chair informed members that the working group would be chaired by the Associate Dean, Graduate Studies and welcomed volunteers. Since the working group’s focus relates to that of the Senate Academic Standards Committee, it was suggested that members from that committee could participate. The Committee Chair further explained that the idea of the working group is to have initial discussions around policy which would then move on to the appropriate committee of Senate (SASC or SAPPC) for debate and approval.

6.4. Senate Continuing Studies Committee (SCSC) – Charles Reeve

6.4.1. For Information:

6.4.1.1. New Approved Courses
The Committee Chair introduced three new continuing studies courses and invited questions. Issues concerning the booking of the fabrication studio for one of the courses was discussed. The Continuing Studies Manager, Evan Tapper,
reported that he worked with the Director, Studio Facilities to ensure that the course was scheduled at a time that would not interfere with other courses run by the Faculty of Art and the Faculty of Design.

7. Capital Planning Updates – Alan Simms
Vice-President, Finance & Administration, Alan Simms, provided an overview on the capital planning framework, including the values that inform the objectives as well as both the near and long term focus. The presentation provided updates on improvements to existing space in terms of renovations and the repurposing of space including the relocation of the campus bookstore and the transformation of 115 McCaul St into studio and experiential learning space. Plans for 230 and 240 Richmond Street West, expansions within 100 McCaul St, potential growth of 113 McCaul St and major capital projects were also addressed. Academic and student space were delineated within the various plans.

Discussion:
The plans for both 60 and 54 McCaul St were questioned. It was stated that these spaces would not be lost in this academic year. Furthermore, the Vice-President, Finance and Administration explained that following a report by Lord Cultural Resources it is anticipated that the student gallery and graduate gallery will possibly be co-located at 205 Richmond St West, although other alternatives are still being explored. Concerns were expressed regarding taking on additional debt with real estate when current facilities were not well maintained. The anticipated increase in foot traffic between north and south campus were also raised in terms of plans for safety provisions. Lastly, the expansion of the special collections and the library in general were discussed in further detail.

The Chair informed members that they were approaching the end of the meeting time and called for a motion to extend the meeting beyond 6:00pm.

Motion to approve, moved by Jill Patrick, seconded by Bruce Hinds.
Motion carried with 29 in favour, 6 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

8. Other Business
The committee reviewed the motion that called for a vote of no confidence in the Board Chair’s leadership in the presidential review committee process. An amendment was then proposed to original motion. The Chair called for a motion for approval to the proposal to amend the motion.

Motion to approve, moved by Caroline Langill, seconded by Frederick Burbach.
Motion carried, with 31 in favour, 0 opposed, 6 abstentions.

It was proposed that the second paragraph be omitted from the motion as it was explained that it confused the issue and added no value to the motion. The Chair called for a motion for approval to omit the paragraph.

Motion to approve the omission of the second paragraph, moved by Tom Barker, seconded by Keith Bresnahan.
Motion carried with in 36 in favour, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

The revised motion was recited as follows:

Whereas the Board of Governors, under the leadership of Chair Ian Tudhope refused to consider its approach to the Presidential Review, despite being presented repeatedly with the Senate’s concerns and with clear evidence that these concerns reflected concerns of the faculty community;

Whereas the Board of Governors, under the leadership of Chair Ian Tudhope, by all of the above, disregarded the bicameralism at the core of the University’s governance and the place of Senate and Faculty members in the governance of the university and;
Therefore be it resolved that the Senate has no confidence in Chair Tudhope’s leadership regarding the Presidential Review Committee.

Discussion:
A final debate on the motion ensued, including strong concerns expressed on whether the motion would be productive for Senate and governance in general at the university. The Chair then put the question to a vote.

Motion carried via paper ballot.

President Diamond raised a point of privilege expressing deep concern over the motion carried and the impact that it will create in further straining Senate relations with the Board.

9. Question and Answer Period
No further questions were raised.

10. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn, moved by Rosemary Donegan, seconded by Frederick Burbach.
Motion carried, unanimously at 6:11pm.