MINUTES OF OCAD UNIVERSITY’S SENATE REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING
MONDAY, MARCH 30, 2015, 3:00 – 6:00pm
ROOM 322, 230 RICHMOND STREET WEST

Present: Keith Rushton (Chair); Lillian Allen; Christine Bovis-Cnossen; Keith Bresnahan; Frederick Burbach; Sara Diamond (via teleconference); Rosemary Donegan; Paul Epp; Michelle Forsyth; Richard Fung; Kate Hartman; Bruce Hinds; Richard Hunt; Barbara Anne Jackson; Simone Jones; Sandy Kedey; Tony Kerr; Caroline Langill; Laura Millard; Lewis Nicholson; Gayle Nicoll; Elisabeth Paradis; Steve Quinlan; Charles Reeve; Helmut Reichenbächer (via teleconference) Ryan Rice; Peter Sramek; Dot Tuer; Natalie Waldburger; Michèle White; b.h. Yael
(non-voting) Carole Beaulieu (via teleconference); Ian Clarke; Colette Laliberté; Michael Prokopow; Evan Tapper

Regrets: Tom Barker; Nicole Collins; Catherine Delaney; Judith Doyle; Jim Drobnick; Andrea Fatona; Deanne Fisher; Simon Glass; Archie Graham; Johanna Householder; Selmin Kara; Simran Kaur; Anda Kubis; Claudette Lauzon; Jeffrey Litwin; Jana Macalik; Alexander Manu; Gerald McMaster; Jill Patrick; Kiri Piotrowski; Nick Puckett; Colleen Reid; Lenore Richards; Alan Simms; Margaux Smith; Virginia Trieloff

Invited: Alastair MacLeod, Chief Information Officer, IT Services (Item #5); Christine Pineda, Manager Special Projects & Research Ethics Board (Item #6.2.2.)

Secretary: Natalie Nanton

IN CAMERA SESSION
Commenced 3:10pm

1. Recommendations from the Honorary Degree Sub-Committee of Senate
In preparation for the presentation of recommendations from the Honorary Degree Sub-Committee of Senate, the Chair called for a motion to move to an in camera session.

   Motion to move to an in camera session, moved by Paul Epp, seconded by Christine Bovis-Cnossen.

   Motion carried, unanimously.

REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING OF SENATE
Commenced at 3:16pm

1. Welcome and Updates from the Chair
The Chair reported that the faculty Senate elections nomination period will be extended until Thursday, April 2nd at 12:00pm. Senators interested in re-election were reminded to submit a
nomination form and encourage their colleagues as well. The Chair also noted that elections for any vacancies in program chair or graduate program director seats will occur later in the Spring, facilitated through the Faculty offices and Office of Graduate Studies.

Lastly, it was reported that the summary report from the January 29, 2015 Board-Senate meeting, compiled by facilitator Jackie Schach, was included in the meeting package and previously circulated to all Senators on March 4, 2015.

2. Approval of the Agenda
The Chair reviewed the agenda and called for a motion for approval.
Motion to approve, moved by Michèle White, seconded by Steve Quinlan.

It was proposed that agenda item #5, Special Topics Presentation: Digital Campus, be presented after the senate committee business.
Motion to amend the Senate agenda, moved by b.h. Yael, seconded by Rosemary Donegan.
Motion carried, with 28 in favour, 0 opposed and 2 abstentions.

The budget process was raised in relation to the timeline of Senate meetings. President Diamond outlined that the Joint Board-Senate Liaison Committee will have a thorough discussion on the budget at their May 7, 2015 meeting. It was also pointed out that the Board of Governors will review the budget at their June meeting and that there is a Senate meeting beforehand on May 20, 2015.

Clarification as well as the plan for action was requested on the $3 million projected deficit that the Board of Governors identified. It was stated that these details should be discussed at Senate after the joint Board-Senate Liaison Committee meeting. In addition, the budget process through the Consolidated Budget Advisory Committee was outlined for Senators, including the committee membership and the schedule of meetings. It was further stated that updates regarding the process will be communicated to the entire OCAD University community. A request was made for more discussion on the subject at the April Senate meeting.

Inquiries were then raised about the possibility of a full joint Board-Senate meeting in the Spring. President Diamond noted that it would occur in June but plans were currently under discussion. The Chair returned to the motion on the table to approve the Senate agenda, as amended. Motion carried, unanimously.

3. Approval of Consent Agenda Information Items and Minutes
The Chair presented the items and called for a motion for approval.
Motion to approve, moved by Elisabeth Paradis, seconded by Caroline Langill.

The “extraordinary items” reported in the Board of Governors report, concerning the $3 million deficit was questioned. It was explained that this was a way to structure the reporting for different incomes and expenditures so that there is a line item for contingencies and capital expenses separated out from other expenditures such as operating costs. Senators requested that clearer details about the deficit be presented to the Senate at the next meeting.

Members inquired about the status of the Board of Governors representative on Senate. Carole Beaulieu, Board Secretary, reported that the role may change by designating it to the Board Chair and Vice-Chair in order to have the role shared so that there is always a representative available.
Furthermore, she stated that this recommendation will be presented to the Board’s Executive Committee in April and subsequently to the Board of Governors at their May meeting. As a point of information, members were informed that the change in representation may require a revision within the Senate Bylaws regarding the Senate membership composition, since there is currently no designate for this position.

Lastly, a correction to a statement in item 7.3.1 of the February 23, 2015 Senate minutes was highlighted concerning policy 1025: Residency Requirements, Undergraduate. It was requested that the statement be revised to read: “….the committee decided to retain the 50% minimum residency requirement. Although the final 2.5 credits must be completed in residence at the university, if a student is only lacking one course for program completion, they may request a letter of permission from their Dean to obtain it at another accredited university.”

**Motion carried**, with 27 in favour, 0 opposed and 3 abstentions.

4. **Information Update from the President**

President Diamond referred to her information report and invited questions. A question was raised regarding the $1 million requested from the government to cover the institution’s enrollment gap and details on the discussion about OCAD University’s position on differentiation funding. President Diamond elaborated on the feedback received about the funding formula and reported that MTCU will exercise degrees of change that will be focused on output such as time-to-completion and the number of graduates. She further stated that a working group within the institution will be looking to refine methods using frameworks in terms of increasing performance driven measurements. Funds requested for the enrollment gap were rationalized in terms of how the University is changing.

Precedent for differentiation funding at other institutions was also discussed. It was summarized that historically, other universities have been successful in this area. President Diamond noted that she has provided a national comparative with such institutions as the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design University and Emily Carr University of Art and Design and she noted that in an Ontario context, OCAD University has received a specialization grant in the past from the government.

5. **Senate Committee Reports**

5.1. **Senate Executive Committee (SEC)**

5.1.1. **For Approval: Extension to the Chair of Senate’s Tenure for Summer Coverage**

The Chair absented himself from the Chair position, allowing the Vice-Chair, Christine Bovis-Cnossen, to proceed with the item of business. The Senate Vice-Chair called for a motion for approval.

**Motion to approve** that the current Chair of Senate remains in place until the September 2015 meeting of Senate whereby the new Chair can be elected, moved by Richard Hunt, Michèle White.

It was noted that there is no senate business presently planned for the summer months and members were reminded that the Senate Executive Committee can decide to convene a summer authority meeting of Senate, if deemed necessary. **Motion carried**, unanimously.
5.2. Senate Academic Policy & Planning Committee (SAPPC)

5.2.1. For Approval: Proposal for a Graduate Studies Curriculum Committee

Members were referred to the proposal presented in their materials and the Chair called for a motion for approval.

Motion to approve the establishment of a Graduate Studies Curriculum Committee, moved by Christine Bovis-Cnossen, seconded by Richard Hunt.

The rationale for the committee was explained including the need to have more involvement from faculty members and to increase cross-program discussion. It was reported that the initial discussion for the establishment of the committee originated from the Senate Bylaws and Efficiency Working Group and that as a result the existing Senate Graduate Studies Committee would be less administration heavy in terms of curricular details and thereby focus on more strategic senate business. Members expressed general favour for the committee in order to improve communications between the graduate programs.

Discussion arose about the impact of potential structural changes of having some graduate programs housed outside the Office of Graduate Studies and within their home faculties. It was confirmed that all graduate programs, no matter where they are held, would be represented in the Graduate Studies Curriculum Committee. Graduate student representation was then debated as to whether one student was enough to be representative of all graduate programs and how that student would be chosen. Senators recommended that there should be at least two student representatives. The Chair called for a motion to approve the amendment to the motion on the table.

Motion to approve the amendment that there are two student representatives from different graduate programs on the Graduate Studies Curriculum Committee, moved by Michelle Forsyth, seconded by Rosemary Donegan.

Motion carried, unanimously.

Further discussion ensued regarding the relationship of graduate programs and the provision of oversight if they are housed in different areas. The Vice President, Academic spoke of her role and management of all degree programs through the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). The Chair returned to the motion on the table, as amended.

Motion carried, unanimously.

5.2.2. For Approval: Removal of OCAD U Research Ethics Board Policy and adoption of the Tri-Council Policy Statement

Members were referred to the memo in the meeting package and the Chair called for a motion for approval.

Motion to approve that OCAD University Research Ethics Board shall remove the OCAD University Research Ethics Policy from OCAD University’s active policies and that the University shall adopt the Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research on Humans and its subsequent versions as the standard by which the Research Ethics Board shall review and provide feedback on received applications, moved by Christine Bovis-Cnossen, seconded by Tony Kerr.

It was questioned whether there was a presence of art and design education examples within the policy and clarification of what kind of work should be submitted. Tony Kerr,
Research Ethics Board (REB) Chair, reported that OCAD University is pioneering the way for art and design research and that other universities are following the institution. He also noted that the committee views applications from an art and design perspective but that there are advisors with medical and legal expertise, etc., as some research falls into those areas. Furthermore, he explained that not every project requires REB oversight, above the professor level.

Tony offered to discuss more details on specific examples at a later date. He reported that not all projects will fit within the Tri-Council parameters and in those situations it would be taken to a panel for further discussion. Lastly, Senators expressed the need to have a forum to address research-related questions at the institution and potentially a cross-institutional dialogue to see what other institutions are struggling with, in regard to ethical practices in art and design. The Chair returned to the motion on the table.

Motion carried, unanimously.

5.2.3. For Information: Plan and Timeline for the Academic Plan
The Vice-President, Academic thanked the SAPPC members for providing extensive feedback, explaining that the plan had been slightly revised in terms of extended timelines for consultation and a definition added on what an Academic Plan is. Members were reminded that the current Academic Plan is valid until the end of the 2015/16 academic year. It was highlighted that the development of the Academic Plan 2016-2021 would have oversight from a steering committee, for which a call for volunteers will be made, and that the plan will be reviewed by the SAPPC before approval at Senate. The Vice-President, Academic also confirmed that the Academic Plan will undergo a costing exercise before moving forward for approval.

5.3. Senate Undergraduate Studies Committee
5.3.1. For Information: Ratified New and Revised Curriculum from the Faculty of Art and Faculty of Liberal Arts and Sciences and School of Interdisciplinary Studies
The Committee Chair reviewed two curricular items. Concerns were expressed regarding the English prerequisite grade change in the Faculty of Art. It was clarified that while the mark is being lowered to create a more consistent grade across the Faculty, it has no relation to the standards that students will still need to adhere to. A small correction was requested for the title of the English courses being discussed: to change English as a Second Language (ESL) to the new term, English Language Learner (ELL).

5.4. Senate Continuing Studies Committee
5.4.1. For Information: New Approved Courses
The Committee Chair outlined the list of approved courses and invited questions.

6. Special Topics Presentation; Digital Campus
Alastair MacLeod, Chief Information Officer, IT Services presented a broad overview of technology as it pertains to academic computing at the institution. Major topics highlighted included students and technology; the internet of things; social media in education; wearable technology; faculty and technology; digital literacy in terms of proficiency and critical thinking; online learning; big data; research data; and libraries and technology. The relevance of the presentation was also emphasized in relation to the development of the Academic Plan.
Discussion:
It was suggested that a group be established to further discuss the key ideas presented in terms of how the institution may move forward with regard to the curricular impact. Furthermore, the need for a venue to share commonalities and problems around digital literacy was voiced, so individuals are not working in isolation. Concerns regarding mental health and overuse of technological space on campus were also raised. The equal importance of creating technologically free zones was emphasized as well as the need to look at technology as an option rather than inevitability.

In order to expand on the special topic, it was further recommended that a panel discussion could occur early in the next academic year where representatives from each Faculty can focus on some of the ideas in terms of what it means for OCAD University. In response to the student user findings presented, it was recommended that there be more focus on user analysis with student representation on the panel. Details were requested on how students are using Canvas in order to better inform faculty use. While it was reported that Canvas use is high, it was pointed out that faculty use Canvas in diverse ways and that it would benefit students to have a uniform experience across their courses. President Diamond endorsed the idea to have greater discussion at Senate through deeper investigation and practical implications, including budget support.

7. Other Business
It was reported that the second legal opinion concerning the interpretation of the OCAD University Act would be ready within the next week and be first reviewed by the Senate Executive Committee.

Discussion ensued regarding attendance required for a summer authority meeting of Senate. It was noted that only a quarter of the members would be required for quorum and members would be given the opportunity to join the meeting via teleconference and Skype. Questions were raised about the ability to attend Senate committee meetings such as the Senate Executive Committee. Senators were reminded that Senate committees are normally open to the public and meeting dates are circulated at the start of the Senate session, are available on the Senate SharePoint site and through the Senate Secretary.

Updates were then requested concerning space allocation such as the loss of 60 and 52 McCaul Streets as it affects the faculties. The Vice-President, Academic notified members of the upcoming Town Hall meeting on April 8, 2015, at which the Vice-President, Finance and Administration would provide an update on campus planning. She also reminded members of the newsletter circulated by Marketing & Communications advertising a call for questions in advance to be answered by the leadership team during the Town Hall. Further updates on capital planning were requested at the April or May meeting of Senate. Also, the status of 230/240 Richmond Street West was queried. Similarly, an update was requested for the plans for 115 McCaul Street.

8. Question and Answer Period
No other questions were raised.

9. Adjournment
Motion to adjourn, moved by Christine Bovis-Cnossen, seconded by Gayle Nicoll.
Motion carried, unanimously at 5:46pm.