<div align="center">

SENATE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE DISCUSSION
Tuesday, December 5, 2023

</div>

5:00 p.m. Committee of the Whole Discussion: Periodic Program Review: Principles and Practices

The Vice Chair of Senate, K. Metersky, chaired this section of the meeting.

Opening Remarks – K. Metersky
Good evening. Thank you for coming to tonight's committee of the whole discussion. My name is Kateryna Metersky, and I'm your vice chair of Senate, and I have the distinct pleasure of leading the discussion tonight. Our topic today is the Periodic Program Review Principles and Practices, and we have two speakers this evening, Dr. Sean Kheraj, Vice-Provost Academic and Dr. Stéphanie Walsh Matthews, Director of Curriculum Quality Assurance. What's going to happen tonight is the speakers will deliver an approximately 20-minute presentation, and after the presentation we will open the floor for discussion. Importantly, if you have any questions, please use the chat feature. You do not have to list or share the question with us, but just indicate that you have a question, and Donna will be keeping a running list of the questions and the order in which they are going to be asked. At this point I am going to turn it over to our two speakers for the evening. Thank you so much.

Dr. Sean Kheraj, Vice-Provost Academic –
What we're going to do in the presentation quickly is just set some of the context, for the Institutional Quality Assurance processes and the Quality Assurance Framework in Ontario that governs quality assurance for all of the publicly assisted universities in the province. That's all twenty three of them. And then we'll go over some of the elements of the periodic program review, just to get a common baseline understanding of what the current state is at TMU, and then we'll talk a bit about some of the supports that are available to colleagues as they're going through the PPR process. So, let's hop to the next slide.

In Ontario, quality assurance is governed by an arm's length body that's made up of colleagues from across the sector. There's a self governance element to this, called the Ontario University's Council on Quality Assurance. And the Quality Council sets out the Quality Assurance Framework which provides the basis for all of the public assisted universities internal institutional quality assurance processes, or their IQAPs. The quality assurance framework's intent is to ensure a culture of continuous improvement and support for the vision of a student-centered education based on clearly articulated program learning outcomes. Quality assurance processes result in an educational system that is open, accountable and transparent. That is the intent behind the quality assurance framework. It applies to all of the publicly assisted universities that grant degrees as well as graduate diplomas. That includes undergraduate and graduate degrees. Move to the next slide.

At TMU, our institutional quality assurance processes are spread across four Senate policies, so that is Senate Policy 110, 112, 126, and 127, and it's 126 that details the processes for the periodic program reviews. Our IQAP, as all institutional quality assurance processes at universities in Ontario, provides the details for creating new programs, closing existing programs, curriculum modifications, program reviews and external audits of the university's quality assurance processes. Next slide.

The processes that we use for our PPRs are detailed by the quality assurance framework. So, we need to have a process that aligns with what is set out by the Quality Council. In the Quality Assurance Framework, they use the language Cyclical Program Review. We use Periodic Program Review. So, you can treat those as equivalent. The cyclical program review of existing programs is the key quality assurance process aimed at assessing the quality of existing academic programs, identifying ongoing improvements to programs, and ensuring continuing relevance of the program to stakeholders. So that

kind of sets out the baseline for why we do program reviews in the first place, and what our expectations are in terms of the outcomes that we want to see from them. When we go to the next slide, we'll see what some of the core elements are of a periodic program review.

All periodic program reviews or cyclical program reviews must, according to the quality assurance framework, include a self study, an external review from experts in the field, relevant to whichever program is being assessed, a final assessment report and implementation plan that outlines the steps and measures that a program's going to take to implement any kinds of changes that come out of recommendations from the self study in the external review. Then there's follow up reporting as an accountability measure. And it also details that this process should occur no longer than every eight years. You can have a maximum eight-year cycle according to the Quality Assurance Framework. And so periodic program reviews are a critical element of the collegial self-governance system in the province of Ontario. It ensures that our programs are regularly assessed, that they are assessed both within the program and within external peer review by experts in the relevant fields. Let's go to the next slide.

This maybe is just a useful chart to keep for later. It kind of walks you through the process here. You've got your initial institutional process where you initiate the program review and conduct the self study. Then you move into the external evaluation phase where you bring in your peer reviewers who assess the program and then produce a report. Then you move into the internal perspective phase, during which the program and the Dean's office respond to the external reviewer's report and then put together a final assessment report, an implementation plan, and an executive summary. That then should be reported within the university's internal governance structure. We see that ultimately, through our Senate. That's to be posted to the university's website publicly and then, in compliance with any monitoring, reporting requirements and then, finally, the final assessment report and the implementation plans are submitted each year to the Quality Council for review, and any adjustments that may need to be made based on feedback from Quality Council.

I'm going to turn things over now to Stephanie, who's our Director of Curriculum Quality Assurance to break down the elements of the self study. This is the component of the periodic program review that happens internally within a program and it's the part that has the most work locally in preparation for the external review.

Dr. Stéphanie Walsh Matthews - Director of Curriculum Quality Assurance -
Good evening, everyone. Thank you, Sean. As we've laid out the processes that govern the reason why we do PPRs, and in many ways I'm sure everybody understands that. Now we need to demystify some of the elements as it pertains to doing the actual work. Here we have broken down for you what is in a self study, what are you actually preparing. As you can see here, the self study consists of ten sections and although PPR manuals shift over time, they're very much grounded around these ten sections. And this is the important self reflexive work. As you see here, typically taking up about 50 or 60 pages of writing as you respond to the questions as you are prompted by the manual. And so, you write an introduction, and then you're asked to provide the program objectives during the process of every eight years, the PPR process. You're going to reconsider what those program objectives are as curriculum changes, society changes, the context of your field also changes. It is the reason why we do this periodically. It's to ensure that you are up to date, and that you are really providing the most contextualized educational frame and the most successful program for your students. You're then going to look again at your admission requirements, the curriculum which is a significant portion of the self study requiring you to, much like the program objectives, reconsider the learning outcomes, map your curriculum to those learning outcomes, and that is the central core to ensuring that there is quality within your program. Decisions around your curriculum operate around those learning outcomes as well. We want to make sure that you're assessing your students in a way to ensure that those learning outcomes are acquired. We then look at resources of your programs, the quality indicators of your program, the faculty, the space, other quality enhancements as they speak to the same kind of resource implications, but also opportunities for your students and for the faculty. The program is then

asked to come up with a series of recommendations, and this is a very critical, if you want, it's the trampoline off which the periodic program review peer review team we'll be looking at those recommendations in light of what the program is doing, and which way it would like to go. And then an executive summary that more or less summarizes the overall work and it provides a pretty good snapshot of what the program has done and what it would like to do, moving forward. And as we've mentioned, this is a pretty poignant, tight succinct report. Should you follow the manual and its guidelines, it really does respond to these critical sections. Next slide please.

Sean and I have been speaking to many of you, I'm sure, in different forums about the PPR process, and in a real effort to demystify the process, but also to really show you where the strengths and the supports within the Curriculum Quality Assurance (CQA) office and beyond, in the Centre for Excellence of Learning and Teaching reside. We want to make sure that everything is very clear. Often times we've thought of the PPR process as this two-year thing that you have a lot of time to do, there is no rush or urgency, and we wanted to provide you with a much clearer timeline, really in an effort to make sure that the various deadlines are met, and that you can do this work in an effective way that really provides you the program space to do the analytical work. We'll talk about further resources in just a minute as well. So, it is a two-year process, but the real work is in year one, as you can see on the slide. The fall before your PPR is to commence, the CQA team will reach out to you and remind you that you have a PPR coming up. So that the fall term is really dedicated around gathering data. A lot of that data gathering is done by the CQA office and working alongside of you through workshops to get those program objectives written, the learning outcomes done, the mapping and so on. So that in the winter term of that first year you're really dedicated to writing the self-study, and that, too, is a very supportive process, ensuring that you're meeting the timelines and we're going to guide you through that with some workshops as well, so that the editing and the finalizing of that document happens in the spring. And hopefully you have a peer review visit the next fall, which then means you'll be awaiting the peer review report, to which you will respond, and your dean will also respond, making the final approval stages coming through the winter, and you're going to refine the documents most especially that implementation plan, so that the Academic Standards Committee and then Senate may review and approve your PPR so we can send it to Quality Council within that two-year time frame. So, this is a map that we've started circulating this fall really to show you, it is a two-year process, but that your work is front loaded on that first year, and it also aids us in providing you with an understanding of the kinds of resources that we can provide in order for you to meet these timelines. Next slide please.

There are many supports in place. Some of these have been long standing, some of these are new, and there's future efforts as well to really ensure that the PPR process for our colleagues here is about the analysis, and not so much the document tracking and bureaucratic elements that come along with a significant review like this one. Each program undergoing a PPR will have an assigned curriculum specialist, and this person will take you from the beginning all the way to the end, and guide you through the various processes, provide you with the workshop supports, do a lot of the data collecting for you, do analysis of your student surveys, also go into the classroom and do the student surveys feedback. Though, as it says here, program objectives, learning outcomes and student feedback are the three main categories, there is a lot more support beyond those three workshops as well. We will provide you with a whole host of orientations and various consultation meetings with the CQA and VPA, either in tandem or separately depending on the needs of your program. We're also building a wider community of practice. So, programs that are undergoing their PPRs at the same stage will have opportunities to come together in workshops so that we can start developing best practices. And that community of practice just generates the right amount of camaraderie to get through the process with a little bit more joy. And in the future, this is the big one. It's in development and we're really hopeful to have this concluded within the next few months. We've designed a PPR portal that essentially does the formatting of the PPR, it will contain the manual for you, in which all of your data will be uploaded, you'll be able to click on buttons so that the tables that you need to report to or report on within the self study will automatically be uploaded. It will allow you to share the drafting process with your colleagues. It will allow for assignments of various tasks and the whole rest of the process hopefully concentrated within a portal that's accessible, traceable, editable, shareable, and all the other ables

that are good for this process. And that concludes our presentation around what are the practices in the processes. And we are very happy to take any questions that may be about the PPR process, or anything else that relates to the IQAP and its relationship to curriculum.

Questions to Guide Senate Committee of the Whole Discussion -

Q: I have no problem understanding what the process is intended to achieve. I have a lot of questions concerning how it achieves that given that it's only done once every eight years. So, if we're doing continuous quality improvement once every eight years, this strikes me as kind of a limited amount that you can actually do, especially when things are held hostage like major changes can't be done, as I was told in my graduate program, until the PPR is done, which seems rather counterintuitive. Also, the fact that you're saying with a straight face, that some punter like myself has to produce 60 pages of self reflection on data they haven't seen, and no one to explain it with a manual which is festooned with errors is very challenging to me. So, the question I have is, will there be actual resources put into place from people who actually have to do this. So not all the people who are magically creating meetings or producing all this other additional data, that will actually assist us in producing this to me, because that's what it is. So, while the self study is 60 pages long, as you said, the actual document ends up being north of a thousand pages. We don't ask PhD students to produce 250 pages, but for some reason every eight years we are required to produce a giant bible of data which many people do not understand, including myself, including the people who tried to explain it to me, obviously don't understand it. So, I'm not sure if we want to continue down this road. If we wish to continue down this road, I'm asking specifically what financial commitment the university will provide to the people who actually have to produce this in terms of technical writing staff and people who are aware of this, so that they're not forced to do it as a big surprise every once in a while. Will there be actual investment from the university to make sure that the people at the bottom end who have to do that self-study are actually supported by technical staff, who can help them and do work rather than suggest things and educate them.

A: S. Kheraj – Sure I can start and I'll apologize, as there are probably seven or eight things I should respond to in there, but I'll try to capture as much as I can. I guess the first question is about continuous improvement when the cycle can be as long as every eight years. So that's obviously the requirement. But a program can, of course, engage in self assessment in between cycles if an issue has emerged and you want to make some modifications to the program. What we probably don't want to see are quite substantial modifications happening in between cycles. If you imagine how challenging it can be to operationalize a major modification to a program where you have to sequence in a cohort of students and then sequence out a cohort of students when you've got a major program change so it can sometimes take years for that to flow through as students who start on the old version of the program graduate out and new students come in. The other reason that we might hold off on making curricular changes when a program hasn't gone through a periodic program review is, the review is intended to validate the changes. It's not just a self assessment, it's a peer assessment as well. So, we would like to see that the proposed curricular changes have some external validation from peer reviewers who concur with the program on the proposed changes as they go through. Absent that, we don't have a lot of basis other than our own self assessment for those particular changes, so that would largely be around significant or major modifications to a program. On support, Stéphanie had outlined in the support section the assignment of curricular specialists to each program that's undergoing a periodic program review. They do provide consultation, advice, and support to the programs as they're going through it. One of the areas, though, where I think we are a bit reluctant to provide support is in the writing itself. The self study and the analysis is supposed to be done by academics in the field. So, the experts in the field, not by staff, on behalf of academics in the field. It would be counterintuitive to a self assessment to have someone else do the work for you. And it would not be entirely consistent with practice in the sector. And then finally, on the pages, I mean, yeah, they do end up being pretty big when you print them out. About 80% of it is CVs and course outlines that were written by someone else. So, it's a collating exercise, which is why we've tried to focus on the original writing as the component where the analytical work happens in a program review.

A: S. Walsh-Matthews – And something that I may have not mentioned. At TMU we process the PPRs differently at the undergraduate level than at the graduate level, and so the resource frames and the style of commitment, even the breakdown for the manual, the manual itself is very different from the undergraduate program from the graduate program. So, Sean and I are speaking very specifically to the undergraduate framework. I would also add that if on cycle, and at least 85% of our undergraduate programs are really in cycle, they're managing the PPR process very nicely. They're writing the work, they're analyzing their data, they're working collectively together. And it is the reason they do curricular modification. And curricular renewal may happen naturally between both ends of the cycle. Oftentimes the PPR will prompt the need for a revision or recalibration or a reworking, but it is quite typical to also see other rationales for curricular renewal happening outside of the curriculum. Should a program be following its timelines and respecting them, there is a lot of flexibility around modifying the curriculum. But to Sean's point we want to create enough stability so that our students are successful as they work through a predictable curriculum, knowing exactly what the outcomes may be at the end of those four years.

To Sean's point, much of the information that generates the page buildup is documentation that the program should be collecting at the start of every term, regardless of the PPR cycle. You should have updated CVs for all of your faculty members, you should have updated course outlines as well. So, a lot of that is more of a collated exercise. It's something that protects the student's ability to say that they have a compliant and approved program and vetted by the colleagues here at the University, and from the peer review team, and then Quality Council as managing all of those points. So again, my first point was to distinguish what we're doing at the undergraduate from the graduate program, but also to note that we have most of our programs here, abiding by these guidelines very well, and we are hopeful to make it even more of an alleviated task as we move forward with the portal in the future.

Q: Thank you very much for doing some amazing work and I really appreciate the clarity with the timeline. I am wondering about those schools and programs that have external accreditation, how this might intersect with it, because sometimes accreditation will prompt major curricular change or renewal in and of itself. Would you then suggest that this coincides with that, or would you suggest that this goes at the interim? In which case could you know a certain program, for instance, like the MD program, ask for every seven years, so that we're always doing this is a dry run, you know, midway through a cycle like three years in, self study, administration, and then therefore be ready for accreditation. Or how do you suggest working with some of these other programs?

A: S. Walsh-Matthews – That's an excellent question. And we do have a lot of programs that come up with this question. What we do is we have developed forms that allow us to remain compliant with the schedule, but at the same time develop enough flexibility to be able to work with accreditation timelines. So, this is what allows you to have accreditation. At the same time, there's a great deal of value in making sure that you're compliant with the PPR. We recognize that we want to work in tandem with the accreditation. So, without naming faculties here, but we have developed plans to create some cyclicity that alleviates the burden of writing a lot in one year. So, separating the two, and sometimes that's the preference. Others would like to tackle both at the same time, because there's a lot of comparable material that could be used. And you know; you've generated these task forces that are going to be able to do the work. So, we really address it on a case-by-case basis depending on the needs. We would be very glad to have the conversation with the medical school when that time comes, so that we are aligning ourselves much like we did in the program development process. We aligned with the CACMS requirements, and we built in a schedule that allowed us to prepare the documentation, so you'd be ready for that process. And similarly, we would build in processes that are, you know, complicit in that way, to make sure that everything is being addressed. We want to make sure that we are discussing this every cycle, so that we're always addressing these things. Some programs have seven years, others five years. So putting in these kind of blanket statements is not very helpful either, so we will address it on the cycle as well, and we document any requests for extensions or modifications, just to make sure that when we are

audited, all of our documentation signals that we have a good understanding of what these processes are, and that we take the PPR process just as seriously.

A: S. Kheraj – And I just want to acknowledge that this is a challenge for a lot of programs. Balancing accreditation and quality assurance requirements. The timing can be difficult and produce workload problems where maybe accreditation lines up in the same year that your periodic program review starts. Stéphanie and I participate in regular meetings with other members through the Council of Ontario Universities to talk about issues around quality assurance. This is one of them that's common among other institutions. We've asked that this be one of the topics for discussion where we can compare how other institutions are managing accreditation and quality assurance and learn some best practices from other places, and also to make some suggestions so that the rest of the sector can hear the challenges that we face.

Q: Thanks for the overview. I was interested in hearing a little bit more about this portal that's being developed, and I don't know if anyone can speak to it a bit more specifically. But one thing that I think has always been a challenge with this process is there's a huge communication barrier to overcome during this process. I can recall many times in my career sort of getting a oh, there needs to be a library report, and can we have it tomorrow. Just trying to make sure that all of the checklist is done. Is the portal going to somehow address that through assigning people certain processes?

A: S. Kheraj – Stephanie has all the details on it, but I will say that the overarching principle for the portal is to diminish the administrative work that's involved in a PPR so that you can focus on the analysis. As you said, Cecile, some of the biggest challenges are communications and timelines and logistics. It's probably thousands of emails that fly back and forth between colleagues and the CQA office when you're going through a PPR. So Stéphanie's team that's been working on the portal has been really attentive to this because they also track and manage all that communication. And it's a big, big load of work. So, this is hopefully going to reduce some of that.

A: S. Walsh-Matthews – Yes, thank you. I have done one of these PPRs myself. So, I came in with all of those memories to make sure that we were addressing them, but exactly to that point. So instead of worrying about well, what do I need and not being sure, what manual am I using, who do I need to write to, everything is going to be really centralized. Where, in fact, when you just start the PPR process, currently we have curriculum specialists who will write to the library to ensure that your report is written. They will write to the OVPECI to make sure that you have your tool kit prepared, they will start building up your UPO data for you. But we're still relaying through Google Folders and we're doing a lot of emailing. So, the portal will have everything there. And so, you don't even have to wonder what you titled the document that you were working on. And it will have the same kind of editing capacities, our hope is, as a Google document, so that multiple people can contribute and write, but at the same time, we can track edits. It will also prompt emails, and there will be a whole host of features in the portal to allow for consistency on reporting. All the former emails are going to be documented there, too. Your timeline is going to be produced there so, you know what you're supposed to do, at what time. And again, multiple people will have access to it. So instead of really having this fall on the shoulders of one person, which is what we're really hoping to cease with the portal. Building strong PPRs teams, multiple hands getting in on this work, the distribution of tasks and easy access via the portal, your data being managed there, the requests done through there and then the communication also tracked and traced through the portal as well. So just to really make it about focusing on analyzing your program based on what you can see. And in terms of the data, so Alex referred to this earlier as well, and I think this might be part of your question also, Cecile, is that the data right now comes to us, and the UPO office is very happy to provide insights on the data. But we are also working with them, to find ways to visualize data a little bit in a way to kind of incentivize you, to look at it through a different critical lens. I don't want to speak for Kimberly, but we do have some efforts underway to make sure that data is going to be more accessible as well. And we're looking for opportunities to have further discussions around that.

Q: I, too, want to follow up on the portal. So, this is a wonderful thing. I wish it existed when I started the process, which was largely me and my GPA gathering a bunch of data from people who didn't put it into the context that it needed to be in. It needed to be massaged in all kinds of ways, I'm sure

you've heard this before. So given that now we're going to have a PPR completed, and this is an institutional process. Surely the institution would be responsible for keeping track of what happened previously. So, for example, if I put a lot of effort into producing GDLES. By the way, GDLES, or Graduate Degree Level Expectations or undergraduate degree level expectations, was magically introduced by quality counsel without justification or explanation, just layered on top of it. So here we were thinking where we're doing the right thing when someone decided at the Quality Council that we were doing exactly the wrong thing. Once we actually produce the right thing, will the institution track those and make them available rather than the program having to track something. So they might be out of date, they might be inaccurate, but at least they will exist because the people who are actually at the base end of this putting it together are unlikely to be the same people. But the people tracking that information should be the same people. So will that be a goal of this portal that the data that you actually have will be made available in a form that can be used by the people actually writing the report?

A: S. Kheraj – Yes, that's the intent. Just a couple of things, I should have anticipated we'd end up talking about GDLES and UDLES at some point here, but just for clarification the UDLES are University Undergraduate degree level expectations, GDLES are Graduate degree level expectations. Those are set by the Quality Council, and then our program learning outcomes are mapped to those degree level expectations. The question of do we keep track of that, yes, in fact, we're supposed to according to the Quality Assurance framework. Stéphanie 's team is working on providing a central repository of all the program learning outcomes for each program which we hope will be useful for programs when they then have to do their next program review, instead of having to track down wherever the list of programs learning outcomes happens to be. It's actually supposed to be kept in a central place publicly available and published on a public website as well. And then in terms of past data and information, yes, that should all be available as well. The UPO supports the distribution of the data packages as well as updating data for the key performance indicators that colleagues need when they go through the self study, Stéphanie anything to add on that in terms of data, retention and publishing of program learning outcomes.

A: S. Walsh-Matthews – Well, yes, we'll have a big surprise for you in 2024, but I will reserve that for 2024. But to your point yes, we do track, and we hope to archive. The manual does change at the undergraduate and the graduate level, but once you've been locked into a manual you should be able to see it to completion. So, we don't make you switch horses midstream, or whatever that expression is. Unless, of course, you become so far off from your original due date, that there are requirements to update data, maybe adjust to some of the requirements of the new manual. So again, that timeline that I presented earlier, if you were to really stick to it, those kinds of management problems on changes by Quality Council are often avoided entirely. But, I'm speaking really specifically to the undergraduate side. So, I apologize if I'm not answering your question but should you be starting on a manual, the hope is that you complete using the same manual. So, if your manual needed GDLES, then if you're working within the year/two years frame, you should be allowed to finish with the GDLES and that would be addressed in your next PPR. But there is a section in PPRs that allows you to talk about what's changed since the last PPR, and how you've adjusted, but also some of the requirement changes.

C: Thank you. You've done a fine job. But doesn't it strike you as odd that we have, like two different institutional versions of an eight-year cycle for graduate and undergrad.

Q: It's a very, very interesting, exciting conversation here. I've been quite involved with the international evaluations, including QS ratings and Times International. Quite often universities start lobbying you for improving their positions. Now, what you are talking about, be it at the undergraduate level, or the graduate level is rather one important aspect of many things that are considered in the ratings. Have you ever considered if you have been undergoing continuous improvement, if this is the goal and I assume that's happening, are you able to convey this to the global community? What do you do?

A: S. Kheraj – I think this applies to the graduate reviews as well. One of the ways the process communicates continuous improvement is through the publishing of the final assessment reports and the implementation plans, as well as the program learning outcomes, so that we outline

changes that have been made and changes that will be made to demonstrate that iterative process. The key to this for a lot of programs is keeping up relevance. And you saw that in the Quality assurance framework. One of the goals is to make sure that the programs are current, that they are meeting both the academic needs of students coming through the programs as well as the skill development that they may need and industry connections. There are elements of the self-study that involve consulting with alumni and relevant industry depending on the discipline to ensure that what we're teaching in the programs is up to date, is current and is relevant. So that's one of the ways that we can demonstrate it. It in terms of the world rankings, the undergraduate and graduate level quality assurance processes are part of building strong institutional reputation, because, as you know, there's a bunch of other factors that go into those rankings that include research output, and how much money you put into your student services, and those kinds of things as well. But this is a part of it.

Q: As a FEAS senator, the accreditation question is alive and well for us and so, to the credit of your team, you have let us align some of our accreditation with our PPR so that we can do it all at once. What would really help, though, when you think about the sheer number of man hours, and we're talking probably about 2,500 person hours to put together the accreditation. And another 1,500 person hours, actually, I'm underestimating… I would say each of the faculty spent at least 50 hours on accreditation. So, it's a lot of us, it's hundreds or thousands of hours. Is there any way, the PPR process for accredited programs can be aligned so we can just double count, so that the reflection that we do, the visit that we do, the enormous amounts of money and time that are spent on these processes, we can use for both rather than doing a PPR visit and then flying in visitors to do an accreditation visit for the same program, with more or less the same outcomes. As you can see from our perspective, it seems awfully repetitive and given the financial situation that we're all in, perhaps a little bit wasteful. I'm curious about plans to align things to actually reduce the burden on us for this.

A: S. Kheraj – So a couple of responses on this, and then Stéphanie may want to add some more. So yes, as you said, we're trying to figure out ways that we can either align accreditation with program review or desynchronize them if the workload is too heavy in a single year to push one out where we can. So, we've actually tried to do both with FEAS. Some programs want to separate them. Some want to have them come together. I will say, the accreditation question is one of the issues that we're raising at the key contacts table, which is the group of all the participants in the Quality Council that get together regularly, as we've heard common challenges across the sector with this. One of the questions will be about overlapping content, and to what extent can we, reuse some of the elements of an accreditation process for a program review. One of the challenges, as you can imagine, is we may also want to ask the same thing of an accrediting body. So can we ask the accreditation bodies that do accreditation for engineering or computer science, or accounting if they would allow us to use our PPR process for the accreditation, or if they would change the timelines and sequencing for the accreditation to line up with the periodic program review process. Because you can see the struggle that we have here. One body accredits the professional standards of the program, the other allows us to issue a bachelor's degree, and we need both in order to have an accredited undergraduate bachelor's degree program. So, it isn't to say that we just do nothing and just continue to do both processes and manage the workload, but we do need to at least try to seek efficiencies. As you said, it can be a lot of work and cost a lot of money and see if we can do some synchronization of the program reviews vis-a-vis accreditation. And as Stephanie said, it's not practical to have a kind of blanket rule around this, because the sequencing of accreditation is different in nursing than it is in engineering as it is in public health. And so, you do need to be able to adjust and adapt, depending on the nature of the accreditation. Stéphanie, anything you want to add to that, especially in terms of the sequencing?

A: S. Walsh-Matthews – Yes, I think I'll just repeat the point that Sean ended with, which is, we'll look at it, case by case, and ensure that there is work done in concert, but retaining those specific elements of the PPR process that ensure the student experience. So, the aim is slightly different, for that PPR. The overall goal is to ensure that you have a program that is not only compliant but assures a successful student experience with outcomes that are measurable on the learning, and I

do know that oftentimes accreditation seeks similar elements. But the outcome is to ensure that the program is accredited. So, we do have some differences, and it's very important to ensure that those elements of the PPR that are really about providing the student experience and the academic excellence assured through the process as well, is retained, and not even potentially watered down, by trying to just meet up other or possible similar elements of the accreditation process. Now, this is not to say that we are not amiable to this idea of looking at opportunities, but we would not come up with a blanket statement for all programs at all times, that would actually be very problematic for that PPR process.

Q: First I wanted to thank Sean and Stéphanie for a great presentation. I really enjoyed it. I wish it was happening during the time that I was part of the leadership team at the Nursing School, and we had this kind of resources available to us then. It was 2017 when I joined the leadership team, and I was part of the PPR. My dilemma at the time was the lack of objective data from admissions. Particularly for our program, we have multiple, different kinds of undergraduate programs. Some of them have much more comprehensive data. For post diploma, we were really in a very bad situation. Now, my questions to you are that, has there been an improvement? Because I know that there are both components, subjective data that you get from your student, and I hope there is a better mechanism rather than rushing through it and having time for turn out and asking their opinion. But something throughout the years, for doing this where we could really get the real kind of objective data from our students. Objective data has been really a problem for us to provide in our report. Has there been an improvement in that aspect? That was one thing, and the second thing is that I'm sure that most of my colleagues at nursing, and I'm sure you know, across other programs would really benefit from this kind of information session where they can not be afraid of the PPR, but rather to see what an important asset it can be for everyone. Would you provide more info sessions across different programs so that all faculty could benefit from it rather than just the leadership who would be mostly in charge of this component?

A: S. Kheraj – So the answer to your last question is, yes, we'd be happy to come and speak with more colleagues. This year we've been talking with chairs and directors, but of course, you know, we want to see the work of the self reflection in a program review happen across the collegium. So, all colleagues within the program should be engaged in the self-reflective process and have the opportunity to have their say about what they think the new directions might be needed if there's going to be any changes to a program. In terms of data that's provided, the data package right now includes 17 data tables that UPO offers that has a range of information. I'm not even going to try to attempt to say everything that's included in there. But there's enrollment information that would be relevant to student recruitment as well as some retention information there. In terms of soliciting additional information, there's no limit on a program that wants to engage in deeper analysis, especially if you're looking for more quantitative based analysis of the program. Especially to answer questions that may have arisen in between the review that you may be doing now and the last time that you did a program review. And as Stéphanie had said, we're working with UPO to take another look at the data packages, how they're presented, what level of analysis can be provided to the programs to help interpret that data. I do know that sometimes, especially with enrollment data, it can just look like a mess of numbers on a spreadsheet, and not appear particularly meaningful. And so, you might be missing the key insight that is hidden within the numbers. But, Stéphanie, do you want to talk any more about the objective data/the quantitative data that you might have?

A: S. Walsh-Matthews - Yes, thank you. And, as Sean said, everyone is invited to do as much data gathering between the cycles. Of course, it's difficult if you don't have a template. So, some of the things that we have started doing is providing survey templates that can be used at any time. These surveys also provide more of a, well there's some objective quantitative data, but it's also collecting some qualitative data which is very nice. This is deployed by the PPR process, but there's also an opportunity for you to amend these surveys to look at different elements if you wish. You can also use them every two or three years. And we have some programs that do that, that have also decided to generate some surveys of their own that they can use. The data that's collected and granted to you by the UPO does a really nice job at displaying changes over time, you get the per year, there's sections broken down, and we're hoping to find ways to make this a little bit more

illustrative, easier to gather and to see. There's also the OVPECI toolkit, which is very, very well done. It provides a really generous set of data that is helping programs consider EDI analysis. In addition to that, some things that we've been looking at this year is integrating some information coming from the academic integrity office as well as employment data that's coming out of another office that's been collecting this kind of data that would be very useful for us as well, and this is done on a per annum basis, both in the fall and then later on, and it collects information both from employees, the student perspective, and so on, and so forth. The hope is that with the portal, instead of bombarding you with all this different data set, we would look for ways to organize this. There's been a great deal of effort in creating concise reporting and access to even more reporting. There's also the National Student Survey (NSS), the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), that are also provided, understanding that the end count just tends to be a little low on that. Again, the curriculum specialist is there to help you manage the data and its interpretation. They do go in the classroom and do extensive student feedback sessions that collect a lot of that qualitative data, but they also help the program parse through it, organize it, and make it into meaningful tables for them as well.

Q: I just wanted to know a little bit more about the portal. I know that a lot of my members have indicated that sometimes they find the PPR process a bit laborious at times, and as you had both described, sometimes part of it is collating all the material and having to track it all down. And it sounds like, perhaps this portal might be helpful. I'm just wondering, when is it expected to go online, how will it be tested? You know, where are you both in terms of completion? Is there going to be an early preview or beta testing of it? And how will that kind come about?

A: S. Walsh-Matthews – Well, I don't want to make promises. The hope is yes, we will have some beta testers, and the hope is to have them start as of Fall 2024 and this will help us work out a lot of kinks, so we don't want everybody coming on the platform at once. We have assigned this to some programs that are willing to be our beta testers and we're very happy about that. Hopefully, if all goes well, we're looking at a Fall 2025. But I am very nervous to commit to a timeline beyond the hopeful one.

Q: I guess it's a follow up question concerning accreditation. Yes, there's a huge amount of work for one, and there's a huge amount for the work for the other, and it looks like there's actually a huge amount of overlap between the two. We've never actually considered it. What I found interesting about the answer was, you pushed back on Jen, and I guess everybody else who was an accredited program that they should really talk to the accrediting body about changing it over to the Quality Council. But I haven't heard anything about talking to the Quality Council. So clearly, there are other universities that probably are experiencing the same challenges that we are. How are they dealing with it and would there be a movement amongst universities to perhaps modify this incredible process, to make it more attractive and less expensive? And so, what are we doing in that realm, are we talking to the Quality Council, are we asking them questions?

A: S. Kheraj – Yes, so exactly that, bringing the issues that we're hearing from our accredited programs to the central table where we discuss challenges with program reviews. I'll be asking about elements of accreditation processes that can be translated over to the PPR. This is what's been asked: can we use the site visit, can we use the overview of the program, reusing some pieces of the accreditation? Other institutions as well as our own, have sort of asked about synchronization of the sequences between accreditation and the PPR. We'll ask about both, and this will be a little bit of a give and take to see how we can be more efficient when we're doing a lot of work for accreditation, and be able to use any of that work for the quality assurance processes as well.

Q: In terms of the goal of having a useful document. I think to me the number one question would be, what's changed from eight years ago, and quite frankly, for a lot of programs is probably not a lot. It might be we added a couple of courses, we changed some prerequisites around, maybe some data looks a little bit different. I wonder if there's anywhere where there's actually a summary of changes of what happened eight years ago. That's really what we could use to say, can we see any insights,

is there anything that's developed in the data, maybe new student results whatever that's come out along the way to say we should be doing something different; we need to re-look at this. Otherwise to me, if basically, the product itself hasn't changed, all the data, all the underlying curriculum, and so on, if it's 99% the same as it was eight years ago, why are we writing another 1,000 pages about the exact same thing? So can we have sort of an executive summary of what's different from the last time we did this?

A: S. Kheraj – Yes, absolutely. A specific section of the self study program, it has to report on any changes that have occurred since the last periodic program review, and the availability of the last PPR, as well as the final assessment report. The implementation plan and the follow up reporting will allow a program to track and sequence what changed. Also, to figure out what in the implementation plan never actually got accomplished by the time the next PPR came up. Then the outcome of that is to cross reference it against the data tables that you get. So that's one of the reasons why the sequencing is no more than eight years, because you'll get two full cohorts going through typically a four-year undergraduate degree program where you might be able to see if there had been any effect on graduation rates, if that was one of the issues that had come up in a PPR. Or a student's success rates, grades, relevance to the program that might be attracting more students. You might see an increase in enrollments as a result of a change. And that's something that we would ask a program to reflect upon when reporting on that section that asks, what has happened since the last periodic program review. I do agree it's problematic if almost nothing happened. Especially if the implementation plan had indicated that significant things were supposed to have happened. We'll see, I hope, later tonight a major modification to one of our programs based on the recommendations that came out of the periodic program review, that will make a significant change to this program. Then, seven to eight years from now, when we do the next periodic program review, we want to see things like, are students completing the program in a timely manner now. Is this a program that's more attractive, are there alumni reporting on good outcomes to the experience of being in the program, have the rates of employability of graduates improved. All those things that the program may have been looking to improve, based on those changes.

A: S. Walsh-Matthews – And if I may just add that as there's an academic plan that changes every five years, and the PPR has to align itself to values and missions set out by the university - elements such as a manual changes that have requirements that our IQAP also reflects with regards to EDI that was not there then. There's a whole host of other elements that are factored into the review of the program in light of institutional changes. Things like UDLES change to DLE's those two, and of course, you have change in the kinds of students who are coming into the program, the comparator programs that are out there that could potentially be either a threat or an opportunity for future development. Those are all elements that I can assure you every eight years many of those will usher in the need for new reflections, changes to the program. Just faculty turnover alone can generate opportunities for new curricular development changes to past practices. To Sean's point, if the program has not changed or is 99% as it was eight years ago, that is a concern. If you just think about Co-Op alone, you'd have missed a very significant element for curricular development and deployment and opportunities for your students.

A: S. Kheraj – Yes, I want to add one more point here, too, that we want to see a process that is going to initiate challenging conversations about a program for some sort of deep and serious reflection. And I think for all of us in our programs, we've got different numbers of them that we know maybe need a bit of tidying up or have some issues, or the field is starting to shift in a way but the curriculum isn't reflecting that yet, and we need to make adjustments. That's what ideally, you'd like to see out of a program review.

And then, lastly, before we hit time, I just want to thank all the members of the Academic Standards Committee who review all of the PPRs before they come to Senate. It's a huge amount of work. They meet two hours every week to go through this. They're going to be going through it for their last meeting of the semester on Thursday. So, I just want to make sure that they're acknowledged for the work that they do as well as all the staff in the CQA team.

SENATE MINUTES OF MEETING
Tuesday, December 5, 2023
Zoom Video Conference

MEMBERS PRESENT:

EX-OFFICIO:	**FACULTY:**		**STUDENTS:**
P. Albanese	O. Akanbi	J. Price	S. Afshar
D. Bell	M. Bergmann	S. Rakhmayil	N. Almasri
T. Chan	D. Checkland	R. Ravindran	S. Campbell
T. Duever	D. Delic	P. Roberts	M. Daniels
C. Falzon	J. El Ali	M. Santos	P. Fitzpatrick
R. Frankle	D. Enns	D. Scofield	S. Ifeonu
G. Hepburn	R. Fair	B. Tasic	H. Patel
C. Holmes	C. Farnum	B. Thompson	A. Patora
R. Iannacito-Provenzano	A. Ferworn	M. Vahabi	C. Randall
S. Kheraj	P. Goldman		E. Tessema
M. Lachemi	E. Ignagni		
S. Liss	F. Janabi-Sharifi		**STUDENTS' UNION**
K. McCausland	L. Kolasa		**REPRESENTATIVES:**
J. McMillen	J. McArthur		V. Sullivan
A. McWilliams	S. McLane-Davison		M. Taylor
R. Parr	J. Mendoza		
M. Robertson	K. Metersky		
C. Searcy	U. Ngwaba		**ALUMNI:**
D. Young	C. O'Brien		K. Choi
S. Zolfaghari	D. Oguamanam		S. Van Dine

SENATE ASSOCIATES:
K. Brant
R. Denning
L. Koechli
L. Patterson

ABSENT:

		REGRETS:
S. Cellario	J. Murgai	A. Kozlowski
J. Dallaire	R. Scenna	
T. De Mello	P. Sugiman	
J. Fukakusa	N. Sugunalan	
M. Gerges	K. Train	
K. Gharabaghi		
C. Jenkins		
C. MacDonald		

6:00 pm Senate Meeting starts

---

1. Call to Order/Establishment of Quorum

2. Land Acknowledgement
   "Toronto is in the 'Dish With One Spoon Territory'. The Dish With One Spoon is a treaty between the Anishinaabe, Mississaugas and Haudenosaunee that bound them to share the territory and protect the land. Subsequent Indigenous Nations and peoples, Europeans and all newcomers have been invited into this treaty in the spirit of peace, friendship and respect."

3. Approval of the Agenda
   Motion: That Senate approve the agenda for the December 5, 2023 meeting.

   Moved: R. Ravindran; Seconded: A. McWilliams
   Motion Approved

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting
   Motion: That Senate approve the minutes of the November 7, 2023 meeting.

   Moved: P. Albanese; Seconded: G. Hepburn
   Motion Approved

5. Matters Arising from the Minutes

6. **Reports**
6.1 Report of the President
6.1.1 President's Update

You have a copy of my written report, I would be happy to answer any questions.

I'd like to highlight a few activities that have taken place on campus since our last meeting in November.

Impact of the Crisis in the Middle East

We spoke at our last meeting about the significant impact that the crisis in the Middle East is having on TMU community members. I want to provide Senate with a few updates. As you've read in the university's recent statement, we were deeply concerned to learn that there was a swastika shown on Gould Street during a protest on November 29. This is a symbol of hate and antisemitism. It is unacceptable behaviour and it goes directly against our values and our ongoing efforts to create a safe campus environment for community members. We reported the incident the same day to Toronto Police Services to investigate. We are also conducting our own investigation. If TMU community members were involved, the matter will be addressed in accordance with our own policies. I want to repeat what I said at our last meeting of Senate, our campus must remain a space where we are free to debate, discuss, and challenge ideas within a culture of mutual respect. Of course, freedom of expression and academic freedom have to be protected, space that is safe, secure, healthy, and inclusive and a space where we are all committed to fostering a culture of well-being, respect and civility. Our top priority is

supporting the safety and well-being of all community members without exception. As always, a reminder that there are a number of supports and services that are available to our community here on campus.

New CERC Appointment
I'm happy to share great news. TMU has successfully nominated Professor Karen Soldatic for appointment as the Canada Excellence Research Chair (CERC) in Health Equity and Community Wellbeing. This nomination was approved by the federal government with a funding of $8 million, over eight-years. Professor Soldatic is a leading international scholar of disability, marginality and global inequality. She is currently based in Australia at Western Sydney University and she's starting her appointment in the Faculty of Community Services next month, January 2024. This research chair is TMU's second CERC award. The CERC program is known worldwide for being one of the most prestigious of its kind and I would like to take the opportunity to thank the VPRI Office and the Faculty of Community Services and also the Dean of the Faculty for this prestigious appointment.

Rogers Cybersecure Catalyst 5th Anniversary
On November 20th, we celebrated the fifth anniversary of the Rogers Cybersecure Catalyst, a major hub for training, innovation and collaboration in cybersecurity. At the event, they announced renewed investments from founding partners. Rogers Communications committed $15 million for the next five years and RBC committed $1 million this year, with a possibility of more for the future. Thanks to the support of all our partners, the Catalyst has raised over $56 million since its inception in 2018 and they have empowered over 7,000 individuals and 500 organizations across the country through pioneering cybersecurity programs and initiatives. They are doing great work, and we are very grateful for the support of our founding partners and all our program partners.

Events
In celebration of the year-end, this afternoon we hosted TMU Frost, our annual community holiday celebration for all faculty, staff, and students. I hope some of you were able to join and celebrate together. The celebration was held outdoors near Lake Devo with activities, performances, food and warm beverages. Also today, the day before exams, we hosted our annual Exam De-Stress event at the SLC over the lunch hour where we served lunch and snacks to over 800 students.

CCAA Proceedings Exclusion
On November 21, the federal government announced, as part of the Fall Economic Statement, that it will amend the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act (CCWA) and the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act to exclude public universities and colleges. This will exclude public post-secondary institutions from becoming the subject of insolvency proceedings. Remember, that's what happened with our sister university, Laurentian University and that process that led to many job losses and program cuts. I'm bringing this to Senate because we have had two requests at the Senate floor for our university to lobby the government and we have been actively lobbying the federal government for this change. And I especially want to recognize David Checkland for pushing us or encouraging us to lobby the government on this issue. Thank you, David. And I can tell you that TMU was the first university that reached out to the federal government, and we continued to lobby until the change was announced in November. This is not to give full credit to TMU but when you have a Senate working with management for a good cause, this can lead to extraordinary results, and I want to thank Senate for also bringing this to the attention of the management. And I think it's important for us to recognize this important change, because many universities, unfortunately, are experiencing a lot of financial issues.

Thank you and Congratulations - David Checkland

I want to end today's update with a celebration. Today is David Checkland's last Senate meeting as he plans to retire from the university this month. David's career at the university has been remarkable. And this is why the timing for the federal government to come up with this was perfect, and I want to give him credit for that. He has demonstrated his commitment to TMU with an impressive record of distinguished service to the university. In his 30 years here, he has held a number of leadership positions, been a member of important committees, and has been recognized with many awards. In terms of his work at Senate, he has had an important impact. He brought his knowledge and expertise to reviewing, revising, and modernizing Senate's bylaws and policies. In fact, when it comes to policy, he is the most knowledgeable person at this university. Personally, David has been a huge supporter of me and provided a great deal of helpful advice over the number of years that I served as provost and as president. David, your impact and influence at Senate and also at TMU will be greatly missed. And we will hope that we will continue to benefit from your support and expertise. So, on behalf of all Senators, I want to thank you for your great contributions. We wish you all the best.

That's the end of my update. I'm happy to answer any questions.

6.2 Communications Report - no report this meeting

6.3 Report of the Secretary -

6.3.1 2023-2024 Committee Membership updates -

> **C:** D. Bell – Just letting you know that there are some more committee membership updates, and they are available on the Senate website.

6.3.2 Eric Da Silva as Designated Decision Makers' Council (DDMC) Chair, as described in Policy 60: Academic Integrity

Motion: That Senate approve Eric Da Silva as Chair of the Designated Decision Makers' Council (DDMC), as described in Policy 60: Academic Integrity.

Moved: S. Kheraj: Seconded: P. Albanese
Motion Approved

6.3.3 Tribute -

> **C:** D. Bell – I wanted to take a few minutes to really pay tribute to David Checkland and his contributions to Senate and the former Academic Council over the past 20 years. David, you have been a part of Senate almost every year since 2009. You have only been off for the obligatory breaks as per the Bylaws, and then for 4 additional years prior to that, when it was called Academic Council. You chaired the Senate Review Committee in 2007 to turn the Academic Council into Senate. You created our Senate Bylaws #1 and 2 with Neil Thomlinson. You co-chaired a massive Policy 60 review from 2013 to 2016, the longest review in history. You were Vice-Chair of Senate for three years and you have sat on AGPC and SPC more times than we can even count!
>
> You and I met many, many years ago, but we really got to know each other better in 2013 when you co-chaired the Policy 60 review committee. Since then, you have been the key person that I have always turned to for a trusted opinion and to understand institutional knowledge. In 2018

when I was hired in this role as Secretary of Senate, you were not only a friend and a respected work colleague, but you also became a mentor and a sounding board for me to learn from on occasions that are too many to count. We may not have always seen eye to eye, but you always listened, you always considered my perspective and you always made me feel valued. There is nothing better than debating and discussing topics openly and honestly with no ulterior motive other than to find the best way to move forward, fairly and equitably.

There are truly no words to thank you enough for your endless contributions, your years of service and the mark that you have left on this governing body. I think at this point I can almost hear in my head "what would David say" when I am presented with an issue.
As you are a Professor of Philosophy, I thought it fitting to see you off with a quote by Ralph Waldo Emerson, "What lies behind you and what lies in front of you, pales in comparison to what lies inside you." David, that is you. You are wise, humble and unselfish. You function in all you do with the utmost integrity and are you a true man of honor. You will be missed enormously, but I have no doubt that your legend will keep your name alive for many years to come here at TMU. If we were in person, I would ask everyone in the room to stand and give you a well-deserved round of applause for all of your contributions, but instead we will have to do this virtually. We thank you and wish you well as you embark on your new journey.

C: M. Lachemi – Thank you very much, well said Donna. Thank you, David, for everything you have done for Senate and for this university. I would just add, because she mentioned the important work that you have done for Policy 60, and the work started in 2013, and I started my tenure as provost in 2013. David, I remember the first day in the provost's office. I had two faculty members who came to see me and warn me that Policy 60 is a cause of problems for the University, and their advice, to me, was, if you want to be successful as Provost, fix Policy 60 from day one. And I will tell you, one thing I did is actually to put together a committee and to ask David to Co-Chair that committee. That was my best decision as provost. Thank you for everything.

A: D. Checkland - Thank you all for your kind remarks, I'm kind of overwhelmed. I have one question, though, who are those pictures of that young guy that you showed there? I don't remember anybody looking like that.

C: M. Lachemi **-** Very nice pictures, David.

6.4 Committee Reports
6.4.1 Report #F2023-3 of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC): S. Kheraj

6.4.1.1. Major curriculum modifications to the Interior Design program in The Creative School

Motion: That Senate approve the major curriculum modifications to the Interior Design program in The Creative School.

Moved: S. Kheraj; Seconded: P. Albanese
Motion Approved

6.4.1.2. For information: no comments for questions – no comments or questions

   1. 1-year follow-up report for Periodic Program Review
        i. History – Faculty of Arts

6.4.2. Report #F2023-3 of the Academic Governance and Policy Committee (AGPC) -
R. Iannacito-Provenzano

6.4.2.1. Provost's Update

Opening Remarks
Hello everyone. It's great to be here with all of you for our last Senate meeting of the fall semester. I wanted to thank all of you for your continued commitment and dedication to the University and to our students, to our faculty and our staff.

I'd like to echo my colleague's heartfelt sentiments and congratulations to David Checkland, on your retirement. Over the last year I have benefited greatly from your knowledge, wisdom, tremendous institutional memory and friendship, especially on AGPC. So, thank you.

Academic Plan
I will start my update today with the academic planning process. As I mentioned at our last meeting, this semester we began the first round of consultations. These consultations will continue until the break and into the beginning of the new year. Once the first round of consultations are complete, a draft plan will be developed and circulated among the community and another series of consultations and town halls will be held. In total, we have 116 consultations planned that capture students, faculty, staff, alumni and other stakeholders from across the university. There are also plans to have three town halls during the winter 2024 semester. We have already had some great discussions that make me feel energized to hear from more members of our community. The final academic plan will be presented to the Board of Governors as information only and brought to the Senate for approval in late fall 2024. I will continue to keep you updated on this process and I really look forward to the conversations with all of you.

School of Medicine
A brief update on the school of medicine. The school of medicine submitted its accreditation documentation to the Committee on Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools (CACMS) last week, and I just learned this evening, hot off the press, that accreditation documentation to the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada for our post Graduate Medical Education program was submitted today. This submission required 19 different documents, 11 committee terms of reference, and 28 job descriptions in addition to a 55-page accreditation instrument, all related to our 17 residency programs that will launch in 2025. So, kudos to the entire team and huge congratulations. These are critical milestones on our journey to opening the school of medicines doors in 2025.
Over the last couple of weeks, the school of medicine hosted three virtual town halls for members of the TMU community. The town halls offered an opportunity for Dean Teresa Chan and other members of the school's senior leadership team to give a progress update on their respective portfolios including equity and social accountability and post-graduate medical education. These sessions also provided a great opportunity for the university community to learn about and discuss the school's development in a public forum and ask questions. Recruiting, hiring and onboarding staff and clinical faculty continue to be a top priority for the school of medicine team now and over the next several months. Finally, the school of medicine staff and leadership team went on a bus tour of Brampton last week, meeting with community agencies and faith communities and getting an in-depth look at the healthcare landscape in the city. This was an invaluable opportunity for the team to learn more about the diverse and vibrant community the school will serve and to foster future opportunities for partnership and collaboration in Brampton.

Appointments and Searches

As I mentioned at our last meeting, we are undergoing the search for TMU's assistant vice-president, international (AVPI). This important role will advance the university's goal to enhance its global presence and grow international partnerships. Once appointed, the AVPI will oversee a broad range of strategic programs and initiatives, and we are almost at the end of the search and I will keep this body apprised of the candidate once they are announced.

Additionally, the search for the Vice-Provost, Faculty Affairs (VPFA) continues. The first round of interviews are taking place this week with additional meetings with senior leadership and the second round of interviews taking place in early January. The second round of interviews, of course will culminate in a recommendation from the search committee to President Lachemi for approval.
As announced last week, Professor Graham Hudson will be stepping into the role of interim dean of the Lincoln Alexander School of Law as of January 1 until June 30, 2024. During this time, Dean Donna Young is taking a pre-planned administrative leave, returning to the role of dean on July 1, 2024. A professor and associate dean, academic at the law school, Graham has been actively involved in the development of the law school's JD program, including its integrated practice curriculum. He has been a faculty member at TMU since 2010 and has held several administrative positions during this time. I would really like to thank Graham for accepting this interim role and for his continued dedication to the law school.

I would also like to thank Andrew McWilliams for his service and leadership as interim dean, Faculty of Science for the last six months.

Learning and Teaching Highlights

I'd now like to take a few moments to highlight a few learning and teaching initiatives taking place across the university. Earlier this fall, a group of ten students from TRSM's Hospitality and Tourism Management program participated in a unique experiential learning opportunity. They joined Sonya Graci, a professor and the director of the Institute of Hospitality and Tourism Research at TRSM, on a journey to the Yukon and Northwest Territories. The trip provided students with the opportunity to learn from local leaders about Indigenous issues, policies and ways of life in Canada's north.

Also this semester, the English Language Institute (ELI) launched a mentorship program. Through the program 15 ELI alumni mentors, representing five countries and 13 undergraduate programs across six faculties, are working to enhance the engagement and learning experience of international students in ELI's pathway programs.

Lastly, in November, 15 undergraduate students went to Dublin, Ireland to receive a Global Undergraduate Award (GUA), which recognizes top undergraduate academic work and shares their research with an international audience. This year, TMU students submitted a total of 276 submissions. Students submitted projects on topics ranging from promoting corporate accountability for human rights to the link between lifestyle and well-being domains. Three of the students were selected as regional winners for Canada and the U.S. in the categories of social science, law and engineering. This morning, I was thrilled to join them at a celebratory breakfast where they shared their experiences, and the pure joy of having participated in the awards ceremony, but also having submitted their work. It was great to meet them and celebrate with them and learn more about their experience in Dublin at the GUA Awards.

Those are my updates for today, thank you. As this is the last Senate meeting of the term, I wish everyone a restful winter break, thank you. Happy to answer any questions.

6.4.2.2 Revisions to Policy 45: Governance Councils (to incorporate the School of Medicine)

Motion: That Senate approve the revisions to Policy 45: Governance Councils (to incorporate the School of Medicine).

Moved: T. Chan; Seconded: A. McWilliams, S. Zolfaghari, M. Vahabi
Motion Approved

6.4.2.3. Proposal regarding the establishment of Departments and Divisions within the School of Medicine

Motion: That Senate approve the proposal regarding the establishment of Departments and Divisions within the School of Medicine.

Moved; T. Chan; Seconded: K. Metersky, M. Vahabi, A. McWilliams
Motion Approved

6.4.2.4. Department of English – Updated Bylaws

Motion: That Senate approve the Department of English – Updated Bylaws.

Moved; K. Metersky; Seconded: P. Albanese
Motion Approved

6.4.2.5. For information: Academic Integrity Office Annual Report to Senate (2022-2023) – no questions or comments

6.4.3 Report #F2023-1 of the Senate Priorities Committee (SPC): M. Lachemi

6.4.3.1. Amendments to the Toronto Metropolitan University Senate Bylaw #1 to include Senator Emeritus

Motion: That Senate approve the amendments to the Toronto Metropolitan University Senate Bylaw#1 to include Senator Emeritus.

Moved: R. Ravindran, Seconded: J. McArthur, S. Kheraj, M. Vahabi, S. Zolfaghari, K. Metersky, A. Ferworn

Motion Approved

> **Q:** Firstly, I want to echo from a student senator perspective, my own appreciation for David Checkland. I know we're not talking about this topic, but all of us are well aware of how this motion relates to the next one, and the retirement of David Checkland. Having someone present on Senate who has a lot of experience, and who has made important contributions, and who, even though they're leaving the community in other ways, is able to stay on, I don't have a

problem inherently with that idea. But I do think that there are some gaps in terms of outlining what these roles, limitations, and responsibilities, or what capacity they can have in terms of their participation in Senate is. So, for example, there's no clarification in the terms of office section of the bylaw that references Senator Emeritus, and how long a term might be. There's no clarification about whether or not Senator Emeritus can sit on the standing committees, and I think these are very important clarifications if we are going to put forward this honorary seat. With all this in mind, I would actually move to refer this back to the Senate Priorities Committee so that these questions can be answered and we get back a proposed honorary seat that actually is more thoroughly incorporated into the existing structure of Senate.

A: M. Lachemi – Thank you for those questions, and we have had the discussion at SPC. It was discussed thoroughly at the last SPC meeting. Your question about the role, there is no role on Senate, so Senator Emeritus will not have any presence on Senate in terms of role. So, it's not a member of Senate. The role of the Senator Emeritus is to provide advice to the university because of their past experience and expertise and guidance to us. In terms of your question about if the person can sit on committees, the question is, no, because there's no role on Senate, and the third is the term. This, as per the discussion, is an unlimited term. And actually, we do have in the university, which is probably not clear from a student perspective, Professors, when they retire from the university, they can apply to get the title of Professor Emeritus, and that is, for an unlimited term, to just to give you that perspective. Alex was part of this discussion, and I think he can add more context to this.

C: A. Ferworn - I was just going to suggest that. Yes, those are all good points, but if we don't pass it, then David doesn't become one. So, what I would suggest is that we pass it with the proviso that it be returned to SPC for further elucidation.

C: S. Kheraj – I'll just add on SPC, my reading was that the definition, it specifically included that the status doesn't carry any duties or obligations. Which was based on Donna's reading of other inclusions of a similar position, which is why we didn't consider specifying that you can't sit on committees or anything. It's a non-Senate, Senator position.

C: It's a little bit repeating what Sean said, but it is very specific. Section 1.1.4 saying, exactly the role, carrying no duties or obligations, but lets the holder to be called upon for advice and counsel. And then the only other thing is defining how you would be eligible for it. So, I hope you would consider that those are actually addressing the points that were of concern.

C: The reason for bringing this forward, perhaps in an incomplete manner, was to honor David Checkland, and I firmly believe that we should do that. So, no matter what this says, and I think it says enough we should actually go ahead and do that.

C: The purpose of creating this position is to accommodate our respected colleague, David Checkland, period. I think it fully satisfies that and from time to time we do revise policies and rules. I think it is fully complete right now. We should pass it as it is.

C: Thanks to everyone for your responses. But, I'm just wondering if you could repeat what you said about your suggestion, instead of not passing it now and just referring it to SPC. You made a different suggestion**.**

A: I said that we would pass this version of the motion and return it to SPC for improvement or words to that effect.

C: Okay, thank you for clarifying.

6.4.3.2. David Checkland be conferred Senator Emeritus status upon approval of item 6.4.3.1. at Toronto Metropolitan University

Motion: That Senate approve that David Checkland be conferred Senator Emeritus status upon approval of item 6.4.3.1. at Toronto Metropolitan University.

Moved: R. Ravindran; Seconded: J. McArthur, S. Zolfaghari; D. Scofield, A. McWilliams, K. Metersky, M. Vahabi

Motion Approved

> **C:** I'll make some comments. I'm not changing the resolution, it's perfect. The comments I would like to make are as follows. I've known David for all my service here at TMU, which is about between 30 and 35 years closing on 35 actually. All my time I have known him as the President of our Faculty Association and later on, the Senate. David has been, at the Senate, his contribution to policies and procedures, particularly the context, logic, history, the past ongoing and new issues and how to mitigate them as we move forward. He's always a forward thinker. As an Engineer I am more interested in the outcome and adjust the process. The end, you know, is very important. But David always brought in the importance of proper means towards the end, and this articulation always stood out enabling better understanding. Thus, in the Senate, David has been the cynosure of all our eyes, and we all wondered what David has got to say with rapt attention. We look in the direction of David all the time, and I've been delighted to know that David has served on the Academic Council, as well as the Senate, both I have served as well. Well deserved recognition for David, enabling a clear benchmark for this very important recognition at our beloved university. I am indeed very fortunate to have shared many years, David, with you at TMU.
> **C:** M. Lachemi - Ravi, thank you so much and also, thank you for your many contributions to our university.

7. New Business as Circulated - none

8. Members' Business –

Hortative Motion - Given the significant changes involved in the recently announced administrative Naming Policy from the predecessor Benefactor Naming Policy, and in the interests of better ensuring well-informed decisions regarding the benefactor naming of academic units, the Senate of TMU hereby strongly recommends:

> i) that the Procedures accompanying the new Naming Policy be amended;
> ii) that the amendment be to require, in all cases of a proposed naming of an academic unit, that consultation be undertaken with all stakeholders, including, faculty, staff, and students;
> iii) and that such consultation include, but not be limited to, discussion regarding the consistency of the proposed naming with the central values of the disciplines within the academic unit.

Moved: D. Checkland; Seconded; A. McWilliams, M. Vahabi, J. Mendoza; U. Ngwaba
Motion Approved

> **Q:** I just wanted to speak in favor of this motion simply because I do think that the academic units, our members, and at least the TFA members and the academic units would appreciate

being consulted if there is going to be a renaming of their departments, or in addition to their naming of the departments. And David thank you for providing that background, because I think sometimes indeed, you know, a decade later, when you know the Senate composition has changed and there are different people on this being more explicit with respect to the policy and actual consultation with faculty would be beneficial, just so that it is much more clear, instead of having to kind of read it into the policy itself.

C: M. Lachemi – Thank you. And let me just provide a comment because of my role as the President, Chair of Senate. But also, I'm the bridge between the Senate and the Board. I totally agree with the approach used here, and I think it's important for naming of academic units for members of that academic unit to be consulted. So, you have also, David, my full support for this, my full commitment as President, but also, I mean, this is why we appointed you, as Senator Emeritus to keep that memory and history of things that happen. But I don't see any problem with the proposed language here.

9. Consent Agenda

C: M. Lachemi - Before I adjourn this meeting, I also want to acknowledge that today is Andy McWilliams last Senate meeting as interim Dean of the Faculty of Science. The Dean, David Cramb will be returning to his role in January, and I want to take this opportunity to thank Andy for his service to the Faculty of Science. You have done a wonderful job leading the faculty, and I know that you will continue to serve the Faculty in another role. And for all of us this is the last Senate meeting of the year. I want to wish all of you a wonderful holiday season in December. My best wishes for a healthy and joyous season and I look forward to continuing working with you in the new year. Happy holidays, Happy New Year and see you soon.

10. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 7:09 p.m.