Welcome and Updates from the Chair
The Chair opened the meeting with an Indigenous land acknowledgment and spoke to the various Indigenous initiatives occurring at the University including the Indigenous Visual Culture Reading Group organized by the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences and School of Interdisciplinary Studies.

The Chair welcomed the following new senators: Kate Sellen, Graduate Program Director, Design for Health; Akash Inbakumar, third year Material Art and Design student; and Robert Ridgway, second year Sculpture and Installation student. Members were informed that no nominations were received during the extended student nomination period for the vacant graduate seat or the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences and School of Interdisciplinary Studies seat. General elections for both students and faculty are to commence in the Spring.

Lastly, members were reminded of the next Senate special topic discussion: Integration of Different Kinds of Knowledge to occur in March and April. Those interested in participating in the planning of this discussion were invited to contact the Senate Secretary.

2. Senate Agenda for February 26, 2018
The Chair presented the agenda and called for a motion for decision.
Motion to approve the Senate agenda for February 26, 2018, moved by Ryan Rice, seconded by Lewis Nicholson.
**Motion carried**, with 38 in favour, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

3. **Minutes from the January 29, 2018 Meeting of Senate**
   The Chair presented the minutes and called for a motion for decision.
   **Motion to approve** the Senate meeting minutes from January 29, 2018, moved by Bogdan Luca, seconded by Natalie Waldburger.
   **Motion carried** with 31 in favour, 0 opposed and 8 abstentions.

4. **Consent Agenda Information Items**
   The Chair reviewed the following consent agenda information items and called for a motion to accept the following: a) Report from the President and Vice-Chancellor; b) Report from the Vice-President, Academic and Provost; and c) Report from the Vice-President, Research and Innovation.
   **Motion to accept** the consent agenda information items, moved by Min Sook Lee, seconded by Sylvia Whitton.
   An update was requested from the Vice-President, Academic and Provost regarding the faculty complement discussion from the previous meeting. The Provost reported on meetings with Program Chairs around the issue to ensure adequate delivery of curriculum. It was also pointed out that with the development of the multi-year forecast additional Tenure-Track hires are being planned, in addition to the present Indigenous “cluster” hiring initiative.
   **Motion carried**, unanimously.

5. **Information Update from the President and Vice-Chancellor**
   President Diamond provided an update on the institution’s political lobbying activities including meetings with the Liberals, NDP, and Conservatives parties as well as active conversations across three ministries of the provincial government. She spoke of the institution’s full-time equivalent (FTE) status in comparison to other universities and the efforts towards the Ministry to increase support that was not fully provided during OCAD University’s transition from a college. Furthermore, she explained that this support is required in order to reach system averages in the sector, responding to demands for program support, experiential learning, the library and other resources. She spoke further to the different positions and focus of conversations occurring with each political party. In response to questions, the President discussed the amount of money being requested and the overall amount that would bring the institution to the system average to support tenure-track faculty, library improvements and support for undergraduate and graduate studies.

   Access to the Ada Slaight renovation fund was raised in relation to the Creative City Campus decisions for 100 McCaul. It was reported that the north side study had recently become the most considered option and therefore plans will be formalized over the summer so that faculty and students can start to be engaged in the process in the fall. Construction was reported to start in 2019 and be completed in 2022.
6. **COU Academic Colleague Report**

Dean Vladimir Spicanovic reported on the December 12-13, 2017 Council of Ontario Universities’ (COU) Academic Council meeting based on the notes compiled by Dr. Julia Colyer, COU Senior Policy Analyst. Highlights from the meeting included a conversation with Dr. Bill Cormack, President of the University of Guelph Faculty Association, who discussed the government’s focus on performance metrics and accountability frameworks leading to concerns across the sector of a top-down approach on pedagogy and the need to enhance faculty engagement in the Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) process and related areas. An update was provided on the work of the OCAV Task Force on Quality Indicators and the thirteen pilot projects underway for the development of SMA3 metrics. It was noted that OCAD University is involved in two of those pilot projects to develop potential new metrics: one led by Carleton University on employment readiness and on the other led by the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT) on the success and engagement of underrepresented students. Other updates provided included the ethics review on the sector wide sexual violence survey, the Faculty At Work project and lastly, a project on the landscape of accessibility led by Dr. Mahadeo Sukhai, to close the gap between Ontarians with disabilities and those without in postsecondary institutions. The next COU Academic Colleague report, regarding the February 13-14, 2018 meeting, is scheduled to be reported at the March Senate meeting.

7. **Health and Wellness/Centre for Students with Disabilities Restructure**

Deanne Fisher, Vice-Provost, Students and International provided background and context for the review of the Centre for Students with Disabilities (CSD), what was learned, and the priorities moving forward. Overall members were informed that the review is only in its initial phase and the significant change will be to put resources in place for the merging of the CSD with the Health and Wellness Centre (HWC). It was noted that OCAD University is not the only institution struggling with how to improve in supporting accommodations. Deanne also reported on the increase in staff, which has made a positive impact so far and she outlined the following next steps: clarify faculty and student responsibilities with retroactive accommodations, incompletes and attendance policies; rethinking the petitions process; work on operational processes; and rebranding.

**Discussion:** In response to accommodations for physical spaces, such as studios, it was clarified that campus accessibility is implemented through the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and not the CSD, and that work is being done in this area through Facilities and Studio Management in conjunction with the Office of Diversity, Equity & Sustainability Initiatives.

The Vice-Provost acknowledged the concerns around how the restructure will affect faculty workload, stating that it is a priority moving forward in terms of ensuring there is no increase in impact. Discussion ensued regarding the CSD staffing levels in comparison to other universities and the task of the note-taker as to whether it should be assigned to professionals rather than students. Resources were suggested in pedagogy to enable different kinds of structures for learning such as to decolonize and open up the curriculum, different methods of assessment or to provide earlier access of course materials to students. In response to the need for short-term solutions to address faculty and student...
responsibilities, an incremental and project-by-project approach was offered, where increasing inclusive learning would result in a decrease of workload on accommodations. Examples were provided such as creating multiple pathways for assessment to achieve learning outcomes yielding fewer accommodation letters for faculty.

Members engaged in further discussion regarding the grants associated with the CSD, how funding works for the HWC, and faculty responsibilities around accommodations. In relation to rethinking processes to improve the bureaucracy around accommodations, the impact of racial discrimination on mental health was raised and it was expressed that students are in need of support in this area. The Vice-Provost agreed stating that through the findings of the review process there is an intersection in experienced racism and disability that has a profound impact on students. Lastly, professional development was requested for faculty specifically regarding letters of accommodation as well as training to help support faculty in addressing racism and other trauma.

8. Senate Committee Reports

8.1. Student Academic Policy and Planning Committee (SAPPC)

8.1.1. Revisions to the Policy on the Status of Professor Emerita/Emeritus, Associate Professor Emerita/Emeritus

The Chair referred members to the memo and called for a motion for decision. **Motion to approve** the revisions to the Policy on the Status of Professor Emerita/Emeritus, Associate Professor Emerita/Emeritus, moved by Gillian Siddall, seconded by Sara Diamond.

The SAPPC Chair Gillian Siddall reviewed the memo informing members of the scan of Ontario universities to compare sector norms with regard to the inclusion of Continuing Faculty and the research and recommendations provided to argue for the inclusion of permanent Librarians in the policy. With these changes, the policy title was also revised to “Status of Emerita/Emeritus”. **Motion carried**, with 37 in favour, 0 opposed and 2 abstentions.

8.2. Senate Academic Standards Committee (SASC)

8.2.1. Information Report from SASC

The Chair referred to the information report, which outlined the committee’s high-level discussions around policy 1021: Grading, in an effort to review and revise the policy. No questions were raised.

8.3. Senate Undergraduate Studies Committee (SUSC)

8.3.1. Information Report from SUSC

The Chair referred to the information report, which provided a curricular update to course codes in the Faculty of Art regarding the DRPT and INTM streams of the DPXA capstone. Overviews of the committee’s discussion around priorities 1 and 5 of the Academic Plan were also provided. No questions were raised.
8.3.2. Presentation of SUSC Summary of Discussion and Ideas Around Advancing Priority 1 and 5 of the Academic Plan

The Vice-President, Academic and Provost prefaced the presentation by reminding senators of the implementation process for the Academic Plan, which involved the Senate Academic Policy & Planning Committee identifying Senate Committees to provide oversight in the implementation of goals which reside within respective committee purviews. Meetings between the Provost, Chair of Senate and Senate Committee Chairs were held to review these goals with the intention for the committees to report back to Senate.

Committee Chair Colette Laliberté briefly reviewed some of the ideas discussed by the SUSC for Priority 1: Indigenous Learning: Nothing About Us Without Us including mandatory first year Indigenous visual culture courses as well as the movement of the European art history cannon to upper year levels so to provide a non-western art foundation to students. She also briefly spoke about Priority 5: Disciplinary Porosity and Cross Fertilization and the challenges the committee identified with regard to building porosity for curriculum within the institution’s current structures.

Associate Dean Ian Clarke spoke further to the ideas that are being discussed around first year art history in the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences and School of Interdisciplinary Studies curriculum committee. The idea being explored is to change the first year experience by keeping a version of the existing contemporary survey course and add the Turtle Island Art History course and a new course in Cross Cultural Issues in Art and Design. Students would complete at least two of the three course options, the requirements of which would be determined by individual program areas. Members were informed that there is limited availability to run all courses with Indigenous focused content as introductory courses but the courses would provide a prerequisite to upper year Indigenous courses.

In relation to priorities 1 and 5, Program Chair Roderick Grant provided a presentation on program level planning in Graphic Design stemming from their IQAP cyclical program review. This presentation, which was also provided to the committee, demonstrated a way to specifically locate learning within the program and to create a program structure that responds to the Academic Plan priority of porosity. It was noted that the model would not be applicable for large programs and would require the whole university to be on board. Roderick spoke about the exercise of mapping learning outcomes onto the curriculum, allowing the identification of repetition and gaps within the program, which could also be a useful tool to locate the presence of Indigenous knowledge within the curriculum. Roderick reviewed the progression of a student from year 1 to 4 in a proposed program model that would be less prescriptive and allow for a student to create an individualized pathway with an increase in electives. Core and themed studios would occur in the first two years giving students a sense of belonging and allowing for a cross listing of curriculum across programs such as Industrial
Design, Digital Futures and Integrated Media. It was reiterated that that this model would only be able to operate at a certain scale and other work would need to occur at the institution in order to build infrastructure to support it.

Discussion: The topic of managing how different kinds of students learn was raised since some students would thrive in the proposed model while others may require more structure early in their learning experience. The creation of new streams and concentrations was offered as a solution to help manage different ways of student learning. Overall members shared positive commentary on the progressive and radical decentralization of the model. In addition, the collaborative and communal space that this model offers was highlighted as a way to move away from the creation of silos between programs and faculties. It was pointed out that this model would require a significant budget to enable the necessary restructuring.

A suggestion was made to see the presentation more fully detailed so to identify priorities such as Indigenous focused content and other cultural learning components, which could be incorporated, for example, through faculty collaboration in the first year core “homeroom” classes. Roderick explained that as a first step they will be implementing a core studio this fall in Graphic Design and will gather feedback on its implementation.

In response to how faculty can engage in the ideas presented, Ian spoke to the concern from the SUSC of wanting to ensure the ideas around the implementation of the Academic Plan come from faculty rather than presented as a top-down approach. Moreover, members were informed that the proposals presented would be more formally discussed within the faculty curriculum committees. Faculty and Chairs from all program areas were encouraged to engage in the discussion, especially around the first year experience. The SUSC Chair also highlighted the goal of the integration of Indigenous content into courses in a proper manner that is not tokenistic or onerous on Indigenous faculty members, and therefore would require cross-communication between faculty and upper administration.

8.4. Senate Graduate Studies Committee (SGSC)

8.4.1. Procedure for Assigning Undergraduate Equivalences to Graduate 5000 Level Courses

The Chair referred members to the memo outlining the procedure and called for a motion for decision.

Motion to approve the procedure for assigning undergraduate equivalences to graduate 5000 level courses, moved by Ashok Mathur, seconded by Dori Tunstall.

Members were informed that the procedures have been approved by both the SGSC and SUSC as a way of enabling undergraduate students to coordinate a course equivalence of a graduate course to count towards their degree program.
Motion carried with 38 in favour, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

8.4.2. Information Report from SGSC
  The Chair referred members to the information report, which listed the graduate policies the committee is currently discussing as well as plans to further discuss the Academic Plan. No questions were raised.

9. Special Topic Discussion: Enrolment, Retention, Recruitment, and Analytics
  The Vice-Provost, Students and International spoke to the many factors taken into account when planning for enrolment and the combination of math and strategy involved. Primary factors highlighted include the progression of existing students, new intake, graduating students, the mix of international and domestic students and the introduction of new programs in terms of whether or not there will be net new students.

Laura Wood, Manager, Institutional Analysis provided a presentation on enrolment data. The presentation provided comparisons of undergraduate and graduate FTEs; domestic and international FTEs, as well as FTEs broken down by Faculty area and Graduate Studies, and by program. First year undergraduate intake by headcount was also reviewed per Faculty area. Laura also discussed how the institution’s enrolment-based revenue is broken down, the OCAD U corridor model and examples of revenue impact within the current funding formula of the SMA. Lastly, the numbers of undergraduate domestic and international applications were provided for the last three years.

Adam Wiendels, Manager, Marketing provided a presentation on OCAD University’s recruitment advertising campaign. He reviewed how Marketing and Communications works with recruitment and the objectives for their advertising campaign. Strategies included an increase in email marketing and content marketing and working with Ipsos, a market research company and Navigator Ltd, a public strategy and communications firm. Adam emphasized the small marketing budget compared to other institutions and provided early results from the campaign, reflective of their new strategy.

Discussion: An idea was offered to target the National Portfolio Day as a way to further advertise specific programs but members were informed of the rules that are followed within this consortium limiting recruitment strategies in this venue. Discussion ensued regarding whether increased website activity has translated into increased enrolment. Mitigating factors of balancing acceptance offers and controlling program growth were explained.

10. Other Business
  Several issues were raised regarding the institution’s formal assessment period including the back-to-back scheduling of critiques for individual faculty members. In general, an evaluation of the formal assessment period was requested. The Chair stated that she would refer these issues to the appropriate Senate committee and related stakeholders.

11. Adjournment
  Motion to adjourn, moved by Laura Millard, seconded by Sara Diamond. Meeting adjourned at 6:12 p.m.