

Senate Executive Committee

Open Session

November 10, 2025

3:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

Needles Hall

NH 3308 / Virtual Option

Waterloo Campus

Think Differently | Act with Purpose | Work Together

2025 11 10 Senate Executive Committee Meeting Book

AGENDA

Governance Resources

[Link to Governance Resources](#)

OPEN SESSION

3:30 p.m.	1. Approval of the Minutes		
	1.1 Conflict of Interest	Declaration	3
	1.2 Minutes of the October 6, 2025 Meeting	Decision	4
	1.3 Business Arising from the Minutes	Information	
3:35 p.m.	2. Remarks from the Chair		
	2.1 Remarks from the Chair	Information	7
3:40 p.m.	3. Reports to the Senate Executive Committee		
	3.1 Senate Executive Committee Mandate Review [Day]	Information	8
	3.2 Draft Proposal - Senate Alternative Credentials Committee [DeVidi]	Information	9
	3.3 Draft Proposal - Senate Academic Innovation Committee [Abukhdeir]	Information	14
4:05 p.m.	4. Senate Agenda Preparation		
	4.1 Senate Work Plan 25/26	Information	17
	4.2 Draft Senate Agenda for November 24, 2025	Decision	19
4:25 p.m.	5. Other Business	Information	
	6. Adjournment		
	The next meeting of the Senate Executive Committee will be held on January 12, 2025 from 3:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.		

For Approval**Open Session**

To: Senate Executive Committee

From: Ashley Day
Associate University Secretary

Date of Meeting: November 10, 2025

Agenda Item: **1. Approval of Minutes and Business Arising**

1.1 Conflict of Interest

Members are invited to declare any conflicts related to the agenda at this time. Should a conflict of interest arise during discussion, members are asked to declare a conflict of interest as it arises.

The Secretariat can provide guidance regarding potential conflicts of interest in advance of or during the meeting.

1.2 Minutes of the October 6, 2025 Meeting

Motion: To approve the minutes of the October 6, 2025 Senate Executive Committee meeting, as distributed/amended.

Documentation Provided:

- Minutes of the October 6, 2025 Meeting

1.3 Business Arising from the Minutes

At its meeting October 20, 2025, Senate approved the membership of the Senate Engagement Working Group. The Secretariat will provide an update on the status of the Senate Engagement Working Group.

University of Waterloo
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes of the October 6, 2025 Meeting
[in agenda order]

Present: Ashley Day [Secretary], Laura Deakin, Tom Duever [Acting Chair], Mark Ferro, Nadine Ibrahim, Carol Ann MacGregor, Blake Madill, Damian Mikhail, David Porreca, Jessica Rindlisbacher, Rida Sayed, Mark Seasons, James Skidmore, Justin Wan

Resources/Guests: David DeVidi, Jenny Flagler-George, Gen Gauthier-Chalifour, Tony Ly

Regrets: Vivek Goel [Chair], Vikas Gupta

OPEN SESSION

1. Approval of the Minutes

1.1 Minutes of the September 8, 2025 Meeting

No amendments were brought forward. A motion was heard to approve the minutes of the September 8, 2025 meeting. Skidmore and Ibrahim. Carried.

1.2. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

2. Remarks from the Chair

The Acting Chair, Tom Duever, noted he would be chairing the meeting in the Chair's absence.

3. Report to Senate Executive Committee

3.1. Senate Engagement Working Group Update

Gauthier-Chalifour gave a brief overview of how the proposed membership slate was developed. Efforts were made to include as many interested senators as possible. Considerations during the discussion included gender balance, academic governance experience, and diversity of perspectives. It was clarified that the working group is a time-limited appointment, with the intention that it will conclude its recommendations before the June 2026 Senate meeting.

It was noted that three alumni members of Senate expressed disappointment that they could not participate due to the composition of the working group and lack of a designated seat for an alumni member. SEC members discussed the possibility of adding an alumni role to the working group, which would require approval by Senate. Following discussion, members agreed to retain the membership structure as approved by Senate.

Members then discussed the proposed co-chairs and SEC roles, including the skills and experience each individual would bring to the working group. Having put his name forward for consideration, Damian Mikhail recused himself from the meeting. Members discussed the benefits of the remaining interested individuals and perspectives that would be brought to the working group.

A motion was heard that the Senate Executive Committee appoint the proposed members (item 1.1 - 1.2) to the Senate Engagement Working Group, as follows:

Co-Chairs:

- Laura Deakin
- Marcus Shantz

SEC Members:

- Carol Ann MacGregor
- Damian Mikhail

And that the Senate Executive Committee recommend that Senate appoint the names of the faculty, student, and alumni members (item 2.1-2.3) to be appointed to the Senate Engagement Working Group, as follows:

- 2.1 6 Faculty Senators
 - Arts – James Skidmore
 - Health – Martin Cooke
 - Engineering – David Clausi
 - Environment – Rob Gorbet
 - Mathematics – Hans De Sterck
 - Science – Stan Woo
- 2.2 1 Undergraduate Student Senator
 - Alex Pawelko
- 2.3 1 Graduate Student Senator
 - Jessica Rindlisbacher

Deakin and Porreca. Carried.

3.2. Senate By-Election Update

Ashley Day, Secretary to SEC, provided a brief update on the status of the Senate By-Election currently underway. The election process opened on October 1 and will close on October 8. A report with the results is to be included in the final October 20, 2025 Senate package for information.

4. Senate Agenda Preparation

4.1. Senate Work Plan 25/26

This item was provided for information only.

4.2. Draft Senate Agenda for October 20, 2025

The committee reviewed the draft Senate meeting book and discussed the main items on the regular agenda. A member inquired if the Presidential update at the October meeting would address if Federal budget would have any impact on the University's operating budget. The Acting Chair noted this would likely be included in the Chair remarks. Another member inquired about the materials for item 10. Guidelines for Collective Bodies which were not included in the draft package. Gauthier-Chalifour noted that the material had not yet been received by the Secretariat and would be distributed to SEC ahead of the Senate package distribution, if possible.

A motion was heard to approve the October 20, 2025 Senate agenda, as presented. Seasons and Deakin. Carried.

5. Other Business

No items of other business were identified.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:18 p.m.

It was noted the next meeting of the Senate Executive Committee will be held on November 10, 2025.

October 6, 2025

Ashley Day
Associate University Secretary

For Information**Open Session**

To: Senate Executive Committee
From: Ashley Day
Associate University Secretary
Date of Meeting: November 10, 2025
Agenda Item: **2.1 Remarks from the Chair**

Summary

Dr. Thomas Duever will step in as Chair of the Senate Executive Committee for the November 10, 2025 meeting. He will provide an update on matters of interest to the committee.

For Information**Open Session**

To: Senate Executive Committee

From: Ashley Day
Associate University Secretary

Date of Meeting: November 10, 2025

Agenda Item: **3.1 Senate Executive Committee: Mandate Review**

Summary

This memo serves as formal notice of the upcoming review of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) mandate and terms of reference. This review reflects the University's ongoing commitment to effective and transparent governance practices, and follows recent reviews of other Senate standing committees and councils.

The purpose of the review is to ensure that the Committee's composition, mandate, and responsibilities remain effective and aligned with Senate's overall mandate and the University's bicameral governance model. The review of the SEC will run in parallel with the work of the Senate Engagement Working Group, allowing for coordination and sharing of findings and recommendations.

The University Secretariat will conduct a comprehensive review, including an assessment of leading governance practices, analysis of SEC Effectiveness Survey results from the past three years, and an environmental scan of U15 comparator institutions.

Findings from the review will be presented to SEC at its January 12, 2026 meeting for discussion and feedback. The review is expected to be completed by May 2026, at which time a final report will be shared with Senate for consideration and approval of any proposed changes.

Areas identified for consideration based on member and senator comments to-date include:

- Clarification of the role of the SEC in approving the Senate meeting agenda
- Clarification of the role of the SEC in considering items proposed from Senators for the meeting agenda
- Clarification of the role of the SEC in oversight of Senate governance matters

Members will be invited to offer comment on additional items for consideration as part of the review and environmental scan.

Current SEC membership and responsibilities can be found in [Senate By-Law 2](#).

For Information**Open Session**

To: Senate Executive Committee

From: Ashley Day
Associate University Secretary

Date of Meeting: November 10, 2025

Agenda Item: **3.2 Credentials Framework Report Recommendation - Senate Alternative Credentials Committee**

Summary

David DeVidi, AVP, Academic, will provide an overview of the draft proposal for the creation of the Senate Alternative Credentials Committee. The draft proposal is being brought forward for early feedback from the Senate Executive Committee prior to proceeding through the Senate Undergraduate Council and Senate Graduate Council for formal recommendation to Senate.

In alignment with the 2021–2025 Strategic Plan *Connecting Imagination with Impact*, particularly the theme *Developing Talent for a Complex Future*, the University established a working group to develop a Credentials Framework. Throughout 2023, the working group conducted extensive consultations with faculty, students, and staff, and undertook significant research.

The finalized [Credentials Framework Report](#) was released in Spring 2024 and recommended the creation of a new Senate committee to oversee the approval of alternative (non-credit) credentials. This committee will replace the existing Alternative Credentials Approval Committee (ACAC), currently managed by the AVPA Office, and will strengthen the formal connection between Senate and the University's growing engagement with alternative academic credentials while maintaining the efficacy of the ACAC structure.

Jurisdictional Information

Section 22 of the University of Waterloo Act, 1972 empowers Senate:

(m) to create councils and committees to exercise its powers;

Proposed Governance Pathway

Senate Graduate and Research Council: October 21, 2024 (initial discussion)

Senate Undergraduate Council: November 19, 2024 (initial discussion)

Prospective:

Senate Graduate Council: November 17, 2025

Senate Undergraduate Council: December 9, 2025

Senate Executive Committee: January 12, 2026

Senate: January 26, 2026

Documentation Provided

Draft Senate Alternative Credentials Committee Terms of Reference

Draft Senate motion creating Senate Alternative Credentials Committee

Recommendation/Motion:

To recommend Senate approve the creation of the proposed Senate Alternative Credentials Committee, as presented.

Summary:

In response to the recommendations of the 2021-2025 Strategic Plan, *Connecting Imagination with Impact*, and in particular the objectives and recommendations under the theme of Developing Talent for a Complex Future, the University established a working group tasked with developing a Credentials Framework to address the following objectives articulated in that Plan:

- Promoting quality and innovation in teaching and learning
- Removing barriers to collaboration, interdisciplinarity, and the integration of knowledge
- Increasing the flexibility of curricula
- Facilitating the development of academic programs that stimulate reflective, deep learning and developing competencies to address global challenges and opportunities
- Developing more flexible graduate-level academic programming
- Establishing a lifelong learning centre that will enable and encourage our alumni and other professionals to reskill in a society that increasingly values lifelong learning
- Leveraging and optimizing government, industry and community partnerships that create lifelong learning opportunities

Co-Chaired by the Associate Vice-President, Academic and the Registrar, and comprising faculty representatives and professional staff with relevant expertise, the Working Group consulted widely on campus with faculty, students and staff in 2023 and carried out substantial research. The Group synthesized what it learned into a series of recommendations, which were then shared with experts on campus who helped identify any potential unintended consequences of the recommendations as drafted. The recommendations were then finalized in a Credentials Framework Report shared with the senior academic leadership of the University in Spring 2024.

One of the key recommendations of the Credentials Framework Report is the creation of a new Senate committee to handle approval of alternative (i.e., non-credit) credentials, which the working group proposes could be called the *Senate Alternative Credentials Committee* (SACC). The intention is to replace the current Alternative Credentials Approval Committee (ACAC), which runs out of the AVPA Office. The new committee will create a closer and more formalized link between Senate and the University increasingly substantial academic involvement in alternative credentials while preserving the virtues of the existing ACAC framework. The draft proposal of the committee's composition and remit is included below.

Governance Path:

Proposal:

That Senate creates a new Senate Alternative Credentials Committee.

Contextual Remarks:

In 2020-21, the University established WatSPEED as an ancillary unit to accelerate the development of non-credit academic programming aimed at mid-career professionals. A

small working group led by the AVPA and including the AVPGSPA was tasked with considering governance questions for this programming. It quickly became clear that two considerations needed to be balanced:

- i. The University community wanted assurance that our offerings would have academic credibility and that the reputation of the University was safeguarded.
- ii. To be a viable player in this market, WatSPEED needs to be able to “move at the speed of business,” so the approval pathway needs to be much more efficient than the pathways for for-credit offerings.

The solution devised by this working group was the creation of the Alternative Credentials Approval Committee (ACAC). ACAC replaced an existing committee, the Professional Development Advisory Committee (PDAC) chaired by the AVPA (as the Executive Committee members to whom the Centre for Extended Learning, then the unit responsible for PD offerings, reported). Since at least 1973, Senate has not required approval of non-credit credentials via one of its established Councils. In 2003 Senate approved a recommendation regarding definitions and approvals of (what we can call for convenience) for-credit offerings and distinguishing them from other sorts of credentials. In 2005 it was specified that what is now CEL should have its non-credit offerings overseen by a council or committee that would establish a “policy” or standards for continuing education programming, headed by the position that is now the AVPA and including representation from the Faculties. There are no Senate records of the decisions or work of the PDAC since 2005.

ACAC carries out its work asynchronously and online. As voting members, it includes faculty representatives from every Faculty appointed by the Dean, the AVPA (who serves as chair), and the AVPGSPA. ACAC also includes, as non-voting resources to the committee, delegates from several of the Academic Support Units on campus. Since 2021 it has approved approximately two dozen non-credit credentials. Most are developed in collaboration with WatSPEED but there have also been credentials developed without WatSPEED involvement, including those developed by the Centre for Teaching Excellence, Cooperative and Experiential Education, and the Sustainability Office.

There are two primary reasons for recommending that ACAC be replaced by an official Senate Committee and clarifying its remit.

1. The lifelong learning offerings that are now the primary work of ACAC are generally of a different sort, and aimed at a different audience, than the offerings traditionally approved by the PDAC. (These were primarily the sort of “interest courses” that are the traditional subjects of continuing education offerings or the professional development courses that were the primary business of the PD unit of the Centre for Extended Learning.) The current credentials are generally aimed at mid-career professionals and are clearly “university level learning,” sometimes at the graduate level. The rationale that presumably removed PDAC credentials from Senate oversight in 2005 do not apply in the same way to credentials of the sort ACAC has been approving.
2. The existing Senate rationale legitimizing PDAC activities is somewhat vague, places constraints on what ACAC can legitimately approve, and is likely to prove unduly restrictive as the University’s academic programming evolves to meet the needs of the future. For instance, the Senate materials from 2005 say that any “course” that “approximates the length and content of 0.5 unit on campus courses” requires approval from an official Senate Committee, a process that can take a significant amount of time (at least weeks and probably months, vs. the five-day turnaround typical for ACAC). [This proscription may rule out, for instance, the development of partnerships between WatSPEED and professional

organizations seeking to offer programming related to maintenance of professional standing, where something that “approximates” a 12-week course may be exactly what is required, and the current wording suggests it would therefore need approval by Senate Undergrad or Senate Grad and Research, where the approval pathways are too cumbersome. In accordance with the recommendations of the Credentials Framework Report, the proposed remit for SACC distinguishes credit from non-credit offerings in terms of the audience and whether a course can count towards a degree, instead of focusing on whether the offering “approximates a 0.5 credit course”.]

The Credentials Framework Report includes as a subsidiary recommendation that

- i. The new SACC needs to maintain the nimbleness for which ACAC has been praised while providing an appropriate degree of academic oversight for the sorts of credentials on offer. That is, a credential certifying participation in a workshop of mastery of a particular practical skill does not require the level of detailed scrutiny required for a new degree program. We therefore recommend that: SACC should be much smaller than either SUC or SGRC (as ACAC is currently)
- ii. SACC continue to work primarily online and asynchronously
- iii. SACC’s voting membership should include a representative from each Faculty in addition to the AVPA and AVP GSPA

SACC’s membership should include “resource” members from relevant ASUs who can inform decision-making in a timely and effective manner.

Proposed Structure and Remit for Senate Alternative Credentials Committee:

Draft Terms of Reference - Senate Alternative Credentials Committee

Whereas at the University of Waterloo a degree is generally understood to require the completion of specified courses and milestones (e.g., at the graduate level milestones may include comprehensive exams, major research projects, theses, and the like), those courses and milestones which *can* count towards a degree shall be defined as those “for credit.” Academic offerings that are not “for credit” in that sense shall be referred to as “alternative credentials.”

The Senate Alternative Credentials Committee shall have the following powers and responsibilities:

1. On behalf of Senate, to approve alternative credentials, including microcredentials.
2. On behalf of Senate, to establish rules and procedures for the development and approval of alternative credentials, which appropriately balance between ensuring the academic credibility of credentials and the need for efficient decision-making to meet the needs of the learners who earn the alternative credentials.
3. To report annually to Senate on the which alternative credentials have been approved.
4. To work collaboratively with Senate and the Senate councils allocated responsibility for the academic quality of undergraduate and graduate studies, for situations where it is unclear whether the credentials under development are for credit or alternative credentials.

Membership

Voting members:

- The Associate Vice-President, Academic, who shall chair this committee.

- The Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs.
- Six faculty members, one from each Faculty, to be appointed by the Dean of said faculty. Normally this faculty member will be an Associate Dean with responsibility for lifelong learning for the Faculty.

Non-voting resource members will include delegates appointed by:

- The Registrar
- The Director, WatSPEED
- The Director, Centre for Extended Learning
- The Director, Centre for Teaching Excellence
- The Associate Provost, Cooperative and Experiential Education
- The Associate Provost, Institutional Analysis and Planning

For Information**Open Session**

To: Senate Executive Committee

From: Ashley Day
Associate University Secretary

Date of Meeting: November 10, 2025

Agenda Item: **3.3 Draft Proposal - Senate Academic Innovation Committee**

Summary

The enclosed draft and proposal to establish a new Senate Academic Innovation Committee is shared on request of Faculty Senator Nasser Mohieddin Abukhdeir, Associate Professor, Chemical Engineering. N. Abukhdeir will attend the meeting and speak to the proposal and respond to questions.

Next steps will be determined following the meeting of SEC.

Jurisdictional Information

Section 22 of the University of Waterloo Act, 1972 empowers Senate:

(m) to create councils and committees to exercise its powers;

Proposed Governance Pathway

To be determined

Documentation Provided

Draft Senate Academic Innovation Committee Terms of Reference

Draft Terms of Reference: Senate Academic Innovation Committee¹

1 Committee Establishment and Mandate

- 1.1 The Senate Academic Innovation Committee is a standing committee of Senate and is established in accordance with the University of Waterloo Act.
- 1.2 The committee serves as the primary forum within Senate to explore improvements to academic program delivery with an equal focus on efficiency, quality, and viability.

2 Membership

- 2.1 The membership of the committee shall consist of the following:

2.1.1 Ex-officio

- 2.1.1.1 Associate Vice-President, Academic, who shall chair the committee
- 2.1.1.2 President, Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo
- 2.1.1.3 President, Waterloo Undergraduate Students Association
- 2.1.1.4 President, Graduate Student Association
- 2.1.1.5 Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs
- 2.1.1.6 Associate Vice-President, Indigenous Relations
- 2.1.1.7 Associate Vice-President, Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Anti-Racism

2.1.2 Appointed by Senate

- 2.1.2.1 Six elected faculty members of Senate, one from each faculty
 - 2.1.2.2 One faculty member of Senate from the Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo
 - 2.1.2.3 Two elected student members of Senate, at least one of whom shall be an undergraduate student and one who shall be a graduate student
 - 2.1.2.4 One alumni member of Senate
 - 2.1.2.5 One member of the Board of Governors, appointed by the Board from among the community-at-large members of the Board
 - 2.1.2.6 One member of the Board of Governors, appointed by the Board from among the governor-in-council members of the Board
- 2.1.3 For members appointed under section 2.1.2., the aim is to have broad and inclusive representation from all Faculties. Appointments shall be made in accordance with regular Senate nominating processes.

3 Responsibilities

- 3.1 The Committee shall have the following responsibilities:

- 3.1.1 Review and make recommendations on academic and administrative decisions with a focus on efficiency, quality, and viability.
- 3.1.2 Request, consider, and review information and evidence for Senate and its committees in support effective academic decision making.
- 3.1.3 Make recommendations to Senate regarding the development and improvement of University policies, guidelines, and procedures with a focus on efficient, high quality, and viable academic program delivery.

¹Note that portions of these draft Terms of Reference are directly based on:

<https://uwaterloo.ca/waterloo-budget-plan/innovation-action/academic-innovation-working-group>

<https://uwaterloo.ca/waterloo-budget-plan/innovation-action/academic-innovation-working-group/terms-of-reference>
in compliance with Policy 73 section 3.A.

- 3.1.4 Facilitate cross-campus collaboration to share best practices and make recommendations to Senate regarding unified approaches for efficient, high quality, and viable academic program delivery.
- 3.1.5 Conduct university community consultations with faculty, staff, and student regarding academic practices and develop yearly summaries to present to Senate and to inform the Board of Governors.
- 3.1.6 Conduct environmental scans of academic innovation activities at comparator and competitor institutions and development yearly summaries to present to Senate and to inform the Board of Governors.
- 3.1.7 Review its terms of reference on an annual basis and make recommendations to Senate thereon. A comprehensive review shall be undertaken every five years.

4 Meetings

- 4.1 The Committee shall normally hold monthly meetings.
- 4.2 Special meetings may be called by the chair of the Committee.

For Approval**Open Session**

To: Senate Executive Committee
From: Ashley Day
Associate University Secretary
Date of Meeting: November 10, 2025
Agenda Item: **4. Senate Agenda Preparation**

4.1 Senate Work Plan 25/26

The Senate Work Plan is provided for information only.

4.2 Draft Senate Agenda for November 24, 2025

- 5.2: Statement and Procedures on Principles for Institutional Partnerships
 - Motion for recommendation of the updated statement and procedures
- 5.3: Freedom of Expression Task Force - Guidelines for Collective Bodies
 - Motion for recommendation of the updated guidelines
- 5.4: Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances
 - Motion for approval of changes to Policy 70
- 6: Institutional Priority Discussion – AI Enablement
 - Faculty of Science AI Strategy
- 7&8: Curriculum Major Modifications
 - Proposed changes from the Faculty of Engineering (SGC Report) and the Faculty of Arts (SUC Report)
- 13: Candidates for Honorary Degrees (confidential session)
 - Motion for approval of candidates as recommended by the Honorary Degrees Committee

Motion: That the Senate Executive Committee approve the November 24, 2025 Senate agenda as presented.

Documentation Provided

- Draft Senate Package

Senate Agenda Items	September 22, 2025	October 20, 2025	November 24, 2025	January 26, 2026	March 2, 2026	April 6, 2026	May 4, 2026	June 8, 2026
p = planned ✓ = completed								
LEADERSHIP, FACUTLY, AND ASSOCIATION REPORTS								
Report of the President	✓	✓	p	p	p	p	p	p
• Faculty Tenure and Promotion Report (<i>consent</i>)			p	p	p	p	p	p
Report of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost	✓	✓	p	p	p	p	p	p
• Reports from Faculties (e.g., appointments, administrative appointments, sabbaticals) (<i>consent</i>)	✓	✓	p	p	p	p	p	p
• Call for Nominations and Designation of University Professor	✓					p		
Report of the Vice-President, Research & International (<i>consent</i>)	✓	✓	p	p	p	p	p	p
• Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research & International				p				
Faculty Presentations					p		p	p
Annual Association Reports: FAUW, WUSA, GSA					p			
Report of the COU Academic Colleague								p
COMMITTEE & COUNCIL REPORTS Each committee and council of Senate will provide a report to Senate after each meeting.								
Executive Committee, Academic Quality Enhancement Committee, Graduate Council, Honorary Degrees Committee, Planning and Finance Committee, Research and Innovation Council, Undergraduate Council	✓	✓	p	p	p	p	p	p
POLICIES & BY-LAWS Policy and By-Law amendments may also be brought forward based on review schedules or as required.								
Annual Report on Gift Acceptance (Policy 7) (<i>confidential</i>)								p
University Committee on Student Appeals Annual Report (Policy 72)				p				
University Appointment Review Committee Annual Report (Policy 76)						p		
Executive Appointments (Policy 48, 50, 68) (<i>confidential</i>)								
OPERATING BUDGET Under the Report of the Planning and Finance Committee.								
University Operating Budget Update		✓						
Joint Board/Senate Budget Education Sessions				p	p			
Operating Budget (recommendation to Board)						p		
ADMISSIONS UPDATES, CONFERRING OF DEGREES, AND AWARDS								
Call for Nominations: Honorary Degree and Honorary Member	✓				p			
Academic Calendar Dates	✓							
Teaching Awards Committee: Appointment and Award Winners				p			p	
Delegation and Reports of the Roster of Graduands	✓		p			p		
Spring and Fall Convocation Reports	✓		p					
Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions Update				p				
SENATE MEMBERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE								
Senate Orientation	✓							
Call for Senate Nominations, Elections, and Appointments				p	p			p
Senate Effectiveness Survey					p			

Senate

Open & Confidential Sessions

November 24, 2025

3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

Needles Hall

NH 3407

Waterloo Campus

Think Differently | Act with Purpose | Work Together

2025 11 24 Senate Meeting Book

AGENDA

1. Governance Resources

[1.1 Link to Governance Resources](#)

2. OPEN SESSION

3:30 p.m.

3. Territorial Acknowledgement [TBD]

3:35 p.m.

4. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes [Goel]

4.1 Conflict of Interest

Declaration

4

4.2 Approval of the Agenda and Consent Items

Decision

4.3 Minutes of the October 20, 2025 Meeting

Decision

5

4.4 Business Arising from the Minutes

Information

3:40 p.m.

5. Report of the President [Goel]

5.1 General Update

Information

10

5.2 Statement and Procedures on Principles for Institutional Partnerships

Decision

11

5.3 Freedom of Expression Task Force - Guidelines for Collective Bodies

Decision

16

5.4 Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances

Decision

23

4:40 p.m.

6. Institutional Priority Discussion - AI Enablement

6.1 Faculty of Science AI Strategy [Deakin]

Information

4:50 p.m.

7. Report of the Senate Graduate Council [Wan]

7.1 Faculty of Engineering

Decision

43

5:00 p.m.

8. Report of the Senate Undergraduate Council [DeVidi]

8.1 Faculty of Arts

Decision

45

5:10 p.m.	9. Consent Agenda		
	9.1 Senate Work Plan 2025-26	Information	68
	9.2 Policy 68 Amendments	Information	69
	9.3 Report on Convocation	Information	
	9.3.1 Fall 2025 Convocation Report		
	9.3.2 Roster of Graduands		
	9.4 Report of the Senate Executive Committee	Information	
	9.5 Report of the Senate Graduate Council	Information	76
	9.6 Report of the Senate Research and Innovation Council	Information	78
	9.7 Report of the President	Information	
	9.7.1 Tenure and Promotion Report		79
	9.8 Report of the Vice President, Academic and Provost	Information	
	9.8.1 Faculty Appointments and Leaves		83
	9.9 Report of the Vice-President, Research and International	Information	
	9.9.1 Awards, Distinctions, Grants, Commercialization Activity, International Engagements		84
5:15 p.m.	10. Items Removed from the Consent Agenda		
	11. Other Business	Information	
	12. CONFIDENTIAL SESSION		
5:20 p.m.	13. Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee [Goel]		
	13.1 Candidates for Honorary Degrees	Decision	88
	14. Other Business	Information	
	15. Adjournment		
	The next meeting of Senate will take place on January 26, 2026 from 3:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m. in NH 3407.		

For Information**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Gen Gauthier-Chalifour
University Secretary

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

Agenda Item: **4. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes**

4.1 Conflict of Interest

Senators are invited to declare any conflicts related to the open session agenda at this time. Should a conflict of interest arise during discussion, senators are asked to declare a conflict of interest as it arises.

The Secretariat can provide guidance regarding potential conflicts of interest in advance of or during the Senate meeting.

4.2 Approval of the Agenda and Consent Agenda

Motion: To approve the agenda as presented/amended, and to approve or receive for information the items on the consent agenda, listed as items 9.1-9.9 of the Senate agenda.

Senators wishing to have an item removed from consent to the regular agenda are asked to contact the University Secretary in advance of the meeting. Senators may also request to have items moved to the regular agenda immediately prior to the approval of the agenda. Items removed from the consent agenda will be considered under item 10.

4.3 Minutes of the October 20, 2025 Meeting

Motion: To approve the minutes of the October 20, 2025 open session meeting, as distributed.

Documentation Provided:

- Minutes of the October 20, 2025 Meeting

4.4 Business Arising from the Minutes

At the October 20 2025 meeting, under item 8.1 Annual Institutional Performance Update, a member requested further information related to student mental health services. That information has been provided to the member from Chris Read, Associate Provost, Students. A link to additional reporting can be found under item 8.1, as requested.

University of Waterloo
SENATE
Minutes of the October 20, 2025 Meeting
[in agenda order]

Present: John Abraham, Nasser Abukhdeir, Yasmeen Almomani, Michael Barnett-Cowan, Aubrey Basdeo, Raouf Boutaba, David Clausi, Martin Cooke, Cecilia Cotton, Laura Deakin, Charmaine Dean, David DeVidi, Michael Drescher, Thomas Duever, Andrea Edginton, Mark Ferro, Paul Fieguth, Murray Gamble, Gen Gauthier-Chalifour (Secretary), Vivek Goel (Chair), Rob Gorbet, Vikas Gupta, Peter Hall, Kevin Hare, Chris Houser, Nadine Ibrahim, Marc Jerry, Acey Kaspar, Misha Khan, Scott Kline, Sachin Kotecha, Christiane Lemieux, Ondrej Lhotak, Christopher Lim, Lili Liu, Jun Liu, Brad Lushman, Shana MacDonald, Carol Ann MacGregor, Pendar Mahmoudi, Heather Mair, Colleen Maxwell, Peter Meehan, Damian Mikhail, Sushanta Mitra, Richard Myers, Carter Neal, Cathy Newell Kelly, Christopher Nielsen, James Nugent, Alex Pawelko, David Porreca, Neil Randall, Arya Razmjoo, Jacinda Reitsma, Jessica Rindlisbacher, Sharon Roberts, Meray Sadek, Beth Sandore Namachchivaya, Rida Sayed, Mark Seasons, Marcus Shantz, James Skidmore, Karen Sunabacka, Su-Yin Tan, Christopher Taylor, Alexie Tcheuyap, Sharon Tucker, Diana Vangelisti, Bojana Videkanic, Justin Wan, Johanna Wandel, Mary Wells, Stan Woo

Regrets: Laith Alkhawaldeh, Veronica Austen, Jordan Bauman, Jean Becker, Andrew Chang, Helen Chen, Hans De Sterck, Teresa Fortney, Bruce Frayne, Achim Kempf, Jochen Koenemann, Blake Madill, Nicholas Pellegrino, Jagdeep Singh Bachher, Katie Traynor, Jeffrey Wilson, Clarence Woudsma, En-Hui Yang

Guests: Graham Brown, Ashley Day, Nenone Donaldson, Melanie Figueiredo, Jenny Flagler-George, Diana Goncalves, Diane Johnston, Andrea Kelman, John Lewis, Tony Ly, Nick Manning, Christine McWebb, Kirsten Muller, Fayaz Noormohamed, Jodene Pretti, Daniela Seskar-Hencic, Nadia Singh, Ian VanderBurgh, Caitlin Vaux, Tim Weber-Kraljevski, Katy Wong-Francq

1. Governance Resources

A link to the governance resources for Senate was provided for information.

2. OPEN SESSION

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and noted that as a result of the recent Senate by-election, four new faculty senators have begun their terms. The Chair welcomed Michael Barnett-Cowan and Heather Mair from the Faculty of Health, Bojana Videkanic from the Faculty of Arts, and Andrea Edginton from the Faculty of Science.

3. Territorial Acknowledgment

The Chair provided the territorial acknowledgment along with a brief a personal reflection.

4. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes

4.1 Conflict of Interest

The Chair advised that a question had been received from a senator about a potential conflict of interest related to item 7.1 and their appointment to the Senate Engagement Working Group. It was confirmed that such matters are not considered conflicts and a declaration was not required. No other conflicts of interest were declared.

4.2 Minutes of the September 20, 2025 Meeting

The Chair noted that the Secretariat has received a few minor amendments to the attendance list, and clarification of language under item 6.1 and discussion of Policy 42.

A motion was heard to approve the minutes of the meeting, as amended. Porreca and Deakin. Carried.

4.3 Approval of the Agenda and Consent Items

A motion was heard to approve the agenda as presented, and to approve or receive for information the items on the consent agenda, listed as items 11.1-11.6 of the Senate agenda. Porreca and Skidmore. Carried.

4.4 Business Arising from the Minutes

There were no items of business arising from the minutes.

5. United Way Presentation

5.1 United Way Presentation Memo

The Faculty Deans and some special invited guests carried on the tradition of showing their support for the United Way Campaign taking place this month by giving a special presentation. Nenone Donaldson, Vice-President Advancement and External Relations spoke to the importance of the campaign and how funds raised by UWaterloo staff, faculty and students directly support nearly 130 local agencies and charities that are on the front lines, addressing critical issues such as poverty, food insecurity, mental health challenges, and housing instability. The Chair added that our contributions play a vital role in ensuring that these essential services can continue to operate and provide a safety net for those who need it most in our community. More information can be found at uwaterloo.ca/united-way

6. Report of the President

6.1 General Update

The President and Chair of Senate provided an update to Senate on matters of interest. It was noted that convocation events were scheduled for the following week, marking the addition of new graduates to the University's growing alumni community of 255,000 members.

The Chair highlighted the recently announced research collaboration between Google and the University of Waterloo that will look at the impacts of artificial intelligence (AI) in education and how it will shape career readiness in the future. The \$1 million collaboration will focus on the future of work and learning, advancing innovation and interdisciplinary engagement in artificial intelligence research. Professor Edith Law from the Faculty of Mathematics has been appointed Executive Director for the initiative, overseeing the creation of design tools and learning environments to support this evolving area. It was noted that at the end of September, a federal AI Strategy Task Force was launched to shape Canada's approach to artificial intelligence. The Dean of Engineering, Mary Wells, has been named to this national task force, contributing expertise in safe AI systems and broader applications of learning technologies. The University of Waterloo is developing its own AI enablement strategy, engaging the campus and community in determining how best to equip faculty, staff, and students with appropriate AI tools for teaching and research in a safe and responsible manner.

At the federal government level, attention is focused on the upcoming November 4th budget announcement. Early signals indicate government interest in talent development and research investment, particularly in fields such as AI and quantum. However, it was acknowledged that the federal government faces pressures from a growing deficit and will need to balance priorities across multiple areas. At the provincial level, ministry (MCURES) consultations on the funding formula and governance continue, with significant input being gathered from institutions and stakeholders to inform future policy and funding directions.

The Chair spoke to upcoming Senate items including the Statement and Procedures on Principles for Institutional Partnerships and the Freedom of Expression Guidelines for Collective Bodies, both slated to come forward at the November meeting.

Discussion followed. A member requested an update on the ongoing CUPE Local 5524 negotiations. Jacinda Reistma, Vice-President Administration and Finance, responded that negotiations were ongoing and updates would be provided to Senate in the future, as appropriate. Another member requested whether presentations on how AI is being used by faculty members could be provided at future meetings. The Chair noted that such presentations could be arranged at future meetings.

7. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

7.1 Senate Engagement Working Group – Proposed Membership

The Chair introduced the item and spoke to the expressions of interest received for the working group. During the October 6th Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting, members appointed co-Chairs Laura Deakin (Elected Faculty Senator, Science) and Marcus Shantz (President, Conrad Grebel University). SEC also appointed two members of SEC, Carol Ann MacGregor (AFIW Faculty, St. Jerome's University) and Damian Mikhail (WUSA President).

All those that expressed interest in the faculty and student seats have been included in the proposed membership slate. The proposed membership slate is as follows:

6 Faculty Senators

- Arts – James Skidmore
- Health – Martin Cooke
- Engineering – David Clausi
- Environment – Rob Gorbet
- Mathematics – Hans De Sterck
- Science – Stan Woo

1 Undergraduate Student Senator

- Alex Pawelko

1 Graduate Student Senator

- Jessica Rindlisbacher

A motion was heard that Senate approve the proposed slate of Senate-appointed members of the Senate Engagement Working Group (items 2.1-2.3 within), as presented. Skidmore and DeVidi. Carried.

8. Report of the Senate Planning and Finance Committee

8.1 Annual Institutional Performance Update 2024-2025

The Chair provided a brief overview of the report received by the Senate Planning and Finance Committee at their recent meeting, on the Annual Institutional Performance Update for 2024-25. Each Fall, an update is provided as a way to capture metrics and stories of impact organized around our four goal areas emerging from Waterloo at 100. This year, the main report includes both qualitative and quantitative aspects and includes three pieces including the KPI dashboard, a narrative report with stories of impact, and the annual insights report on international students.

Questions were invited and discussion followed.

A member inquired about various parts of Waterloo's mental health services, and whether the improvements in wait times for counselling might have adversely affected other areas, such as the Impact Team. It was noted that a follow-up response will be provided to the member after the meeting.

Members discussed how initiatives are identified and prioritized at the institutional level. It was noted that the University has traditionally identified priorities through five-year strategic plans. With the new integrated planning and budget process, a more systematic and transparent approach for determining institutional priorities has been developed to ensure alignment with strategic objectives and measurable outcomes.

In response to a question about indicators related to student experience it was noted that forthcoming this year would be the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), which is complementary to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and that a presentation on this could be provided to Senate at a future meeting.

In response to a question about how the University measures progress toward its goal of being recognized as a top employer. Reitsma explained that employee engagement surveys have been used to identify focus areas and inform improvement strategies, noting that progress continues despite fiscal constraints.

Questions were raised about WATSpeed and its role in driving non-traditional revenue streams, and how data related to co-op employer ratings can be quantified and tracked as performance indicators.

The Chair noted that additional information and reporting is available on the University's website and that the link would be circulated (<https://uwaterloo.ca/about/accountability-and-reports/additional-reports>).

8.2 Q1 Budget Update

The Chair provided a Q1 Budget Update which focuses on the impact of expense reductions and enrolment performance. It was noted that while the Senate Planning and Finance Committee has not previously received such detailed quarterly updates, new financial reporting processes now enable more timely and effective reporting. Following the November 1 counts, more accurate data will be available as part of Q2 reporting.

Domestic intake reached 109% of the projected level, exceeding expectations. However, it was emphasized that the University has admitted approximately 500 additional domestic students beyond the number for which provincial grants are provided. International intake reached 94% of projections, affected primarily by visa processing delays. There were 186 student deferrals due to late visa approvals, and it is believed that some top international candidates may have chosen other institutions as a result. It was acknowledged that achieving these enrolment outcomes required significant effort and coordination across units. The Chair expressed appreciation to all faculty and staff for their continued hard work and dedication in navigating these challenges.

8.3 Campus Plan Update

John Lewis, Associate Professor, School of Planning, and Director, Indigenous Faculty Relations, gave a brief presentation on the Campus Plan development. It was noted that over the course of the planning process, multiple consultations have taken place. In response to feedback received, the project's vision statement has been revised and simplified. Referring to the material provided in the meeting package, several key components of the conceptual plan were highlighted. The overall plan is intended to function as a living document that is flexible, regularly reviewed, and open to future opportunities.

Discussion followed. A member inquired about integrating public art and creative spaces into the plan, to support a STEAM-focused approach that values both innovation and artistic expression. Lewis responded that the proposal contained discovery and innovation zones with the potential to add creation zones to showcase creativity on campus.

Updates were provided on the development of separate plans for the R+T Park, North Campus, and satellite campuses. Members encouraged embedding local and Mennonite history into future planning and raised concerns about potential building demolitions and deferred maintenance. Reitsma noted that these plans will help prioritize investment and space planning. Members noted the importance of aligning campus development with creativity, heritage, and sustainability.

9. Academic Innovation Initiatives

Tom Duever, Interim Vice-President Academic and Provost, provided an overview of the topic which aims to explore how the University can deliver academic programs more efficiently, leverage technology to enhance teaching and learning, and create new revenue streams through program development. The previous Vice-President Academic and Provost made a commitment in June 2025 to keep Senate informed of the progress of the working group. This is the first update to Senate.

Dave DeVidi, AVP Academic, spoke to the previous discussions at Senate and the communications provided over the last several months to instructors and the larger university community. DeVidi provided an overview of the university's existing structures and policies that support teaching and academic program development. DeVidi referred to the Academic Innovation Working Group (AIWG) whose mandate is to enhance the quality and sustainability of academic programming, with an adaptable structure that responds to emerging institutional priorities. It was noted that although the AIWG does not make decisions, it provides informed advice and recommendations that would in turn advance through appropriate governance pathways. DeVidi provided examples of the working group's early efforts, its membership, and areas where recommendations are expected to be made.

Discussion followed. Members noted the fast pace at which AI is evolving and the need to support students to be workforce ready. DeVidi elaborated on the work of AIWG relative to AI and that a

recommendation is expected regarding a major project to support instructors in this space. A member asked for clarification on why the AIWG's website is housed under the Waterloo Budget Plan site. DeVidi clarified that the AIWG's website placement under the University of Waterloo's Budget Plan site is historical, and that while rooted in efficiency discussions, the AIWG is now driven by academic effectiveness and program delivery priorities.

A member inquired about AIWG's reporting process to Senate, noting the importance of defining deliverables and milestones to ensure accountability and transparency. DeVidi noted that some matters fall under other decision-making or logistical bodies which will be kept informed of the work as appropriate. Clearer milestone updates will be provided as part of future reports to Senate and he confirmed that end dates have been set for the subgroups.

10. Report of the Senate Undergraduate Council

10.1 Faculty of Science

Dave DeVidi, Chair of the Senate Undergraduate Council, introduced the proposed major modification for the Doctor of Optometry program. This modification will add an extra instructional term which can be completed within the four-year time period of the program. It also proposes the development of two new streams and a restructuring of courses.

A motion was heard that Senate approve the proposed major modifications to the Doctor of Optometry program, effective September 1, 2026, as presented. DeVidi and Abukhdeir. Carried.

11. Consent Agenda

The following items were received for information.

11.1 Senate Work Plan 25/26

11.2 Report of the Senate Executive Committee

11.2.1. Senate By-Election Update

11.2.2. Senate Executive Committee – Summary of the October 6, 2025 Meeting

11.3 Report of the Senate Graduate Council

11.4 Report of the Senate Undergraduate Council

11.5 Report of the Vice-President, Academic and Provost

11.5.1. Faculty Appointments and Leaves

11.6 Report of the Vice-President, Research and International

11.6.1. Awards, Distinctions, Grants, Commercialization Activity, Waterloo International Engagements

12. Confidential Consent Agenda

12.1 Confidential Minutes of the September 20, 2025 Meeting

The confidential minutes were approved as part of item 4.2.

13. Items removed from the Consent Agenda

There were no requests to remove items from the consent agenda.

14. Other Business

No other business was identified.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:36 p.m. It was noted the next meeting of Senate will be held on November 24, 2025.

October 17, 2025

Ashley Day
Associate University Secretary

For Information**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Vivek Goel
President and Vice-Chancellor

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

Agenda Item: **5.1 General Update**

Summary

Dr. Vivek Goel, President and Vice-Chancellor, and Chair of Senate, will provide an update on matters of interest to Senate.

For Approval**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Office of the President

Presenter(s): Vivek Goel
President and Vice-Chancellor

Ian Milligan
Associate Vice-President, Research Oversight and Integrity

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

Agenda Item: **5.2 Statement and Procedures on Principles for Institutional Partnerships**

Recommendation/Motion

That the Senate endorse the proposed "Statement and Procedures on Principles for Institutional Partnerships."

Summary

The Statement and Procedures emerge from the [Task Force on Principles for Institutional Partnerships](#). This Statement outlines a unified approach around the initiation/renewal of institutional partnerships, an oversight mechanism, and how concerns will be handled and received. They set out a single, consistent approach to institutional partnerships. This framework aims to improve transparency, consistency, and risk management (reputational, legal, safety, IP, and alignment with institutional commitments).

A note on scope: "Institutional partnerships" generally include institution-to-institution relationships (e.g., student mobility, gifts/donations, sponsored research agreements). They do not include procurement decisions, individual work-integrated learning experiences (coop, internships), or investigator driven research collaborations with external investigators, even when institutional signatures are required.

Proposal/Rationale

In August 2024, Task Force on Principles for Institutional Partnerships (TFPIP) was established to provide a clear, transparent, and values-based framework for how Waterloo establishes, manages, and – when necessary – reviews its institutional partnerships.

The final report of the TFPIP recommends principles to ensure a consistent and transparent approach to partnerships across the University in alignment with our vision, mission and values, and notes that all partnership activities at Waterloo:

- Align with the University of Waterloo's mission, vision, and values
- Respect institutional autonomy and academic freedom
- Prioritize safety and security of Waterloo community members
- Adhere to international human rights standards, referring to recognized standards codified in international legal instruments and guidelines adopted by Canada.
- Embed reciprocity, respect, mutual benefit, and cultural sensitivity
- Comply with law, regulation, and policy
- Respect Waterloo's approach to intellectual property
- Support environmental responsibility in partnership activities
- Uphold the University's commitment to reconciliation and decolonization when initiating institutional partnerships

The report was released in January 2025 and outlined five recommendations:

1. All units managing partnerships should adopt processes that integrate the proposed principles, with clear accountability and documentation requirements.
2. The University should establish a clear and transparent process for reviewing partnerships.
3. The University should review and update, as necessary, University policies relevant to the formation, review, and management of partnerships and related agreements, as well as those relevant to partnership activities on and off campus, to incorporate and ensure observance of these principles.
4. A work plan and accountable senior leader are necessary to oversee the implementation and accountability of these principles and recommendations.
5. The University should ensure equitable access when prioritizing and enacting institutional partnerships.

This Statement and Procedures brought forward to Senate at its November 24, 2025 meeting represents the implementation of the Task Force recommendations.

Governance Path

Dean's Council: March 19, 2025 (consultation)

Senate: May 5, 2025 (consultation)

Senate Graduate and Research Council: October 7, 2025 (consultation)

Dean's Council: October 22, 2025 (consultation)

Council of Academic Leaders: October 30, 2025 (consultation)

Senate: November 24, 2025 (endorsement)

Documentation Provided

Statement and Procedures are attached.

Statement and Procedures on Principles for Institutional Partnerships

The University of Waterloo engages in many partnerships across Canada and the world in support of its mission of teaching, research, and learning. This statement, and accompanying procedures, outlines a set of unified principles and processes for units managing partnerships. A university-wide approach will allow us to consistently and transparently enter, renew, and review such engagements.

Only a subset of the University of Waterloo's partnerships are "institutional" in scope. Generally speaking, institutional partners include institution-to-institution partnerships or institution-to-donor relationships (e.g. for research or student mobility, gifts and donations, and sponsored research agreements), but not procurement decisions or individual work-integrated learning experiences such as co-op terms or internships. Collaborations initiated by a researcher with external investigators to conduct investigator-driven research – even when requiring institutional signatures – are not considered institutional partnerships under these guidelines. Similarly, externally hosted student placements, practica, and internships are also outside of this framework.

The University of Waterloo has the overarching objective of "the pursuit of learning through scholarship teaching and research within a spirit of free enquiry and expression," further refined through the Values of the institution (that we "think differently," "act with purpose," and "work together"). The institution's mission and values shall normally be at the core of all activities at the University, including the engagements that the University has beyond its gates.

Principles

The following principles inform the University of Waterloo's institutional partnerships. All such institutional partnership activities must:

1. Align with the University of Waterloo's mission, vision, and values
2. Respect institutional autonomy and academic freedom
3. Prioritize safety and security of Waterloo community members
4. Adhere to international human rights standards, as codified in international legal instruments and guidelines [adopted by the Government of Canada](#) or the Government of Ontario
5. Embed reciprocity, respect, mutual benefit, and cultural sensitivity
6. Comply with law, regulation, and policy

7. Respect Waterloo's approach to intellectual property
8. Support environmental responsibility in partnership activities
9. Uphold the University's commitment to reconciliation and decolonization when initiating institutional partnerships

Procedures for Institutional Partnerships

The Executive Council member responsible for the institutional partnership must ensure that the principles are at the core of any decision to enter or renew the partnership. All requests to enter or renew an institutional partnership must document how the partnership activities align with each of the nine principles above.

On an annual basis, a summary report on institutional partnerships will be submitted by the President to the Board of Governors and Senate for information. This will include all partnerships except Gifts, which are reported as per Policy 7 (Gift Acceptance).

Assessment of Concerns Regarding Institutional Partnerships

Concerns from members of the community about a partnership should be brought to the attention of the Executive Council member responsible for the partnership. If the concerns are not resolved at that level, they should be brought to the attention of the Office of the President.

The President and responsible Vice-President(s) will work to resolve the concerns with the members of the community.

In exceptional, acute situations with documented and credible allegations that the partnership is not in alignment with the institutional partnership principles, the President, in consultation with the Board Chair, will strike an ad hoc working group to evaluate the allegation in order to determine whether the partnership should be paused.

The ad hoc working group will be composed of members of the community and include individuals with expertise in human rights, social justice, and the development and maintenance of academic partnerships. The majority of members of the ad hoc working group will be drawn from the Senate and Board of Governors.

The President will report to the community, through the Senate and Board of Governors, the findings of the ad hoc working group and present an administrative response outlining the actions taken with respect to the partnership.

Appendix A: List of Relevant Policies

- 7 ([Gift Acceptance](#))
- 8 ([Freedom of Speech](#))
- 10 ([Naming Opportunities](#))
- 11 ([University Risk Management](#))
- 13 ([Signing Authority and Approval](#))
- 33 ([Ethical Behaviour](#))
- 34 ([Health, Safety, and Environment](#))
- 53 ([Environmental Sustainability](#))
- 58 ([Accessibility](#))
- 69 ([Conflict of Interest](#))
- 73 ([Intellectual Property](#))

For Approval**Open Session****To:** Senate**From:** Vivek Goel
President and Vice-ChancellorChristine McWebb
Associate Vice-President, Faculty Planning and Policy and Co-Chair
Taskforce for Freedom of Expression and Inclusive Engagement**Date of Meeting:** November 24, 2025**Agenda Item:** **5.3 Institutional Neutrality, Institutional Restraint and Communication – Guideline for Collective Bodies (Faculties, Schools, Departments, and Academic Support Units)**

Recommendation/Motion

That Senate endorse the Institutional Neutrality, Institutional Restraint and Communications Guidelines for Collective Bodies (Faculties, Schools, Departments, and Academic Support Units), as presented.

Summary

A previous version of the statement was presented to Senate on May 5, 2025 for discussion. Feedback was invited both during and following the Senate meeting and incorporated into the version enclosed for endorsement by Senate. The revised statement was also shared with the Presidential Advisory Committee for Freedom of Expression and Inclusive Engagement.

The revised statement takes into account comments and concerns raised by Senators as well as feedback received after the Senate meeting, and focuses on making the language more neutral and less prescriptive, including:

- The described publication process is now less dependent on the Office of the AVP, Communications and provides a template to be used for increased clarity and has been made less prescriptive while offering constructive guidance.
- The paragraph "Guidance on Social-Media" has been amended to allow department-level social media sharing with a disclaimer.
- Edits provide more clarity overall.

Additional Background - Freedom of Expression and Respectful Engagement Task Force

In November 2023, the University launched a Freedom of Expression and Respectful Engagement Task Force to develop principles of [freedom of expression](#) for the University of Waterloo to help ensure we maintain a campus environment for open inquiry and exchange, free expression, and inclusive engagement. [The Final Report of the Task Force on Freedom of Expression and Inclusive Engagement](#) was released in June 2024.

Recommendations from the Task Force included:

1. *Develop a statement, based on the principle of institutional neutrality, that (a) clarifies the reasons why it is important the president, provost, other senior administrators, deans, and authorized spokespersons avoid speaking and taking positions on social, political, or moral matters on behalf of the University; and (b) articulates the conditions that would warrant these individuals, speaking on behalf of the University, addressing social, political, or moral matters.*

And,

2. *Develop a statement that defines the authority of a University body to take a collective public position on social, political, or moral matters. This would include, for example, the Board of Governors, Senate, Faculties, departments, schools, and academic support units. This work does not violate the principle of institutional neutrality as long as this work fits within the body's academic or professional domain. To the greatest extent possible, those bodies in this situation should clarify that the position or positions expressed belong to the body and not to the University.*

The [Statement on institutional neutrality, institutional restraint, and communications](#) (in response to recommendation #1) was shared with Senate for feedback, in November 2024.

Governance Path

- March 2025 – President's Advisory Committee on Freedom of Expression (consultation)
- March 2025 – Faculty Relations Committee (consultation, endorsement)
- March 2025 – Executive Council (consultation)
- April 2025 – Council of Academic Leaders (consultation)
- May 5, 2025 – Senate (consultation)
- Fall 2025 – President's Advisory Committee on Freedom of Expression (information)
- November 24, 2025 – Senate (endorsement)
- February 3, 2026 – Board of Governors (information)

Documentation Provided

- Draft Statement on Institutional Neutrality, Institutional Restraint and Communications – Guideline for Collective Bodies (Faculties, Schools, Departments, and Academic Support Units)

INSTITUTIONAL NEUTRALITY, INSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINT AND COMMUNICATIONS

GUIDELINE FOR COLLECTIVE BODIES (FACULTIES, SCHOOLS, DEPARTMENTS, AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNITS)

At the University of Waterloo, our commitment to intellectual exchange, academic freedom, and open inquiry rests on embracing diverse perspectives. These principles guide not only our individual scholars and senior leaders, but also collective bodies that include our Faculties, Schools, Departments, Centres, Institutes and Academic Support Units (ASUs) (these bodies are collectively referred to as ‘units’ in this guidance) when they communicate publicly on social, political, and moral issues.

Consistent with Waterloo’s *Statement on Institutional Neutrality, Institutional Restraint, and Communications*, units within the University are expected to exercise restraint in issuing official statements on matters related or unrelated to their core academic or operational mandates. While Faculties, Schools, Departments, and ASUs occupy a central place in the University’s research, teaching, and/or public engagement missions, they also play a key role in safeguarding the open exchange of ideas.

Many units at Waterloo collaborate with professional organizations, produce policy reports, and generate white papers that have social or policy implications. When such activities arise naturally from a unit’s academic or professional expertise, they do not violate the principles of institutional neutrality.

Units should clearly distinguish between contributing specialized knowledge in their field and adopting a broader public position on behalf of the University. Whenever a Faculty, School, Department, or ASU issues a research-informed statement or a policy recommendation, it must clearly indicate that the statement reflects the perspectives of that specific group, not necessarily those of the University as a whole.

Rarely will all members —faculty, staff, postdoctoral fellows, graduate and undergraduate students — of an academic unit, for example, share a single viewpoint. Thus, **collective** statements purporting to speak for an entire unit run the risk of misrepresenting some members. Units are asked to consider transparent mechanisms to ensure unanimity when expressing shared views. This approach acknowledges the diversity of opinions and affirms each member’s right to participate freely in debates on contentious issues.

Faculty members (and staff) **are expected to remain mindful of the inherent power dynamics in their relationships with students in particular. When discussing a statement, units should design a process that actively minimizes perceived pressure. It must be made explicitly clear to all members, especially students, that non-participation will not result in any academic or social penalty. ~~should give careful consideration to the power dynamics that may exist, in particular, between students and faculty members when units discuss making a statement. While students may wish to join a statement, faculty members are encouraged to refrain from soliciting student participation to avoid unintended impacts on students who may feel pressure to sign.~~**

Before issuing any significant public statement, units are advised to:

- reflect on how the position relates to the unit's mission and expertise;
- ensure that any statement has gone through an appropriate internal review, including robust discussion among those who may be affected or whose work and perspectives are implicated; and,
- use **transparent** mechanisms, such as open votes or signed letters, **to establish verifiable support for a statement to ensure that ~~a range of opinions can be reflected in order to preserve an environment of open dialogue and to establish unanimity on the decision to issue a collective statement.~~ it accurately represents those who endorse it, rather than implying it speaks for all members of the unit.**

Units can seek advice from relevant University offices (e.g., Office of the Associate Vice-President, **Faculty and Academic Life**, Secretariat, Associate Vice-President, Communications and Institutional Relations, ~~or the President's Advisory Committee on Freedom of Expression~~) when there is uncertainty about the appropriateness or implications of a proposed public stance. ~~It is highly recommended to reach out to the Associate Vice-President, Communications for assistance with the publication of a statement.~~

When units make the decision to publish a statement, they **must**:

- **are advised to** inform their dean (or vice-president for ASUs) before the statement is published for their awareness (but not approval);
- **must** ensure that the statement includes a disclaimer (see below) that the unit is not speaking for the University of Waterloo as a whole; and
- **should place the statement in a manner that clearly and visually separates it from the unit's official academic or administrative content (for example [https://uwaterloo.ca/\[faculty or department\]/statements](https://uwaterloo.ca/[faculty or department]/statements)). (Note: a template statement page is available from the University Communications team. Statements published on dedicated "statement pages" should not be linked to/from the news section of UWaterloo websites.)**
- in most cases, units should work with their communications teams to create a dedicated "statements" page ~~This can be arranged with the Associate Vice-President, Communications when informing them of the decision to make a statement).~~
- publish the statement on a **website** page other than the unit's main **channels of communication landing page(s)** used for academic or administrative purposes.

Draft disclaimer language

Members of the [unit name] are issuing a statement concerning [issue]. The following statement does not represent the views of the University of Waterloo, any of its faculties, departments, schools or institutes and members issuing this statement recognize that there [are/may be] a range of viewpoints within the unit on this matter.

Guidance on social media

When a statement is published by a **group or collective body** on a University website **statement page**, ~~linking to the statement is only appropriate from individual (personal) social media accounts of the members who have agreed to the statement. Posts should include a disclaimer~~ linking to the statement is appropriate from departmental-level social media accounts only if the post includes a disclaimer: "Members of the [unit name] are issuing a statement concerning [issue]." Statements posted by units in this manner will not be shared or amplified by the University's main social media accounts (including ~~departmental-Faculty~~ level accounts).

Guidance for non-unit, informal collectives

Nothing in this guideline prevents or limits individuals from creating informal groups who may wish to express opinions or make statements as a ~~collective~~ group of private individuals. Care should be taken in canvassing support amongst informal groups to avoid issues related to power dynamics as above. The use of University websites, **University (including departmental and faculty)** social media channels and other **University** digital assets must be avoided in these circumstances.

For further guidance, please refer to Waterloo's *Statement on Institutional Neutrality, Institutional Restraint, and Communications* and additional resources on [freedom of expression website](#).

INSTITUTIONAL NEUTRALITY, INSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINT AND COMMUNICATIONS

GUIDELINE FOR COLLECTIVE BODIES (FACULTIES, SCHOOLS, DEPARTMENTS, AND ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNITS)

At the University of Waterloo, our commitment to intellectual exchange, academic freedom, and open inquiry rests on embracing diverse perspectives. These principles guide not only our individual scholars and senior leaders, but also collective bodies that include our Faculties, Schools, Departments, Centres, Institutes and Academic Support Units (ASUs) (these bodies are collectively referred to as ‘units’ in this guidance) when they communicate publicly on social, political, and moral issues.

Consistent with Waterloo’s *Statement on Institutional Neutrality, Institutional Restraint, and Communications*, units within the University are expected to exercise restraint in issuing official statements on matters related or unrelated to their core academic or operational mandates. While Faculties, Schools, Departments, and ASUs occupy a central place in the University’s research, teaching, and/or public engagement missions, they also play a key role in safeguarding the open exchange of ideas.

Many units at Waterloo collaborate with professional organizations, produce policy reports, and generate white papers that have social or policy implications. When such activities arise naturally from a unit’s academic or professional expertise, they do not violate the principles of institutional neutrality.

Units should clearly distinguish between contributing specialized knowledge in their field and adopting a broader public position on behalf of the University. Whenever a Faculty, School, Department, or ASU issues a research-informed statement or a policy recommendation, it must clearly indicate that the statement reflects the perspectives of that specific group, not necessarily those of the University as a whole.

Rarely will all members —faculty, staff, postdoctoral fellows, graduate and undergraduate students — of an academic unit, for example, share a single viewpoint. Thus, statements purporting to speak for an entire unit run the risk of misrepresenting some members. Units are asked to consider transparent mechanisms to ensure unanimity when expressing shared views. This approach acknowledges the diversity of opinions and affirms each member’s right to participate freely in debates on contentious issues.

Faculty members (and staff) are expected to remain mindful of the inherent power dynamics in their relationships with students in particular. When discussing a statement, units should design a process that actively minimizes perceived pressure. It must be made explicitly clear to all members, especially students, that non-participation will not result in any academic or social penalty.

Before issuing any significant public statement, units are advised to:

- reflect on how the position relates to the unit’s mission and expertise;
- ensure that any statement has gone through an appropriate internal review, including robust discussion among those who may be affected or whose work and perspectives are implicated; and,

- use transparent mechanisms, such as open votes or signed letters, to establish verifiable support for a statement to ensure that it accurately represents those who endorse it, rather than implying it speaks for all members of the unit.

Units can seek advice from relevant University offices (e.g., Office of the Associate Vice-President, Faculty and Academic Life, Secretariat, Associate Vice-President, Communications and Institutional Relations, when there is uncertainty about the appropriateness or implications of a proposed public stance.

When units make the decision to publish a statement, they:

- are advised to inform their dean (or vice-president for ASUs) before the statement is published for their awareness (but not approval);
- must ensure that the statement includes a disclaimer (see below) that the unit is not speaking for the University of Waterloo as a whole;
- should place the statement in a manner that clearly and visually separates it from the unit's official academic or administrative content (for example [https://uwaterloo.ca/\[faculty or department\]/statements](https://uwaterloo.ca/[faculty or department]/statements)). (Note: a template statement page is available from the University Communications team. Statements published on dedicated “statement pages” should not be linked to/from the news section of UWaterloo websites.)
- in most cases, units should work with their communications teams to create a dedicated “statements” page;
- publish the statement on a webpage other than the unit’s main landing page(s) used for academic or administrative purposes.

Draft disclaimer language

Members of the [unit name] are issuing a statement concerning [issue]. The following statement does not represent the views of the University of Waterloo, any of its faculties, departments, schools or institutes and members issuing this statement recognize that there [are/may be] a range of viewpoints within the unit on this matter.

Guidance on social media

When a statement is published by a group or collective on a University website statement page, linking to the statement is appropriate from departmental-level social media accounts only if the post includes a disclaimer: “*Members of the [unit name] are issuing a statement concerning [issue].*” Statements posted by units in this manner will not be shared or amplified by the University’s main social media accounts (including Faculty level accounts).

Guidance for non-unit, informal collectives

Nothing in this guideline prevents or limits individuals from creating informal groups who may wish to express opinions or make statements as a group of private individuals. Care should be taken in canvassing support amongst informal groups to avoid issues related to power dynamics as above. The use of University websites, University (including departmental and faculty) social media channels and other University digital assets must be avoided in these circumstances.

For further guidance, please refer to Waterloo’s *Statement on Institutional Neutrality, Institutional Restraint, and Communications* and additional resources on [freedom of expression website](#).



For Approval

Open Session

To: Senate

From: Office of the President

Presenter(s): Vivek Goel
President and Vice-Chancellor

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

Agenda Item: **5.4 Amendments to Policy 70 – Student Petitions and Grievances**

Recommendation/Motion

That Senate approve the proposed revisions to Policy 70 – Student Petitions and Grievances, as presented.

Summary

Policy 70 Drafting Committee (PDC) was formed in 2017 to review Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances.

Policy Improvements

The following summarizes the substantive changes in this version of Policy 70 relative to the existing version.

1. The draft explicitly defines Petitions, Grievances and Requests for Reassessment individually and treats their purposes, processes, and outcomes separately.
2. The draft embeds procedural elements related to each of the above processes in the body of the policy rather than as appendices.
3. This draft addresses the increasing prevalence of legal arguments in Petitions and Grievances by making the impacts of such approaches – prolonged resolution timelines known to students.
4. This version endeavors to give guidance on the relationships between events that may be governed by Policy 33 or Policy 42, but may concurrently warrant consideration as a petition.
5. This version also considers Petitions and Grievances through inclusion and trauma-informed lenses, providing explicit references to support structures for students with diverse lived experiences and who have experienced trauma.
6. This version contains a fully articulated list of classified supports for students engaged in a process under this Policy. Note that while this list is included in the body of the text for review, the intention is to have this table live outside of the Policy to allow for regular updating. The list with resource descriptions is attached - "Policy 70 Resources (Section 4.2)"
7. Generally, this version of the Policy attempts to provide guidance to both undergraduate and graduate students.

8. With regard to Petitions, this version of the Policy:
 - a) Requires the adjudication of Petitions by a Faculty committee, but allows Faculties the autonomy to populate those committees based on their own cultures and practices;
 - b) Makes more explicit the content that students must submit;
 - c) Establishes greater clarity and expectations on timelines;
 - d) Continues the practice of precluding appeals of petition decisions, except in the case of procedural errors.
9. With respect to Grievances, this version of the Policy eliminates the definition of two stages (request and challenge), noting that while desirable, there are instances when a student is disinclined to attempt resolution informally.
10. This version treats reassessments not as a kind of Grievance, but in its own category, identifying the Associate Dean as the recipient of the reassessment request and the Chair as the coordinator of the reassessment.

The Policy review also resulted in the creation of a new form to facilitate and unify the submission of grievances. The form will be linked within the policy once approved – “Policy 70 Form.”

Policy Development Committee (PDC) Membership

PDC membership has included:

- Mario Coniglio, Associate Vice President Academic as Chair (until 2021), then continuing as former Associate Dean Undergraduate Studies in the Faculty Science and former AVP-Academic.
- Jeff Casello, Associate Vice President Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs as a member (until 2021) and as Chair from 2021 to 2024.
- Marlee Spafford, Special Advisor the Provost on Student Experience and former Associate Dean Undergraduate Studies, Faculty of Science.
- Kathy Acheson, Associate Dean Undergraduate Programs, Faculty of Arts
- Undergraduate student representatives:
 - o Andrew Clubine
 - o Maya Venters
 - o Tessa Femia-Sebben
 - o Syeda Nasir
 - o Matthew Gerrits
 - o Amanda Morin
 - o Stephanie Ye-Mowe
 - o Graduate student representatives:
 - o Robert Patrick Bruce
 - o Naima Samuel
 - o Amir Isfahani
 - o Katherine Arnold
 - o Natalie Doan

Throughout its work, the PDC was supported by various members of the University Secretariat.

Consultation History

Substantial consultations on the draft Policy were undertaken by the PDC between *[NB: To be provided]*, primarily by the Chair. All feedback received was considered by the PDC, and resulted in edits to the draft where deemed appropriate. Consultations, sometimes over the course of multiple meetings, took place with the following committees and departments:

- Undergraduate Operations Committee
- Associate Deans Undergraduate Studies
- Graduate Operations Committee
- Associate Deans Graduate Studies
- Deans' Council
- Undergraduate Student Relations Committee
- Graduate Student Relations Committee
- AccessAbility Services
- Conflict Management and Human Rights Office
- Co-operative and Experiential Education
- Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Anti-Racism Office
- Office of Indigenous Relations
- Student Success Office
- Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Office
- Registrar's Office
- Associate Vice President Academic
- Graduate Students

Jurisdictional Information

Policy 70 is a Class G policy, as described in Policy 1 – Initiation and Review of University Policies. With respect to the initiation, development and approval of Class G policies, the President determines the consultation path required prior to acceptance or rejection of the revised draft.

Governance Path

- [Refer to consultation history above]
- Senate: November 24, 2025

Documentation Provided

1. Amended version of Policy 70
(a redlined version would not be practical due to the magnitude of the amendments)
2. List of Policy 70 Resources (Section 4.2 of the Policy)

The policies found on the website of the Secretariat) are compulsory rules for the university community. The authoritative copies of the policies are held by the Secretariat and bear the seal of the university. The online version accessible through the website of the Secretariat is available for information purposes only. In case of discrepancy between the online version and the authoritative copy held by the Secretariat, the authoritative copy shall prevail. Please contact the Secretariat for assistance if necessary.

Established:	June 6, 1989
Revised:	TBD
Class:	G
Responsible/Originating Department:	Office of the Associate Vice-President, Academic Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs
Executive Contact:	Associate Vice-President, Academic Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs

Related Policies, Guidelines and Procedures:

- Policy 33 – Ethical Behaviour
- Policy 42 – Prevention of and Response to Sexual Violence
- Policy 46 – Information Management
- Policy 71 – Student Discipline
- Policy 72 – Student Appeals
- Undergraduate Studies Academic Calendar
- Graduate Studies Academic Calendar
- Student Academic Accommodation Guidelines

A Glossary can be found at the end of the policy, as Appendix A.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This policy governs student **Petitions, Grievances, and Requests for Reassessment**.
- 1.2 A student may file a Petition when seeking an exception to, or relief from, faculty or University rules and regulations. A Petition is appropriate when:
 - University rules or regulations were applied fairly to the student; and
 - Extenuating Circumstances may warrant an exception to the University rules for that student.
- 1.3 A Grievance may be pursued when a student believes that a decision of a University authority or the action of a University employee affecting some aspect of their University life has been unfair or unreasonable.

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

- 1.4 A Request for Reassessment may be pursued when a student believes that their academic course work has been incorrectly assessed.
- 1.5 Petitions, Grievances and Requests for Reassessment are separate processes with different requirements. Each may lead to different outcomes. It is the responsibility of the student to understand the differences between the three processes and to pursue the most appropriate path forward. Information on resources to assist students in making this determination can be found in Section 4.

2. Scope

- 2.1 This policy applies to all University of Waterloo undergraduate and graduate students, including individuals who were students at the time of the event(s) upon which a Petition, Grievance or Request for Reassessment is based.

Students may file a Petition, Grievance or Request for Reassessment related to Academic Decisions.

Students may file Grievances related to non-academic matters, with exceptions for grievances concerning non-academic departments who employ and make publicly accessible their own resolution processes (including Campus Housing and UW Parking Services, as examples), consistent with the Guiding Principles of this policy.

- 2.2 The following matters fall outside of the scope of this policy:
 - Complaints of a human rights violation, such as harassment or discrimination, including those that are based on protected grounds under the *Ontario Human Rights Code*, are governed by Policy 33 - Ethical Behaviour.
 - Complaints alleging sexual violence by employees are governed by Policy 33 - Ethical Behavior.
 - Complaints alleging sexual violence by students are governed by Policy 42 - Prevention of and Response to Sexual Violence.
 - The review process for a complaint involving a PhD thesis examination is governed by the Graduate Studies Academic Calendar.

A student whose academic performance is influenced by actions, events or behaviours governed by Policy 33 – Ethical Behaviour or Policy 42 – Prevention of and Response to Sexual Violence may concurrently engage in the resolution process(es) articulated in the relevant policy and:

- seek an exception to or relief from Faculty or University rules and regulations by filing a Petition; or
- submit a Request for Reassessment on academic course work.

A student pursuing a Grievance related to ethical behaviour should seek guidance from the Conflict Management Office on the possible application of Policy 33 – Ethical Behaviour concurrent with or in lieu of the processes articulated in this policy.

- 2.3 Requests to change a student's record after the student's degree, diploma or certificate has been conferred are not considered unless the request is based on the grounds of a disability as described in the *Student Accommodation Guidelines*.

3. Jurisdiction

- 3.1 The authority to render decisions (Jurisdiction) is as follows:

(a) Jurisdiction over Petitions lies with Faculty Petitions Committees in each University Faculty.

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

Petitions for AFIW co-registered students are handled by their University of Waterloo Faculty. In situations where the Jurisdiction is unclear (e.g., double degree programs, BASE), the decision on Jurisdiction shall be made by the student's Associate Dean.

- (b) Jurisdiction over Grievances normally lies with the Associate Dean (Undergraduate Studies or Graduate Studies) in the student's Home Faculty/AFIW. The following exceptions apply:

If the decision being grieved is made	Jurisdiction belongs to
by the Associate Dean (undergraduate or graduate) in the student's Home Faculty/AFIW	Faculty Dean or their delegate
by the Faculty Dean in the student's Home Faculty/AFIW	Vice-President, Academic & Provost or their delegate
in a Faculty or AFIW other than the student's Home Faculty/AFIW	Associate Dean or their delegate (Undergraduate Studies or Graduate Studies) of the Faculty/AFIW where the decision was made with input from the Associate Dean in the student's Home Faculty.
in an academic support unit	Associate Dean of the student's Home Faculty/AFIW who shall decide the most appropriate process, including delegation of responsibility, for the Grievance, in consultation with the head of the academic support unit being grieved and the Secretariat.
by Co-operative Education associated with employers, work conditions, work term grading including failed work terms, etc.	Co-operative and Experiential Education
on the outcome of a PhD defense.	Those articulated in the Graduate Studies Academic Calendar

- (c) Jurisdiction over Requests for Reassessment lies with the Associate Dean in the Faculty/AFIW in which the original assessment was made. If the Associate Dean is the instructor of the course in which the Request for Reassessment is being sought, Jurisdiction lies with the Dean of the offering faculty (or their delegate).

- 3.2 For assistance and advice on Jurisdictional matters, students should contact the Associate Dean in their Home Faculty/AFIW or the Secretariat.

4. Resources

- 4.1 Before submitting a Petition, Grievance, or Request for Reassessment, students are encouraged to communicate with their Faculty or departmental representative (e.g., undergraduate academic advisor, undergraduate associate chair or coordinator, graduate associate chair or coordinator, or graduate academic supervisor) for information on the potential academic impacts of a successful request.
- 4.2 Students have access to a variety of resources that may assist them, including their Associate Deans who may provide direction on available campus resources as needed.

The following resources are available to aid students in understanding the concepts included in policy and to providing support to a student while they are navigating the processes described in this Policy:

- Centre for Academic Policy Support (undergraduate students)

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conflict Management Office• Equity, Diversity, Inclusivity and Anti-Racism Office• Graduate Student Association (graduate students)• Sexual Violence Prevention & Response Office• Student’s academic unit, particularly the undergraduate academic advisors or the graduate department coordinators• The Centre (Student Service Centre)• Waterloo Indigenous Student Centre• Waterloo Undergraduate Student Association
<p>The following resources are available to aid students and may provide documentation for processes described in this Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• AccessAbility Services• Counselling Services• Health Services• External accredited health practitioners
<p>The following resources are available to provide guidance on the processes described in this Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Co-operative Education• Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs (graduate students)• Registrar’s Office (undergraduate students)• Secretariat

- 4.3 Assistance to students preparing their Petitions, Grievances or Requests for Reassessment may include explaining policy elements, documenting interactions with an office, referring to other supports, and assessing potential academic outcomes, as appropriate. Determinations on outcomes of Petitions, Grievances and Requests for Reassessment are made by those with Jurisdiction only.
- 4.4 Throughout the processes governed by this Policy, students may engage a Support Person for advice and support. The role of the Support Person is to provide moral and emotional support to the student; a Support Person holds no official standing in the process. Normally, the Support Person is a fellow student, friend or family member rather than a legal professional.

5. Guiding Principles

- 5.1 All members of the University community are expected to conduct themselves with integrity, and to adhere to University policies, procedures and guidelines. Students have the right to be informed of University policies, procedures and guidelines, and to question whether decisions affecting students are consistent with policies, procedures or guidelines.
- 5.2 The University of Waterloo is a diverse community. Given its pluralistic nature, the University understands that students’ Petitions, Grievances and Requests for Reassessment reflect diverse cultural expectations, social norms, or lived experiences. The University is committed to supporting students and adjudicating these requests in ways that are informed by and respectful of these student perspectives.
- 5.3 Decisions are to be made in accordance with the Principles of Natural Justice and all applicable University policies.
- 5.4 The consideration of Petitions and Grievances requires time to obtain and assess submitted documentation and records, consult relevant individuals as needed, and communicate the outcome. The consideration of Requests for Reassessments requires time to determine if a

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

reassessment is warranted and, if so, to identify an appropriate reassessor and to allow the reassessment to take place. Adherence to policy timelines is expected because expeditious resolution of Petitions, Grievances and Requests for Reassessment is normally in the best interests of students.

- 5.5 Those with Jurisdiction will consider requests for timeline extensions on a case-by-case basis including the consequences of such extensions on those affected by the Petition, Grievance and Request for Reassessment. In situations where the reason for a late submission is the result of a health condition, students are encouraged to register and work with AccessAbility Services such that appropriate timelines can be determined. Students may also seek documentation in support of requests for extended timelines from appropriate University support groups (e.g., Conflict Management Office, the Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Anti-Racism Office).
- 5.6 The University is required to accommodate disabilities, within specified legal limits, that are known or ought to be known. While engaging this Policy, University authorities may suspect that an individual is not well. University authorities must attempt to help individuals who appear unwell or who may be perceived to have a disability by referring them to AccessAbility Services. AccessAbility Services will inquire further to determine if the person has needs related a disability and will offer assistance, potentially through the arrangement of accommodations, should the student wish to engage their services.
- 5.7 The time to reach a decision under Policy 70 may be extended if a student presents legal arguments or if the student initiates a legal action in a venue external to the University. The individual or committee receiving notification of the external legal support or action shall contact the University's Legal and Immigration Services for advice on how to proceed.
- 5.8 The following principles guide decision-making:

A student engaging a process under this Policy is entitled to:

- have access to processes and procedures grounded in:
 - procedural fairness;
 - Human Rights legislation;
 - the Okanagan Charter: An International Charter for Health Promoting Universities and Colleges;
 - the Scarborough Charter on Anti-Black Racism and Black Inclusion in Higher Education in Canada;
 - Universities Canada principles on Indigenous education;
 - the principles of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada;
 - a recognition of the cultural, historic, racial, and gendered roots of trauma and the potential that trauma may impact a student; and
 - the University's commitment to student wellness, including awareness, support and training regarding mental health and sexual violence;
- have matters addressed fairly and as expeditiously as possible, and to have those matters considered by those who are not sitting in judgment of their own actions or decisions;
- have matters decided with consideration given to University precedent;
- have matters decided based on a Balance of Probabilities;
- participate in Petition, Grievance or Request for Reassessment proceedings without reprisal or fear of reprisal;
- have their privacy and the tenets of Policy 46 - Information Management respected;
- have the resolution of their disputes be informed by the persons or units with the most relevant information on the student's situation, where feasible; and
- be accompanied by a Support Person to any meetings with University administrators.

6. Petitions

- 6.1 A Petition is a request by a student seeking exception to or relief from normal Faculty or University rules and regulations as a result of unique or Extenuating Circumstances, events or situations that have been beyond the student's control and could not reasonably have been predicted or expected. Common examples include medical or health concerns and unexpected familial responsibilities.

Petition Examples

- 6.2 Examples of requests made by Petition include but are not limited to:
- adding or dropping a course after the deadline;
 - increasing or reducing a required course load;
 - reconsidering an end-of-term academic standing or other academic decision;
 - reconsidering the academic record (e.g., converting numeric to non-numeric grades, removing a WD/WF for a late drop); and
 - reconsidering decisions by Co-operative Education (e.g., co-op job board access, co-op credit eligibility, work term status, Co-op Research Certificate).
- 6.3 Examples of Petitions specific to graduate students include, but are not limited to:
- allowing the continuation of a student's program beyond time limits; and
 - extending timelines related to research milestones.
- 6.4 Examples of outcomes that cannot be achieved through a Petition include:
- adjusting a numeric grade from one value to another;
 - granting a credit where no credit was earned;
 - converting a final grade in a course to an INC; and
 - the consideration of matters that are Grievances.

Faculty Petitions Committees

- 6.5 Faculties constitute their Faculty Petitions Committees according to their own internal practices and determine whether the identity of individual members is made public. Faculty Petitions Committees may be specific to undergraduate and graduate petitions, or a single committee may adjudicate all Petitions. Members normally include a combination of faculty and staff representatives from the Faculty the student is petitioning, supported by the Registrar's Office or Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, and other campus experts (e.g., AccessAbility Services) as appropriate.
- 6.6 Co-operative Education determines the membership of its Petitions Committee according to its own practices.
- 6.7 A Faculty Petitions Committee should be comprised and supported such that members have an understanding of and respect for contemporary student challenges that inform the adjudication of Petitions. As indicated in Section 5.2, the University acknowledges the pluralistic nature of its community. As such, Petitions Committees should reasonably reflect in lived experiences the composition of the community of students to the extent possible.
- 6.8 The Faculty Petitions Committee chair has the responsibility to ask for a declaration of any real or perceived conflicts of interest between any Committee members and the petitioning student and to modify the process to address the conflict.

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

- 6.9 The Faculty Petitions Committee chair has the authority to have petitions considered by a subset of the full committee. Normally, this process occurs when:
- the chair, in consultation with the student's Associate Dean, deems that the content of the Petition warrants increased confidentiality, in which case the student and the full Faculty Petitions Committee will be notified that the decision will be made by a subset of the committee;
 - the petition involves consideration of a request for retroactive accommodation; or
 - strong precedent exists to grant the exception requested by the student.

Adjudication

- 6.10 The Faculty Petitions Committee determines whether an exception to a rule or regulation is granted or denied. Before making this decision, the Faculty Petition Committee may seek additional information it deems necessary.
- 6.11 In the case that an exception is granted, the Committee may consider a range of possible resolutions before deciding upon an outcome that is informed by University policy, University precedent and the student's request. The outcome may differ from the student's desired outcome (e.g., changing one term rather than two terms of the academic record).
- 6.12 A Petition on which a decision has been reached may be reconsidered by the Committee if the student provides new information, typically supported with additional documentation, that has the potential to alter the decision (e.g., medical documentation, travel documentation, bereavement documentation, course reports). The student can submit new evidence that was not available through prior due diligence. The decision as to whether the new documentation meets the threshold for reconsideration lies with the chair of the Faculty Petitions Committee.
- 6.13 Petition decisions and associated records are kept in accordance with procedures within Faculties and the Registrar's Office or Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, and compliant with Policy 46 – Information Management.

Petition Procedures

- 6.14 To begin the Petition process, an undergraduate student submits (online) a completed *Petition for Exception to Academic Regulations - Undergraduate* along with any Supporting Documentation to the Registrar's Office. The petition file is then forwarded to the appropriate Faculty Petitions Committee.

A graduate student wishing to begin the process submits (online) a completed *Petition for Exception to Academic Regulations – Graduate Students* along with any Supporting Documentation to Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs.

- 6.15 When submitting a Petition, a student is indicating that they agree that the rule or regulation has been fairly applied to them, but they believe they warrant an exception. To seek the exception, the student must provide:
- a clear indication of the decision and outcome from which they are seeking an exception;
 - an explanation of the Extenuating Circumstances they believe warrant an exception;
 - Supporting Documentation verifying the impact of the Extenuating Circumstances on the student; and
 - an articulation of the desired outcome of the Petition.
- 6.16 At the request of the Faculty Petitions Committee, the Registrar's Office (for undergraduate Petitions) or Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs (for graduate Petitions) may gather information related to the student's academic performance and participation during the period of

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

the reported Extenuating Circumstances. This information will be provided to the Faculty Petitions Committee to support their decision-making.

- 6.17 Requests for retroactive consideration (e.g., due to illness, related to bereavement) or retroactive ground-protected accommodations (e.g., disability) will be considered. The timely submission of requests is encouraged. For further information about retroactive accommodations on the grounds of disability, students are directed to the Student Academic Accommodation Guidelines.
- 6.18 The Faculty Petitions Committee has discretion to decide if a Petition submitted by a Previously Enrolled Student will be considered. Normally, the Faculty Petitions Committee's decision to hear the petition will be based on an assessment of whether the outcome of the Petition might substantially affect the student's academic record such that the student would have an opportunity to pursue future studies at the University or elsewhere.
- 6.19 Faculty Petitions Committees may be unable to adjudicate a Petition in cases when information necessary to evaluate the Petition is no longer available or if the outcome being sought is no longer feasible.
- 6.20 A student will receive a decision normally within 20 Working Days of submission. Petition timelines may vary depending on:
- the Petition Committee meeting schedule;
 - the volume of Petitions being submitted;
 - the potential impact of the decision on current term enrolment (e.g., Petitions that affect current term enrollment may be prioritized over those involving a prior term);
 - the complexity of the request;
 - any requirement for additional documentation; and/or
 - the need for consultation with experts (e.g., academic advisors, instructors, AccessAbility Services, Legal and Immigration Services).

When a timeline will not be met (e.g., a decision returned in 20 business days), the student will receive an update on the progress towards adjudicating their petition, including revised timelines.

- 6.21 Undergraduate and graduate students will be notified in writing (hard copy or electronic) of the outcome of their petition.
- 6.22 Petitions decisions are final and cannot be appealed under Policy 72 – Student Appeals.
- 6.23 The results of a petition decision may only be grieved under this Policy if there is evidence that there has been a procedural error in the adjudication. A denied petition decision by a Petitions Committee is not in itself a procedural error. Procedural errors include deviations from procedures set by policy or guideline, evidence of bias in a decision, and inadequate consideration of the provided evidence. In such situations, the focus of the grievance shall be solely on the procedural error leading to the contested petition decision. Procedures for filing a grievance are outlined in Section 7.

7. Grievances

- 7.1 When a student believes an academic decision or action of a University authority is unfair or unreasonable, the student is encouraged to seek a resolution with the person (or persons) who made the decision in question. Recognizing the value of an expedited resolution, and to avoid a prolonged formal process, a resolution may be sought:
- by the student directly with the decision-maker;
 - by the student with the support of their Associate Dean who may, at the student's request, communicate with the decision-maker.

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

- 7.2 The Associate Dean in the student's home faculty may require a student to seek an informal resolution prior to the processing of a student's formal grievance.
- 7.3 Where a grieved decision or action applies to more than one student (including instances where students file one joint grievance as a group), the Adjudicator (described below) may elect to render one decision that applies to multiple students.
- 7.4 Examples of Grievances covered by this Policy include situations where a student is seeking a resolution because they believe:
- there was a substantial deviation from a course outline without reasonable notice to or approval from students enrolled in the course;
 - there was improper application of University regulations governing program or degree requirements;
 - an unfair decision was reached during the evaluation of a research milestone;
 - an agreed-upon accommodation plan guided by AccessAbility Services was not followed by the instructor; and/or
 - there was an error in an academic decision of a University authority that is not related to courses, or program or degree requirements (e.g., student exchanges, certificate in university teaching).

Requirements

- 7.5 When submitting a Grievance, a student must provide:
- a clear indication of the decision or action they are grieving and why they believe that decision is unfair and/or unreasonable;
 - an explanation of how they believe the decision or action unfairly and/or unreasonably affects them;
 - the identification of relevant individual(s)/academic or administrative unit(s) associated with the Grievance;
 - a summary of previous communication with the decision-maker(s) to attempt to resolve the situation, or an explanation as to why these communications did not take place;
 - Supporting Documentation, if any, that is relevant to the Grievance including medical documentation submitted to AccessAbility Services; and
 - an articulation of the desired outcome of the Grievance.

Grievance Procedure

- 7.6 The University recognizes the value of the timely resolution of students' concerns. As such, students who believe a decision or action of a University authority is unfair or unreasonable must submit a Notice of Grievance to their Associate Dean no later than 20 Working Days after the decision or action of concern. The 20 Working Day period also applies to a student in their last term before graduation. Students for whom medical conditions preclude timely submission of grievances should register with AccessAbility Services to evaluate the potential for accommodation.
- 7.7 A Notice of Grievance that is received after 20 days may in rare cases be considered at the discretion of the Associate Dean. The decision to consider the grievance beyond the 20 days may be based on:
- whether the information necessary to adjudicate the grievance remains available;
 - whether the outcome of the grievance remains timely and relevant; and/or
 - whether the source of the delay in submitting the grievance was beyond the control of the student.

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

- 7.8 Students intending to rely on medical documentation as part of their grievance must register with AccessAbility Services and submit their medical documentation through that unit. AccessAbility Services will coordinate communication of the relevant contents of those medical documents with the appropriate Associate Dean in the student's Home Faculty/AFIW.
- 7.9 A student's completed Notice of Grievance will be received by the appropriate Associate Dean in the student's Home Faculty/AFIW who will normally serve as the Adjudicator of the grievance. Exceptions on Jurisdiction are listed in Section 3.1.

Decision and Appeal

- 7.10 The Adjudicator shall review the student's written complaint and supporting documentation, conduct an investigation and render a decision on the Balance of Probabilities.
- 7.11 Normally within 20 Working Days of receiving the Notice of Grievance, the Adjudicator shall provide the student a written decision with reasons, using the Report of Grievance Decision. If this timeline cannot be met, the Adjudicator will advise the student in writing and provide a revised timeline.
- 7.12 In instances where the student's records should reflect the outcome of the decision, the Associate Dean will communicate the decision to the appropriate body (e.g., Registrar's Office, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, the course instructor).
- 7.13 A Grievance decision may be appealed. The appeal must be initiated by submitting the appropriate documentation no later than 10 Working Days after notification of the decision, provided a ground for appeal can be satisfied. See Policy 72 – Student Appeals.

8. Requests for Reassessments

- 8.1 When a student believes that an individual Course Element has received an incorrect mark, they are encouraged to seek a resolution with the person (or persons) who made the decision in question. In instances where a student is unable to reach a resolution through informal means, the student may initiate a Request for Reassessment. Examples of work to be reassessed include assignments, projects, essays, lab reports, and tests, including quizzes and final exams.
- 8.2 Examples of instances when a student may seek a Request for Reassessment include when a student believes:
- marks were not given for a correct answer;
 - partial grades ought to have been awarded;
 - assessment and grading expectations were misaligned; or
 - a grading rubric was inconsistently applied.
- 8.3 The decision on a Request for Reassessment may result in a grade being raised, lowered or maintained.

Request for Reassessment Procedure

- 8.4 Requests for Reassessments must be commenced within 20 Working Days of the student receiving the original assessment of the work. The 20 Working Day deadline also applies to a student in the last term before graduation.
- 8.5 To file a Request for Reassessment, a student submits a completed Notice of Request for Reassessment. When submitting their Notice of Request for Reassessment students must specify

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

whether they are requesting a reassessment of an entire Course Element or portions of it.

- 8.6 The Notice of Request for Reassessment will be received by the Associate Dean of the Faculty or the AFIW in which the course is being offered. The Associate Dean will appoint a Coordinator for the Request for Reassessment. The Coordinator will normally be the Chair of the unit offering the course. When the Chair of the offering unit or the Associate Dean of the offering Faculty is the instructor of the course in which the reassessment is sought, the Dean of the Faculty/AFIW (or their delegate) will coordinate the Request for Reassessment.
- 8.7 The Coordinator must consider a properly submitted Request for Reassessment unless the Coordinator deems it to be without merit. The Coordinator must provide a written rationale to the student and to the appropriate Associate Dean for refusing to consider a Request for Reassessment.
- 8.8 The Coordinator will determine if the Request for Reassessment includes the totality of the Course Element or only a portion of the Course Element. In making this determination the Coordinator will consider:
 - the limits of the request made by the student in the Notice of Request for Reassessment; and
 - the interdependencies of the individual elements of the evaluated work and the feasibility of limiting the Request for Reassessment to specific portions.
- 8.9 If the Coordinator determines that the Request for Reassessment will include portions of the Course Element that differ from the student's request, the Coordinator will inform the student of the revised Request for Reassessment scope and allow the student the opportunity to retract their Request for Reassessment request.
- 8.10 Within 5 Working Days of finalizing the elements to be reassessed, the Coordinator will select a qualified new assessor(s) who may be external to the University. After obtaining the work to be reassessed, the Coordinator will send the assessor a copy of the work, anonymized whenever possible. The Coordinator will also provide the assessment rubric used and, if appropriate, any relevant contextual information.
- 8.11 The Coordinator will take all reasonable steps to ensure student anonymity and impartiality of the assessor(s). The Coordinator will seek a completed reassessment from the assessor within 15 Working Days.

Decision and Appeal

- 8.12 The Coordinator will receive and consider the assessor's report and make a determination on the student's revised grade. The Coordinator shall then communicate the outcome of the Request for Reassessment to the student and the Associate Dean using the Report of Reassessment Decision.
- 8.13 In exceptional circumstances where the Coordinator does not follow the recommendation of the assessor(s), a written rationale will be provided through the Report of Reassessment Decision.
- 8.14 In instances where the student's record should reflect the outcome of the decision, the revised grade will be communicated by the Coordinator to the appropriate body (e.g., Registrar's Office, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, the course instructor).
- 8.15 Normally, Requests for Reassessment will be resolved within 20 Working Days of the Associate Dean's receipt of the student's Notice of Request for Reassessment. If this timeline cannot be met, the Associate Dean will advise the student in writing and provide a revised timeline.
- 8.16 A Reassessment decision may be appealed. The appeal must be initiated by submitting the

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

appropriate documentation no later than 10 Working Days after notification of the decision, provided a ground for appeal can be satisfied. See Policy 72 – Student Appeals.

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

Appendix A – Glossary

Academic Decision – a decision made by a University authority that directly impacts the student's academic record.

Adjudicator – The individual with Jurisdiction to render a finding regarding a student's Grievance. The Adjudicator for a Grievance is normally the Associate Dean of the student's home Faculty (or AFIW equivalent).

AFIW - Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo. Includes Conrad Grebel University College, Renison University College, St. Jerome's University, and United College.

Associate Dean – the Associate Dean (undergraduate or graduate) of a Faculty or their delegate. In the AFIWs, the equivalent roles are the dean (Conrad Grebel University College), vice-president academic and dean (Renison University College), associate dean (St. Jerome's University) and academic dean (United College).

Balance of Probabilities – the standard of proof used to determine whether the occurrence of an event is more likely than not, based on an analysis of the facts and evidence presented. It is a lesser burden of proof than 'beyond a reasonable doubt'.

Chair – in the context of Requests for Reassessment, the chair of the department/director of the school or program hosting the course or their delegate. For a course taught outside a department or school, the Chair is the person responsible for assigning the instructor, e.g., the Associate Dean, for a course administered at the Faculty level. For a co-operative education professional development course, the Chair is the Associate Dean of the student's Home Faculty. The Chair is often the Coordinator of the Request for Reassessment.

Coordinator – in the context of Requests for Reassessment, the Coordinator will normally be the Chair of the unit offering the course (see definition of Chair, above). When the Chair of the offering unit or the Associate Dean of the offering Faculty / AFIW is the instructor of the course in which the reassessment is sought, the Dean of the Faculty (or their delegate) will coordinate the Request for Reassessment.

Course Element – refers to a student's work (e.g., assignment, essay, project, test) that counts towards the final course grade.

Extenuating Circumstances – Exceptional and often unforeseen situations or events that significantly impact a student's ability to meet academic requirements or adhere to established policies or procedures. These circumstances are typically beyond the student's control and can include serious personal challenges, medical issues, family emergencies, or other unexpected events that may adversely affect the student's academic performance. The University acknowledges that Extenuating Circumstances may differ according to a person's social identities and geographical reference points/origin.

Grievance – a claim pursued by a student where the student believes that a decision or action of a University authority has unfairly or unreasonably affected them.

Home Faculty – the Faculty in which a student is registered. In the case of a program involving two or more Faculties - one Faculty, and therefore the associate dean of that Faculty, will have been designated as having the responsibility to deal with matters related to the student's program and to the processes described in this policy.

Jurisdiction – the authority to render decisions.

CONFIDENTIAL DRAFT – POST CONSULTATIONS

Petition – A request by a student seeking exception to or relief from normal Faculty or University rules and regulations as a result of unique and/or Extenuating Circumstances, events or situations that are or have been beyond the control of the student, that could not have reasonably been predicted or expected.

Previously Enrolled Student – a person who was previously enrolled at the University of Waterloo, but whose current status requires an application for readmission to continue their studies at the University.

Principles of Natural Justice – the fundamental principles and standards that govern the fair and impartial treatment of individuals in the context of decision-making processes within the University. Key elements of natural justice include the right to fair and impartial process, the right to be heard and to respond and to receive a reasoned and unbiased decision.

Reassessment – a request by a student for the reconsideration of the assessment coursework.

Support Person – an individual who may provide moral and emotional support through the process, and is normally a fellow student, friend or family member. The support person is not normally a lawyer or paralegal and has no official standing in the process.

Supporting Documentation – Supporting Documentation play an important role in substantiating requests and claims made through Petitions and Grievances. These documents serve as evidence of a student's circumstances and provide context to support the claims made. The nature of Supporting Documentation can vary widely but can include medical documentation (to be submitted through AccessAbility Services), personal statements, third-party letters, legal documents, obituaries, academic records, communication records, witness statements, and photographic evidence, as examples.

Student – an individual who is registered (paid fees or has arranged to pay fees) at the University of Waterloo or an individual who was a student, has not graduated, and can resume studies at the University of Waterloo without having to initiate a formal re-application.

Working Day – Monday to Friday, inclusive, excluding statutory and University holidays. In most offices at the University of Waterloo, regular business hours are 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., with some closed for lunch.

[Centre for Academic Policy Support \(CAPS\)](#)

CAPS is a confidential student support service run by students; a CAPS co-ordinator is trained to assist fellow undergraduate students in navigating and understanding academic policies. CAPS provides help in defining potential problems and providing solution options, explaining deadlines and due dates noted within the policy, and directing students to proper forms and templates for use in student grievances, appeals and petitions.

[Conflict Management Office \(CMO\)](#)

CMO acts as a contact for confidential consultations, where trained personnel are available to listen to and discuss concerns, review informal and formal processes available to address concerns, and/or to provide formal or informal services to manage conflict. CMO will assist in connecting with other campus resources where applicable.

[The Office of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Anti-Racism Office \(EDIRO\)](#)

EDIRO offers confidential services to help University community members to understand their rights and responsibilities, as guided by policies, regulations, and legislation in the areas of anti-racism and equity. The Office is available to provide guidance on claims of and responses to concerns of racism and other forms of discrimination faced by students, faculty and staff. The Office is also available to support the navigation of University systems and processes. EDIRO will assist in connecting with other campus resources where applicable.

[Graduate Student Association \(GSA\)](#)

The GSA assists graduate students with navigating University policies and conflicts, offers guidance on filing a grievance, appeal, or petition, providing a support person for meetings with University administration, answering questions and providing information on available resources both on and off campus.

[The Sexual Violence Prevention & Response Office \(SVPRO\)](#)

The SVPRO provides confidential support to students, staff and faculty who have experienced or been impacted by sexual and gender-based violence. The SVPRO works with individuals from a trauma-informed and person-centered framework, supporting those who are navigating University policies and procedures from this lens. The SVPRO recognizes the prevalence and pervasive impact of trauma and promotes survivor safety and healing, seeking to minimize experiences of re-traumatization throughout University processes. In addition, the SVPRO provides support in accessing academic and workplace accommodations, makes referrals to on and off campus supports and resources, and consults with those tasked with overseeing University processes.

[Student's academic unit, particularly the undergraduate academic advisors or the graduate department coordinators](#)

An academic advisor is dedicated to students' success and provides students with individualized direction to resources, supports, and services across campus. An academic advisor provides knowledgeable advice and clarity to students regarding policies and procedures, and potential academic impacts arising out of these policies and procedures.

[The Centre \(Student Service Centre\)](#)

The Centre helps students navigate their administrative needs. This includes providing official documents such as transcripts, diplomas and official University letters (letters of permission, enrolment verification and degree verification). The Centre answers questions about tuition, OSAP, financial aid; registration, enrolment and admission and also offers Notary services for University business. The Centre supports and directs students to the many resources available to assist with the petition, grievance, and appeal process.

[Waterloo Indigenous Student Centre \(WISC\)](#)

WISC is a warm and welcoming Indigenous space that offers culturally relevant programming, support, services, and events, bringing together a vibrant and growing Indigenous campus community to support all UWaterloo Indigenous (First Nations, Métis, and Inuit) students throughout their academic journey. A few examples of the work they do is: bridging gaps to on/off-campus services, advocating for equitable opportunities for Indigenous peoples and provide access to academic advice, information sessions, laptops, printing, tutors, Indigenous crafting, medicines, and Elders.

[Waterloo Undergraduate Student Association \(WUSA\)](#)

WUSA members are knowledgeable advocates for all undergraduate students and aid in coordinating academic and support services available to undergraduates. WUSA provides support to students to help understand and navigate University policies specific to the petition, grievance, and appeal processes.

[AccessAbility Services \(AAS\)](#)

AccessAbility Services (AAS) collaborates with all academic departments to facilitate academic accommodations for students with known or suspected disabilities and disabling conditions (e.g. medical conditions, injuries, impacts of trauma such as from violence, discrimination, or oppression). AAS works with students to ensure they are informed of, and connected with the campus resource that is best suited to meet their needs, such as the Writing and Communication Centre, who may be able to aid students in completing the petition/grievance/appeal forms.

[Counselling Services](#)

Counselling Services provides a secure, supportive environment for students of all orientations, backgrounds and lived experiences. Counselling Services offers a broad range of support to assist students in coping with academic challenges and counsellors work together with students to determine the best individualized approach. In terms of policy 70, counsellors provide support with petition letters for students accessing services.

[Health Services](#)

Health Services offers comprehensive medical care tailored specifically to our students' needs. In addition to providing essential medical services, we also offer Verification of Illness forms to support students in navigating academic accommodations necessitated by health-related issues.

External accredited health practitioners

For medical, professional, and/or counselling advice, students may wish to contact their external health care professional directly. Medical documents obtained from external accredited health practitioners are submitted to the University through AccessAbility Services for students.

For Approval**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Senate Graduate Council

Presenter(s): Justin Wan
Interim Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

Agenda Item: **7.1 Report of the Senate Graduate Council: Faculty of Engineering – Major Modifications**

Recommendation/Motion

That Senate approve the major modifications to the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Master of Applied Science (MASC) in Electrical and Computer Engineering programs, effective January 1, 2026, as presented.

Summary

[Senate Graduate Council](#) met on [October 23, 2025](#) and agreed to forward the following item to Senate for approval as part of the regular agenda.

- a. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Master of Applied Science (MASC) in Electrical and Computer Engineering programs.

The full proposal can be found in the October 23, 2025 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 79](#).

Proposal/Rationale

Update and re-organize the Electrical and Computer Engineering research fields and cleanup wording in the course requirements section: The research fields in Electrical and Computer Engineering have remained unchanged for a long time. This update modernizes their names to reflect recent advancements and consolidates them for greater clarity.

Additionally, this revision updates the list of core courses associated with each research field. All Electrical and Computer Engineering PhD students must pass at least two courses from the list of core courses for their designated research field, as specified in their letter of admission (unless this requirement was achieved during their MASC).

Jurisdictional Information

As outlined in the council's [Terms and Reference](#), Senate Graduate Council is empowered to make approvals on behalf of Senate for a variety of matters:

- Consider, study and review all proposals for new graduate programs, the deletion of graduate programs, and/or major modifications to existing graduate programs, and make recommendations to Senate thereon.

Governance Path

Faculty of Engineering: January 23, 2025

Senate Graduate Council: October 23, 2025

Senate: November 24, 2025

Documentation Provided

Appendix A: [Proposed Changes – Faculty of Engineering](#)

The full proposal can be found in the October 23, 2025 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 79](#).

For Approval**Open Session**

To: Senate
From: Senate Undergraduate Council
Presenter(s): David DeVidi
Associate Vice-President, Academic

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

Agenda Item: **8.1 Senate Undergraduate Council: Faculty of Arts – Major Modifications**

Recommendation/Motion

That Senate approve the major plan modifications for the Faculty of Arts and Renison University College double degree programs for Social Development Studies and Bachelor of Social Work, effective September 1, 2026, as presented.

Summary

[Senate Undergraduate Council](#) met on [September 30, 2025](#) and agreed to forward the following items to Senate for approval as part of the regular agenda.

- a. The double degree programs for Social Development Studies and Bachelor of Social Work

The full proposal can be found in the September 30, 2025 Senate Undergraduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 610](#).

Proposal/Rationale

The 10-month post-degree Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) has operated at Renison University College since the Fall of 1998 with accreditation from the Canadian Association for Social Work Education-Association Canadienne pour la Formation en Travail Social (CASWE-ACFTS). On February 3, 2023, the Commission on Accreditation (COA) of the CASWE-ACFTS granted the Renison Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) program a two-year re-accreditation with the following conditions:

1. Demonstrate oversight of content related to accreditation of the BSW program.
2. Eliminate redundancies within the overlapping curricula with the Social Development Studies program.

3. Demonstrate that core social work courses related to the accredited program are developed and taught by those within the School of Social Work's influence and according to the accreditation standards.
4. Provide professional social work content equivalent to that of a four (4)-year BSW program.

To meet the re-accreditation conditions, the School of Social Work determined that the 10-month, post-degree BSW program had to be discontinued and replaced with a concurrent double degree program, combining a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Social Development Studies (SDS) and BSW. Knowing that CASWE-ACFTS would likely recommend a revised BSW Model, work to develop a new model began in June 2021 with a joint working group comprising SSW and SDS faculty. Considering CASWE-ACFTS conditions and feedback from alumni, students, and stakeholders, the Joint Working Group tabled a proposal to create a concurrent double degree that would allow students to earn a BA degree with a major in SDS alongside a BSW degree. This major modification proposal outlines the changes required for the double degree program to begin in Fall 2026.

The proposed plan recognizes the need to concurrently continue the 10-month, post-degree BSW program for the 2026-27, 2027-28, and 2028-29 academic years for two reasons. (After this time, the 10-month post-degree plan will be de-activated.)

1. To ensure that all current students who are completing BSW eligibility requirements in the SDS program can achieve their degrees. We will use the 2026-2027, 2027-2028, and 2028-2029 academic years as "transition" years to a) offer the post-degree BSW to students who started in SDS intending to enter the post-degree BSW based on the program information they received at the time, and that informed their decision to enter SDS; and b) ensure financial flow through.
2. To allow for the social work courses (SWREN) of the double degree to be offered at full capacity in years four (4) and five (5) of the five-year double degree program plan.

There will be three admissions pathways:

1. Direct entry to the double degree.
2. Admission to the double degree at the end of 1B pending completion of SOCWK 120R with a minimum grade of 75%.
3. Transfer from college or university.

Progression in the double degree requires that SWREN 111R be completed by the end of 2A with a minimum 75%.

Jurisdictional Information

As provided for in [Senate Bylaw 2](#), section 5.03, council is empowered to make approvals on behalf of Senate for a variety of operational matters:

- b. Make recommendations to Senate with respect to new undergraduate programs/plans, the deletion of undergraduate programs/plans, and major changes to undergraduate programs/plans.

Governance Path

Faculty of Arts and Renison University College: February 21, 2025

Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Subcommittee: July 11, 2025

Senate Undergraduate Council: September 30, 2025

Senate: November 24, 2025

Documentation Provided

[Proposed Changes – Faculty of Arts](#)

The full proposal can be found in the September 30, 2025 Senate Undergraduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 610](#).

SUC 2025-09-30 – Regular Agenda – Faculty of Arts

Meeting Information

Agenda Page Title ⓘ
SUC 2025-09-30 – Regular Agenda – Faculty of Arts

Career Level Undergraduate	Faculty/Unit Faculty of Arts	
Date 2025/09/30	Time	Location
Summary Summary of Submissions		
Regulations None		
Plans – Retires None		
Plans – New (Major Modifications) Renison University College		

Other Business

Attachment(s)

Course Proposals

Course Proposal Details

Courses: Retire
No proposals have been added.

Courses: New
No proposals have been added.

Courses: Changes
No proposals have been added.

Programs & Plans Proposals

Programs & Plans Proposal Details

Plans - New (Major Modifications)

Renison University College
Double Degree - Honours Bachelor of Arts, Social Development Studies and Bachelor of Social Work
Double Degree - Four-Year General Bachelor of Arts, Social Development Studies and Bachelor of Social Work
Double Degree - Three-Year General Bachelor of Arts, Social Development Studies and Bachelor of Social Work

- The changes presented here are to combine two existing plans. They are listed under "Plans - New" because both the Social Development Studies plan and the Bachelor of Social Work will continue to exist, and so these proposals could not be created as plan changes or that would overwrite the current plans. They are "New" and "Major Modifications". The Registrar's Office explained this to ensure they went through the correct pathways.

Programs & Plans: Retire
No proposals have been added.

H-BA (SDS) & H-BSW Double Degree Social Development Studies and Social Work Double Degree (Bachelor of Arts - Honours and Bachelor of Social Work - Honours)

Under Review | Fall 2026

Proposal Information

Workflow Status

In Progress

SUC Subcommittee, SUC Curricular Subcommittee

expand ▲

Waiting for Approval | Approval Delegate(s)

Tim Weber-Kraljevski

Mike Grivicic

Diana Goncalves

Kuali - Arts

Kuali - Env

Melanie Figueiredo

Kuali - Math

Kuali - Eng

Kuali - Hlth

Ashley Day

Kuali - Science

Effective Date and Career

Career

Undergraduate

Important! ⓘ

Effective Term and Year ⓘ

Fall 2026

Proposal Details

Proposal Type ⓘ

New

Academic Unit Approval

02/21/2025

Quality Assurance Designation ⓘ

Major Modification

Major Modification Categories

Change course/program requirements

Merge two or more programs

Undergraduate only: Add new pathway for college students

Recruitment Materials

No

Co-operative System of Study and Requirements ⓘ

Not Applicable

Creating or Changing Invalid Combinations ⓘ

Yes

Invalid Combinations Consultations

Arts and Business

Any other stand alone major

- Consultation with Faculty of Arts

Social Work Specialization in SDS

- Both units in agreement

Change to Learning Outcomes

No

Rationale and Background for New Program/Plan

The 10-month post-degree Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) has operated at Renison University College since the Fall of 1998 with accreditation from the Canadian Association for Social Work Education-Association Canadienne pour la Formation en Travail Social (CASWE-ACFTS). On February 3, 2023, the Commission on Accreditation (COA) of the CASWE-ACFTS granted the Renison Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) program a two-year re-accreditation with the following conditions:

1. Demonstrate oversight of content related to accreditation of the BSW program.
2. Eliminate redundancies within the overlapping curricula with the Social Development Studies program.
3. Demonstrate that core social work courses related to the accredited program are developed and taught by those within the School of Social Work's influence and according to the accreditation standards.
4. Provide professional social work content equivalent to that of a four (4)-year BSW program.

To meet the re-accreditation conditions, the School of Social Work determined that the 10-month, post-degree BSW program had to be discontinued and replaced with a concurrent double degree program, combining a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Social Development Studies (SDS) and BSW. Knowing that CASWE-ACFTS would likely recommend a revised BSW Model, work to develop a new model began in June 2021 with a joint working group comprising SSW and SDS faculty. Considering CASWE-ACFTS conditions and feedback from alumni, students, and stakeholders, the Joint Working Group tabled a proposal to create a concurrent double degree that would allow students to earn a BA degree with a major in SDS alongside a BSW degree. This major modification proposal outlines the changes required for the double degree program to begin in Fall 2026.

The proposed plan recognizes the need to concurrently continue the 10-month, post-degree BSW program for the 2026-27, 2027-28, and 2028-29 academic years for two reasons. (After this time, the 10-month post-degree plan will be de-activated.)

1. To ensure that all current students who are completing BSW eligibility requirements in the SDS program can achieve their degrees. We will use the 2026-2027, 2027-2028, and 2028-2029 academic years as "transition" years to a) offer the post-degree BSW to students who started in SDS intending to enter the post-degree BSW based on the program information they received at the time, and that informed their decision to enter SDS; and b) ensure financial flow through.
2. To allow for the social work courses (SWREN) of the double degree to be offered at full capacity in years four (4) and five (5) of the five-year double degree program plan.

There will be three admissions pathways:

1. Direct entry to the double degree.
2. Admission to the double degree at the end of 1B pending completion of SOCWK 120R with a minimum grade of 75%.
3. Transfer from college or university.

Progression in the double degree requires that SWREN 111R be completed by the end of 2A with a minimum 75%.

Consultations (Departmental)

Consultations occurred with the Faculty of Arts, the Social Development Studies department, and the School of Social Work.

Supporting Documentation**General Program/Plan Information****Faculty**

Vice-President Academic Office

Academic Unit

Interdisciplinary Studies

Field of Study

Social Development Studies

Faculty

Faculty of Arts with Renison University College

Undergraduate Credential Type

Major

Program Type

Honours

Degree

Bachelor of Arts (Arts) + Bachelor of Social Work

Program/Plan Name

Social Development Studies and Social Work Double Degree (Bachelor of Arts - Honours and Bachelor of Social Work - Honours)

Systems of Study

Regular

Online Degree/Diploma**Admissions****Admissions Entry Point**

Both

Admission Requirements: Minimum Requirements**Declaration Requirements**

Requirements Information

Invalid Combinations ⓘ

Yes

List of Invalid Combinations ⓘ

Arts & BusinessSocial Work Specialization

Average Requirement ⓘ

Yes

Minimum Average(s) Required ⓘ

- A minimum cumulative overall average of 60.0%.
- A minimum cumulative major average of 70.0% in all PSYCH, SDS, SOC, and SOCWK required and approved courses listed below.
- A minimum cumulative special major average of 75.0% in all SWREN courses in addition to the following courses: SDS251R, SOCWK120R, SOCWK220R, SOCWK321R.

Graduation Requirements ⓘ

- Concurrent completion of both degrees: A Bachelor of Arts (BA), Honours degree and a Bachelor of of Social Work (BSW), Honours degree.

Unit Requirements

- Complete a total of 25.0 units:
 - 8.0 units of Social Development Studies required and approved courses (see below).
 - 9.5 units of Social Work courses (see below).
 - 7.5 units of electives.

Bachelor of Arts Breadth Requirements

- Complete the BA Breadth Requirements outlined on the Bachelor of Arts degree-level requirements.

Undergraduate Communication Requirement

- Complete the Undergraduate Communication Requirement outlined on the Bachelor of Arts degree-level requirements.

Field Practicum Requirement

- The Field Practicum Requirement - completion of 720 hours - is achieved by successfully completing the required SWREN 444R and SWREN 445R.
- It is required by most practicum agencies that students have a valid driver's license and access to their own vehicle. Police checks are required by many agencies and in some settings immunization shots may be required.

Co-operative Education Program Requirements ⓘ

Course Requirements (units) ⓘ

Additional Requirements

No Rules

0

Units to Complete

Course Requirements (no units) ⓘ

Required Courses

- Complete all of the following

Social Development Studies Courses

- Complete all of the following

- Complete all the following:

- SDS131R - Political Ideologies and Social Development (0.50)
- SDS150R - Lifespan Processes (0.50)
- SDS250R - Social Statistics (0.50)
- SDS251R - Social Research (0.50)
- SOCWK120R - Introduction to Social Work (0.50)
- SOCWK220R - Social Work with Individuals - Theory and Practice 1 (0.50)
- SOCWK321R - Social Work with Families (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- PSYCH101 - Introductory Psychology (0.50)
- PSYCH101R - Introductory Psychology (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- PSYCH253 - Social Psychology (0.50)
- PSYCH253R - Social Psychology (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- SOC101 - Introduction to Sociology (0.50)
- SOC101R - Introduction to Sociology (0.50)

- Complete 3.0 additional units of approved courses at the 200-level or above

Social Work Courses

- Complete all of the following

- Complete all the following:

- SWREN111R - Foundations of Critical Social Work: Social Justice and Helping (0.50)
- SWREN212R - Social Work Storytelling and Critical Trauma Informed Practice (0.50)
- SWREN261R - Indigenous Knowledges and Decolonizing Social Work Practice with Indigenous Peoples (0.50)
- SWREN314R - Interviewing and Assessment in Social Work Practice (0.50)
- SWREN322R - Macro Practice: Critical Considerations of Community Organization (0.50)
- SWREN323R - Social Work Knowledge and Skills for Diverse Group Work Practice (0.50)
- SWREN324R - Social Work Activism and Social Policy (0.50)
- SWREN334R - Selected Theories for Social Work Practice: Analysis and Application (0.50)
- SWREN412R - Environmental Justice and Community Action (0.50)
- SWREN416R - Transnational Social Work and Transmigration (0.50)
- SWREN424R - Social Work and Organizations (0.50)
- SWREN444R - Practicum 1 (1.50)
- SWREN445R - Practicum 2 (1.50)
- SWREN470R - Mental Health Landscapes, Concepts, and Practice Approaches (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- SWREN431R - Practitioner Research in Social Work: Intersectional Considerations (0.50)
- SWREN471R - Social Work with Older Adults: Critical Issues and Future Trends (0.50)
- SWREN490R - Special Topics in Social Work (0.50)

Course Lists ⓘ

Approved Courses List

- Complete all of the following
 - Choose any of the following:
 - LS273 - Children's Rights in Canada (0.50)
 - SOC204R - Sociology of Adolescence (0.50)
 - SOC207 - Sociology of Education (0.50)
 - SOC207R - Sociology of Education (0.50)
 - SOC223 - Deviance: Perspectives and Processes (0.50)
 - SOC223R - Deviance: Perspectives and Processes (0.50)
 - SOC224R - Poverty in Canada and its Social Consequences (0.50)
 - SOC375R - Studies in Sociology (0.50)
 - SOC398R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - SOC399R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - SOC450R - Senior Seminar in Special Topics (0.50)
 - SOC490R - Special Studies (0.50)
 - Choose any of the following:
 - PSYCH212 - Educational Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH212R - Educational Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH213R - Exceptional Children (0.50)
 - PSYCH226R - Positive Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH257 - Psychopathology (0.50)
 - PSYCH257R - Psychopathology (0.50)
 - PSYCH312 - Learning Disabilities (0.50)
 - PSYCH312R - Learning Disabilities (0.50)
 - PSYCH334R - Theories of Individual Counselling Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH352 - Culture and Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH352R - Culture and Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH354 - Interpersonal Relations (0.50)
 - PSYCH354R - Interpersonal Relations (0.50)
 - PSYCH356 - Personality (0.50)
 - PSYCH356R - Personality (0.50)
 - PSYCH375R - Studies in Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH398R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - PSYCH399R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - PSYCH444R - Psychological Interventions (0.50)
 - PSYCH448R - Close Relationships (0.50)
 - PSYCH450R - Senior Seminar in Special Topics (0.50)
 - PSYCH490R - Special Studies (0.50)
 - Choose any additional SDS or SOCWK courses at the 200-level or above

Are there cross-listed courses listed in requirements?

Yes

Cross-Listings Options ⓘ

All cross-listings to be displayed

Additional Constraints ⓘ

1. Students may only complete one course from any cross-listed set.
2. Transfer credits with direct equivalencies to any specific course listed above and unspecific transfer credits (e.g., SDS2XX) with the SDS subject code at the 200-level and above may be counted towards this plan; common degree requirements (e.g., residency, 50% rule) must still be met.
3. Transfer credits for SWREN courses at the 100 and 200 level will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Transfer credits will not be allowed for SWREN courses at the 300 and 400 level.
4. For the additional 3.0 units of approved courses:
 1. 1.5 units must be SDS courses.
 2. 1.5 units must be at the 400-level or above.

Notes ⓘ

- Students who choose not to complete the Bachelor of Social Work courses in the last year may elect to withdraw from the double degree program and graduate with a single Social Development Studies plan (Bachelor of Arts) degree via a Plan Modification Form.

Specializations

Specializations for this Major ⓘ

Yes - Optional

Specialization Details ⓘ

Students may choose to focus their elective choices by completing one or more of four available specializations.

Specializations List ⓘ

- Diversity & Equity Specialization, Education Specialization, Individual Well-Being & Development Specialization, or Social Policy & Social Action Specialization

Workflow Information

Workflow Path ⓘ	Faculty/AFIW Path(s) for Workflow ⓘ	Senate Workflow
Committee approvals	Renison University CollegeFaculty of Arts	Senate Regular

Dependencies

Dependent Courses and Programs/Plans
There are no dependencies

4G-BA (SDS) & H-BSW Double Degree Social Development Studies and Social Work Double Degree (Bachelor of Arts - Four-Year General and Bachelor of Social Work - Honours)

Under Review | Fall 2026

Proposal Information

Workflow Status

In Progress

SUC Subcommittee, SUC Curricular Subcommittee

expand ▲

Waiting for Approval | Approval Delegate(s)

- Tim Weber-Kraljevski
- Mike Grivicic
- Diana Goncalves
- Kuali - Arts
- Kuali - Env
- Melanie Figueiredo
- Kuali - Math
- Kuali - Eng
- Kuali - Hlth
- Ashley Day
- Kuali - Science

Effective Date and Career

Career

Undergraduate

Important! ⓘ

Effective Term and Year ⓘ

Fall 2026

Proposal Details

Proposal Type ⓘ

New

Academic Unit Approval

02/21/2025

Quality Assurance Designation ⓘ

Major Modification

Major Modification Categories

- Change course/program requirements
- Merge two or more programs
- Undergraduate only: Add new pathway for college students

Recruitment Materials

No

Co-operative System of Study and Requirements ⓘ

Not Applicable

Creating or Changing Invalid Combinations ⓘ

Yes

Invalid Combinations Consultations

- Social Work Specialization in SDS
- Both units in agreement

Change to Learning Outcomes

No

Rationale and Background for New Program/Plan

The 10-month post-degree Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) has operated at Renison University College since the Fall of 1998 with accreditation from the Canadian Association for Social Work Education-Association Canadienne pour la Formation en Travail Social (CASWE-ACFTS). On February 3, 2023, the Commission on Accreditation (COA) of the CASWE-ACFTS granted the Renison Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) program a two-year re-accreditation with the following conditions:

1. Demonstrate oversight of content related to accreditation of the BSW program.
2. Eliminate redundancies within the overlapping curricula with the Social Development Studies program.
3. Demonstrate that core social work courses related to the accredited program are developed and taught by those within the School of Social Work's influence and according to the accreditation standards.
4. Provide professional social work content equivalent to that of a four (4)-year BSW program.

To meet the re-accreditation conditions, the School of Social Work determined that the 10-month, post-degree BSW program had to be discontinued and replaced with a concurrent double degree program, combining a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Social Development Studies (SDS) and BSW. Knowing that CASWE-ACFTS would likely recommend a revised BSW Model, work to develop a new model began in June 2021 with a joint working group comprising SSW and SDS faculty. Considering CASWE-ACFTS conditions and feedback from alumni, students, and stakeholders, the Joint Working Group tabled a proposal to create a concurrent double degree that would allow students to earn a BA degree with a major in SDS alongside a BSW degree. This major modification proposal outlines the changes required for the double degree program to begin in Fall 2026.

The proposed plan recognizes the need to concurrently continue the 10-month, post-degree BSW program for the 2026-27, 2027-28, and 2028-29 academic years for two reasons. (After this time, the 10-month post-degree plan will be de-activated.)

1. To ensure that all current students who are completing BSW eligibility requirements in the SDS program can achieve their degrees. We will use the 2026-2027, 2027-2028, and 2028-2029 academic years as "transition" years to a) offer the post-degree BSW to students who started in SDS intending to enter the post-degree BSW based on the program information they received at the time, and that informed their decision to enter SDS; and b) ensure financial flow through.
2. To allow for the social work courses (SWREN) of the double degree to be offered at full capacity in years four (4) and five (5) of the five-year double degree program plan.

There will be three admissions pathways:

1. Direct entry to the double degree.
2. Admission to the double degree at the end of 1B pending completion of SOCWK 120R with a minimum grade of 75%.
3. Transfer from college or university.

Progression in the double degree requires that SWREN 111R be completed by the end of 2A with a minimum 75%.

Consultations (Departmental)

Consultations occurred with the Faculty of Arts, the Social Development Studies department, and the School of Social Work.

Supporting Documentation**General Program/Plan Information****Faculty**

Vice-President Academic Office

Academic Unit

Interdisciplinary Studies

Field of Study

Social Development Studies

Faculty

Faculty of Arts with Renison University College

Undergraduate Credential Type

Major

Program Type

Four-Year General

Degree

Bachelor of Arts (Arts) + Bachelor of Social Work

Program/Plan Name

Social Development Studies and Social Work Double Degree (Bachelor of Arts - Four-Year General and Bachelor of Social Work - Honours)

Systems of Study

Regular

Online Degree/Diploma**Admissions****Admissions Entry Point**

Both

Admission Requirements: Minimum Requirements**Declaration Requirements**

Requirements Information

Invalid Combinations ⓘ

Yes

List of Invalid Combinations ⓘ

Social Work Specialization

Average Requirement ⓘ

Yes

Minimum Average(s) Required ⓘ

- A minimum cumulative overall average of 60.0%.
- A minimum cumulative major average of 65.0% in all PSYCH, SDS, SOC, and SOCWK required and approved courses listed below.
- A minimum cumulative special major average of 75.0% in all SWREN courses in addition to the following courses: SDS251R, SOCWK120R, SOCWK220R, SOCWK321R.

Graduation Requirements ⓘ

- Concurrent completion of both degrees: A Bachelor of Arts (BA), Four-Year General degree and a Bachelor of of Social Work (BSW), Honours degree.

Unit Requirements

- Complete a total of 25.0 units:
 - 8.0 units of Social Development Studies required and approved courses (see below).
 - 9.5 units of Social Work courses (see below).
 - 7.5 units of electives.

Bachelor of Arts Breadth Requirements

- Complete the BA Breadth Requirements outlined on the Bachelor of Arts degree-level requirements.

Undergraduate Communication Requirement

- Complete the Undergraduate Communication Requirement outlined on the Bachelor of Arts degree-level requirements.

Field Practicum Requirement

- The Field Practicum Requirement - completion of 720 hours - is achieved by successfully completing the required SWREN 444R and SWREN 445R.
- It is required by most practicum agencies that students have a valid driver's license and access to their own vehicle. Police checks are required by many agencies and in some settings immunization shots may be required.

Co-operative Education Program Requirements ⓘ

Course Requirements (units) ⓘ

Required Courses

No Rules

0

Units to Complete

Course Requirements (no units) ⓘ

Required Courses

- Complete all of the following

Social Development Studies Courses

- Complete all of the following

- Complete all the following:

- SDS131R - Political Ideologies and Social Development (0.50)
- SDS150R - Lifespan Processes (0.50)
- SDS250R - Social Statistics (0.50)
- SDS251R - Social Research (0.50)
- SOCWK120R - Introduction to Social Work (0.50)
- SOCWK220R - Social Work with Individuals - Theory and Practice 1 (0.50)
- SOCWK321R - Social Work with Families (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- PSYCH101 - Introductory Psychology (0.50)
- PSYCH101R - Introductory Psychology (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- PSYCH253 - Social Psychology (0.50)
- PSYCH253R - Social Psychology (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- SOC101 - Introduction to Sociology (0.50)
- SOC101R - Introduction to Sociology (0.50)

- Complete 3.0 additional units of approved courses at the 200-level or above

Social Work Courses

- Complete all of the following

- Complete all the following:

- SWREN111R - Foundations of Critical Social Work: Social Justice and Helping (0.50)
- SWREN212R - Social Work Storytelling and Critical Trauma Informed Practice (0.50)
- SWREN261R - Indigenous Knowledges and Decolonizing Social Work Practice with Indigenous Peoples (0.50)
- SWREN314R - Interviewing and Assessment in Social Work Practice (0.50)
- SWREN322R - Macro Practice: Critical Considerations of Community Organization (0.50)
- SWREN323R - Social Work Knowledge and Skills for Diverse Group Work Practice (0.50)
- SWREN324R - Social Work Activism and Social Policy (0.50)
- SWREN334R - Selected Theories for Social Work Practice: Analysis and Application (0.50)
- SWREN412R - Environmental Justice and Community Action (0.50)
- SWREN416R - Transnational Social Work and Transmigration (0.50)
- SWREN424R - Social Work and Organizations (0.50)
- SWREN444R - Practicum 1 (1.50)
- SWREN445R - Practicum 2 (1.50)
- SWREN470R - Mental Health Landscapes, Concepts, and Practice Approaches (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- SWREN431R - Practitioner Research in Social Work: Intersectional Considerations (0.50)
- SWREN471R - Social Work with Older Adults: Critical Issues and Future Trends (0.50)
- SWREN490R - Special Topics in Social Work (0.50)

Course Lists ⓘ

Approved Courses List

- Complete all of the following
 - Choose any of the following:
 - LS273 - Children's Rights in Canada (0.50)
 - SOC204R - Sociology of Adolescence (0.50)
 - SOC207 - Sociology of Education (0.50)
 - SOC207R - Sociology of Education (0.50)
 - SOC223 - Deviance: Perspectives and Processes (0.50)
 - SOC223R - Deviance: Perspectives and Processes (0.50)
 - SOC224R - Poverty in Canada and its Social Consequences (0.50)
 - SOC375R - Studies in Sociology (0.50)
 - SOC398R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - SOC399R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - SOC450R - Senior Seminar in Special Topics (0.50)
 - SOC490R - Special Studies (0.50)
 - Choose any of the following:
 - PSYCH212 - Educational Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH212R - Educational Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH213R - Exceptional Children (0.50)
 - PSYCH226R - Positive Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH312 - Learning Disabilities (0.50)
 - PSYCH312R - Learning Disabilities (0.50)
 - PSYCH257 - Psychopathology (0.50)
 - PSYCH257R - Psychopathology (0.50)
 - PSYCH334R - Theories of Individual Counselling Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH352 - Culture and Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH352R - Culture and Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH354 - Interpersonal Relations (0.50)
 - PSYCH354R - Interpersonal Relations (0.50)
 - PSYCH356 - Personality (0.50)
 - PSYCH356R - Personality (0.50)
 - PSYCH375R - Studies in Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH398R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - PSYCH399R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - PSYCH444R - Psychological Interventions (0.50)
 - PSYCH448R - Close Relationships (0.50)
 - PSYCH450R - Senior Seminar in Special Topics (0.50)
 - PSYCH490R - Special Studies (0.50)
 - Choose any additional SDS or SOCWK courses at the 200-level or above

Are there cross-listed courses listed in requirements?

Yes

Cross-Listings Options ⓘ

All cross-listings to be displayed

Additional Constraints ⓘ

1. Students may only complete one course from any cross-listed set.
2. Transfer credits with direct equivalencies to any specific course listed above and unspecific transfer credits (e.g., SDS2XX) with the SDS subject code at the 200-level and above may be counted towards this plan; common degree requirements (e.g., residency, 50% rule) must still be met.
3. Transfer credits for SWREN courses at the 100 and 200 level will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Transfer credits will not be allowed for SWREN courses at the 300 and 400 level.
4. For the additional 3.0 units of approved courses:
 1. 1.5 units must be SDS courses.
 2. 1.5 units must be at the 400-level or above.

Notes ⓘ

- Students who choose not to complete the Bachelor of Social Work courses in the last year may elect to withdraw from the double degree program and graduate with a single Social Development Studies plan (Bachelor of Arts) degree via a Plan Modification Form.

Specializations

Specializations for this Major ⓘ

Yes - Optional

Specialization Details ⓘ

Students may choose to focus their elective choices by completing one or more of four available specializations.

Specializations List ⓘ

- Diversity & Equity Specialization, Education Specialization, Individual Well-Being & Development Specialization, or Social Policy & Social Action Specialization

Workflow Information

Workflow Path ⓘ

Committee approvals

Faculty/AFIW Path(s) for Workflow ⓘ

Renison University CollegeFaculty of Arts

Senate Workflow

Senate Regular

Dependencies

Dependent Courses and Programs/Plans

There are no dependencies

3G-BA (SDS) & H-BSW Double Degree Social Development Studies and Social Work Double Degree (Bachelor of Arts - Three-Year General and Bachelor of Social Work - Honours)

Under Review | Fall 2026

Proposal Information

Workflow Status

In Progress

SUC Subcommittee, SUC Curricular Subcommittee

expand ▲

Waiting for Approval | Approval Delegate(s)

- Tim Weber-Kraljevski
- Mike Grivicic
- Diana Goncalves
- Kuali - Arts
- Kuali - Env
- Melanie Figueiredo
- Kuali - Math
- Kuali - Eng
- Kuali - Hlth
- Ashley Day
- Kuali - Science

Effective Date and Career

Career

Undergraduate

Important! ⓘ

Effective Term and Year ⓘ

Fall 2026

Proposal Details

Proposal Type ⓘ

New

Academic Unit Approval

02/21/2025

Quality Assurance Designation ⓘ

Major Modification

Major Modification Categories

- Change course/program requirements
- Merge two or more programs
- Undergraduate only: Add new pathway for college students

Recruitment Materials

No

Co-operative System of Study and Requirements ⓘ

Not Applicable

Creating or Changing Invalid Combinations ⓘ

Yes

Invalid Combinations Consultations

- Social Work Specialization in SDS
- Both units in agreement

Change to Learning Outcomes

No

Rationale and Background for New Program/Plan ⓘ

The 10-month post-degree Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) has operated at Renison University College since the Fall of 1998 with accreditation from the Canadian Association for Social Work Education-Association Canadienne pour la Formation en Travail Social (CASWE-ACFTS). On February 3, 2023, the Commission on Accreditation (COA) of the CASWE-ACFTS granted the Renison Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) program a two-year re-accreditation with the following conditions:

1. Demonstrate oversight of content related to accreditation of the BSW program.
2. Eliminate redundancies within the overlapping curricula with the Social Development Studies program.
3. Demonstrate that core social work courses related to the accredited program are developed and taught by those within the School of Social Work's influence and according to the accreditation standards.
4. Provide professional social work content equivalent to that of a four (4)-year BSW program.

To meet the re-accreditation conditions, the School of Social Work determined that the 10-month, post-degree BSW program had to be discontinued and replaced with a concurrent double degree program, combining a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Social Development Studies (SDS) and BSW. Knowing that CASWE-ACFTS would likely recommend a revised BSW Model, work to develop a new model began in June 2021 with a joint working group comprising SSW and SDS faculty. Considering CASWE-ACFTS conditions and feedback from alumni, students, and stakeholders, the Joint Working Group tabled a proposal to create a concurrent double degree that would allow students to earn a BA degree with a major in SDS alongside a BSW degree. This major modification proposal outlines the changes required for the double degree program to begin in Fall 2026.

The proposed plan recognizes the need to concurrently continue the 10-month, post-degree BSW program for the 2026-27, 2027-28, and 2028-29 academic years for two reasons. (After this time, the 10-month post-degree plan will be de-activated.)

1. To ensure that all current students who are completing BSW eligibility requirements in the SDS program can achieve their degrees. We will use the 2026-2027, 2027-2028, and 2028-2029 academic years as "transition" years to a) offer the post-degree BSW to students who started in SDS intending to enter the post-degree BSW based on the program information they received at the time, and that informed their decision to enter SDS; and b) ensure financial flow through.
2. To allow for the social work courses (SWREN) of the double degree to be offered at full capacity in years four (4) and five (5) of the five-year double degree program plan

There will be three admissions pathways:

1. Direct entry to the double degree.
2. Admission to the double degree at the end of 1B pending completion of SOCWK 120R with a minimum grade of 75%.
3. Transfer from college or university.

Progression in the double degree requires that SWREN 111R be completed by the end of 2A with a minimum 75%.

Consultations (Departmental) ⓘ

Consultations occurred with the Faculty of Arts, the Social Development Studies department, and the School of Social Work.

Supporting Documentation

General Program/Plan Information

Faculty ⓘ

Vice-President Academic Office

Academic Unit ⓘ

Interdisciplinary Studies

Field of Study ⓘ

Social Development Studies

Faculty ⓘ

Faculty of Arts with Renison University College

Undergraduate Credential Type ⓘ

Major

Program Type

Three-Year General

Degree ⓘ

Bachelor of Arts (Arts) + Bachelor of Social Work

Program/Plan Name ⓘ

Social Development Studies and Social Work Double Degree (Bachelor of Arts - Three-Year General and Bachelor of Social Work - Honours)

Systems of Study

Regular

Online Degree/Diploma ⓘ

Admissions

Admissions Entry Point ⓘ

Both

Admission Requirements: Minimum Requirements ⓘ

Declaration Requirements ⓘ

Requirements Information

Invalid Combinations ⓘ

Yes

Average Requirement ⓘ

Yes

List of Invalid Combinations ⓘ

Social Work Specialization

Minimum Average(s) Required ⓘ

- A minimum cumulative overall average of 60.0%.
- A minimum cumulative major average of 65.0% in all PSYCH, SDS, SOC, and SOCWK required and approved courses listed below.
- A minimum cumulative special major average of 75.0% in all SWREN courses in addition to the following courses: SDS251R, SOCWK120R, SOCWK220R, SOCWK321R.

Graduation Requirements ⓘ

- Concurrent completion of both degrees: A Bachelor of Arts (BA), Three-Year General degree and a Bachelor of of Social Work (BSW), Honours degree.

Unit Requirements

- Complete a total of 20.0 units:
 - 6.0 units of Social Development Studies required and approved courses (see below).
 - 9.5 units of Social Work courses (see below).
 - 4.5 units of electives.

Bachelor of Arts Breadth Requirements

- Complete the BA Breadth Requirements outlined on the Bachelor of Arts degree-level requirements.

Undergraduate Communication Requirement

- Complete the Undergraduate Communication Requirement outlined on the Bachelor of Arts degree-level requirements.

Field Practicum Requirement

- The Field Practicum Requirement - completion of 720 hours - is achieved by successfully completing the required SWREN 444R and SWREN 445R.
- It is required by most practicum agencies that students have a valid driver's license and access to their own vehicle. Police checks are required by many agencies and in some settings immunization shots may be required.

Co-operative Education Program Requirements ⓘ

Course Requirements (units) ⓘ

Required Courses

No Rules

0

Units to Complete

Course Requirements (no units) ⓘ

Required Courses

- Complete all of the following

Social Development Studies Courses

- Complete all of the following

- Complete all the following:

- SDS131R - Political Ideologies and Social Development (0.50)
- SDS150R - Lifespan Processes (0.50)
- SDS250R - Social Statistics (0.50)
- SDS251R - Social Research (0.50)
- SOCWK120R - Introduction to Social Work (0.50)
- SOCWK220R - Social Work with Individuals - Theory and Practice 1 (0.50)
- SOCWK321R - Social Work with Families (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- PSYCH101 - Introductory Psychology (0.50)
- PSYCH101R - Introductory Psychology (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- PSYCH253 - Social Psychology (0.50)
- PSYCH253R - Social Psychology (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- SOC101 - Introduction to Sociology (0.50)
- SOC101R - Introduction to Sociology (0.50)

- Complete 1.0 additional unit of SDS courses at the 200-level or above

Social Work Courses

- Complete all of the following

- Complete all the following:

- SWREN111R - Foundations of Critical Social Work: Social Justice and Helping (0.50)
- SWREN212R - Social Work Storytelling and Critical Trauma Informed Practice (0.50)
- SWREN261R - Indigenous Knowledges and Decolonizing Social Work Practice with Indigenous Peoples (0.50)
- SWREN314R - Interviewing and Assessment in Social Work Practice (0.50)
- SWREN322R - Macro Practice: Critical Considerations of Community Organization (0.50)
- SWREN323R - Social Work Knowledge and Skills for Diverse Group Work Practice (0.50)
- SWREN324R - Social Work Activism and Social Policy (0.50)
- SWREN334R - Selected Theories for Social Work Practice: Analysis and Application (0.50)
- SWREN412R - Environmental Justice and Community Action (0.50)
- SWREN416R - Transnational Social Work and Transmigration (0.50)
- SWREN424R - Social Work and Organizations (0.50)
- SWREN444R - Practicum 1 (1.50)
- SWREN445R - Practicum 2 (1.50)
- SWREN470R - Mental Health Landscapes, Concepts, and Practice Approaches (0.50)

- Complete 1 of the following:

- SWREN431R - Practitioner Research in Social Work: Intersectional Considerations (0.50)
- SWREN471R - Social Work with Older Adults: Critical Issues and Future Trends (0.50)
- SWREN490R - Special Topics in Social Work (0.50)

Course Lists

Approved Courses List

- Complete all of the following
 - Choose any of the following:
 - LS273 - Children's Rights in Canada (0.50)
 - SOC204R - Sociology of Adolescence (0.50)
 - SOC207 - Sociology of Education (0.50)
 - SOC207R - Sociology of Education (0.50)
 - SOC223 - Deviance: Perspectives and Processes (0.50)
 - SOC223R - Deviance: Perspectives and Processes (0.50)
 - SOC224R - Poverty in Canada and its Social Consequences (0.50)
 - SOC375R - Studies in Sociology (0.50)
 - SOC398R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - SOC399R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - SOC450R - Senior Seminar in Special Topics (0.50)
 - SOC490R - Special Studies (0.50)
 - Choose any of the following:
 - PSYCH212 - Educational Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH212R - Educational Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH213R - Exceptional Children (0.50)
 - PSYCH226R - Positive Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH257 - Psychopathology (0.50)
 - PSYCH257R - Psychopathology (0.50)
 - PSYCH312 - Learning Disabilities (0.50)
 - PSYCH312R - Learning Disabilities (0.50)
 - PSYCH334R - Theories of Individual Counselling Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH352 - Culture and Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH352R - Culture and Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH354 - Interpersonal Relations (0.50)
 - PSYCH354R - Interpersonal Relations (0.50)
 - PSYCH356 - Personality (0.50)
 - PSYCH356R - Personality (0.50)
 - PSYCH375R - Studies in Psychology (0.50)
 - PSYCH398R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - PSYCH399R - Independent Study (0.50)
 - PSYCH444R - Psychological Interventions (0.50)
 - PSYCH448R - Close Relationships (0.50)
 - PSYCH450R - Senior Seminar in Special Topics (0.50)
 - PSYCH490R - Special Studies (0.50)
 - Choose any additional SDS or SOCWK courses at the 200-level or above

Are there cross-listed courses listed in requirements?

Yes

Cross-Listings Options

All cross-listings to be displayed

Additional Constraints

1. Students may only complete one course from any cross-listed set.
2. Transfer credits with direct equivalencies to any specific course listed above and unspecific transfer credits (e.g., SDS2XX) with the SDS subject code at the 200-level and above may be counted towards this plan; common degree requirements (e.g., residency, 50% rule) must still be met.
3. Transfer credits for SWREN courses at the 100 and 200 level will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Transfer credits will not be allowed for SWREN courses at the 300 and 400 level.

Notes

- Students who choose not to complete the Bachelor of Social Work courses in the last year may elect to withdraw from the double degree program and graduate with a single Social Development Studies plan (Bachelor of Arts) degree via a Plan Modification Form.

Specializations

Specializations for this Major

Yes - Optional

Specialization Details

Students may choose to focus their elective choices by completing one or more of four available specializations.

Specializations List

- Diversity & Equity Specialization, Education Specialization, Individual Well-Being & Development Specialization, or Social Policy & Social Action Specialization

Workflow Information

Workflow Path ⓘ
Committee approvals

Faculty/AFIW Path(s) for Workflow ⓘ
Renison University CollegeFaculty of Arts

Senate Workflow
Senate Regular

Dependencies

Dependent Courses and Programs/Plans
There are no dependencies

Senate Agenda Items p = planned ✓ = completed	September 22, 2025	October 20, 2025	November 24, 2025	January 26, 2026	March 2, 2026	April 6, 2026	May 4, 2026	June 8, 2026
LEADERSHIP, FACUTLY, AND ASSOCIATION REPORTS								
Report of the President	✓	✓	p	p	p	p	p	p
• Faculty Tenure and Promotion Report (<i>consent</i>)			p	p	p	p	p	p
Report of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost	✓	✓	p	p	p	p	p	p
• Reports from Faculties (e.g., appointments, administrative appointments, sabbaticals) (<i>consent</i>)	✓	✓	p	p	p	p	p	p
• Call for Nominations and Designation of University Professor	✓					p		
Report of the Vice-President, Research & International (<i>consent</i>)	✓	✓	p	p	p	p	p	p
• Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research & International				p				
Faculty Presentations					p		p	p
Annual Association Reports: FAUW, WUSA, GSA					p			
Report of the COU Academic Colleague								p
COMMITTEE & COUNCIL REPORTS Each committee and council of Senate will provide a report to Senate after each meeting.								
Executive Committee, Academic Quality Enhancement Committee, Graduate Council, Honorary Degrees Committee, Planning and Finance Committee, Research and Innovation Council, Undergraduate Council	✓	✓	p	p	p	p	p	p
POLICIES & BY-LAWS Policy and By-Law amendments may also be brought forward based on review schedules or as required.								
Annual Report on Gift Acceptance (Policy 7) (<i>confidential</i>)								p
University Committee on Student Appeals Annual Report (Policy 72)				p				
University Appointment Review Committee Annual Report (Policy 76)						p		
Executive Appointments (Policy 48, 50, 68) (<i>confidential</i>)								
OPERATING BUDGET Under the Report of the Planning and Finance Committee.								
University Operating Budget Update		✓						
Joint Board/Senate Budget Education Sessions				p	p			
Operating Budget (recommendation to Board)						p		
ADMISSIONS UPDATES, CONFERRING OF DEGREES, AND AWARDS								
Call for Nominations: Honorary Degree and Honorary Member	✓				p			
Academic Calendar Dates	✓							
Teaching Awards Committee: Appointment and Award Winners				p			p	
Delegation and Reports of the Roster of Graduands	✓		p			p		
Spring and Fall Convocation Reports	✓		p					
Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions Update				p				
SENATE MEMBERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE								
Senate Orientation	✓							
Call for Senate Nominations, Elections, and Appointments				p	p			p
Senate Effectiveness Survey					p			



For Information

Consent

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

To: Senate

From: Genevieve Gauthier-Chalifour
University Secretary

Agenda Item: **9.2 Policy 68: Vice-President, University Research International – Minor/Housekeeping Amendments**

Background:

At its meeting September 18, 2025, the [Faculty Relations Committee \(FRC\)](#) approved minor/housekeeping amendments to Policy 68 – Vice-President, University Research International. The amendments were made in accordance with [Policy 1 – Initiation and Review of University Policies](#), which provides that minor amendments to such policies can be addressed directly by the FRC.

The amendments are as outlined below and were provided to the Board of Governors for information at their October 28, 2025 meeting. The following is similarly being provided to Senate for information at its November 24, 2025 meeting:

1. To reflect the correct position title of the “Vice-President, Research and International” throughout Policy 68.
2. To neutralize gendered language throughout Policy 68.
3. To reflect the dissolving of the Senate Graduate & Research Council into the Senate Graduate Council and the Senate Research and Innovation Council, throughout Policy 68.

Documentation Provided:

- Policy 68 – Vice-President Research and International – Revised September 2025



Appendix B – Policy 68 (Redlined)

University of Waterloo
Policy 68Vice-President, ~~University Research International~~ Research and International*

Established:	21 November 1988
Revised:	27 October 1998 28 October 2014 28 February 2020. Amended, official titles only. <u>[TBD]. Amended, official titles only.</u>
Supersedes:	N/A
Class:	A
Responsible/Originating Department:	Office of the President
Executive Contact:	President

Related Policies, Guidelines and Procedures:

N/A

1. General

The Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International provides leadership in research throughout the University and externally. ~~He/she is the~~ The individual is appointed for a definite and known term after the appropriate selection procedure has been followed.

2. Qualifications, duties, and responsibilities

The Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International is a senior faculty member of considerable scholarly stature. ~~He/she is the~~ The individual is a University officer, serving in that capacity on Senate, appropriate major committees, and on other such University bodies. As a University officer, the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International has responsibility for making independent judgments on total University matters, representing the particular interests, policies and point of view of research as determined by the Senate Graduate & Research Research and Innovation Council, and being the external representative for the University with regard to research and research-related issues. The Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International has particular responsibility for maintaining the autonomy and

intellectual independence of the University in matters related to research, and for fostering an environment which promotes a high academic standard of scholarly activity.

The Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International is ~~co~~-chair and academic mentor of the ~~Senate Research and Innovation~~ Graduate & Research Council. ~~T~~together with the Faculty deans, ~~he/she is they are~~ the individual is responsible for setting and maintaining a high academic standard of scholarly activity with respect to research throughout the University.

3. Legal framework

In addition to the abovementioned “Related Policies, Guidelines & Procedures”, the Policy must be construed in accordance with applicable law, in particular:

- *Employment Standards Act, 2000*, S.O. 2000, c. 41;
- *Human Rights Code*, R.S.O. 1990, c. H.19;
- *Pay Equity Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.7;
- *Occupational Health and Safety Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O1;
- *The University of Waterloo Act 1972*, S.O., 1972, c. 200; and
- *Workplace Safety and Insurance Act*, 1997, S.O. 1997, c. 16.

If any of these legal provisions are modified, abrogated, superseded, or added to, the Policy shall be interpreted in accordance with the new legal framework.

4. Term of office

A. The term of office for the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International is normally five years, renewable for five years, to a maximum of ten years.

B. Reappointment beyond a second consecutive term should be considered unusual and will occur only if there are compelling reasons, as specified by the nominating committee, along with strong support throughout the University.

C. In the event of the absence of the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International for any prolonged period, arrangements should be made for the President to appoint an Acting Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International for a period of no more than one year.

If the office of the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International becomes vacant through death, resignation, or other causes, it is the responsibility of the President to appoint, after appropriate consultation, an interim Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International and to initiate the process of filling the vacancy as prescribed in section 5. The term of office of the interim Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International should be of sufficient length for the nominating committee to complete its task and, normally, should not exceed one year.

5. Appointment and reappointment procedures

A. Appointment of a nominating committee

When nominations for the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International are required, as through notice of resignation, death, or the approaching end of a term, a nominating committee shall be formed by the President. The nominating committee shall normally be formed no earlier than 18 months and no later than one full calendar year prior to the end of the term of office of the incumbent.

The nominating committee shall consist of:

- The President or the President's delegate, who shall chair the committee.
- The Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs.
- One senator of professorial rank from each Faculty, elected by a vote within that Faculty.
- Two graduate students, appointed by the Graduate Student Association.
- One staff member appointed by the Staff Association, and one elected by and from the regular staff in the Office of Research.
- One faculty member from and appointed by the affiliated and federated institutions of Waterloo.

A reasonable gender balance should be maintained on nominating committees, whenever feasible.

Membership on nominating committees shall be conditional on each person agreeing to maintain in confidence the information discussed by the committee, except on points where the committee subsequently agrees otherwise, and to exercise authority and responsibility as an individual in order that decisions may be taken at the time and place of committee meetings.

If any member of the nominating committee becomes, or seeks to become, a candidate for the office of Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International, the member shall resign from the committee.

In the event of a perceived conflict of interest that could compromise or be seen to compromise the member's judgment of the candidates, ~~he/she~~ the member shall disclose the nature of that conflict to the committee in sufficient detail to enable the committee to determine whether the member must resign from the committee.

If the association of any member of the nominating committee with the University is terminated or in any way significantly altered, or if for any reason, including resignation, any member is unable to carry out responsibilities on the committee, the nominating committee will request a replacement member, unless the committee has reached a stage in its deliberations where it deems such a replacement inadvisable.

B. Terms of reference

It is understood that the committee shall be responsible for soliciting the views of those affected, including graduate students.

1. Reappointment at the end of a first term

The first charge to the nominating committee will be to solicit, with the prior knowledge of the incumbent and by whatever means it may decide, the opinion of the **Senate Research and Innovation Graduate & Research Council**, the Faculty Deans and other persons affected, with respect to the reappointment of the incumbent. If the incumbent is found to be generally acceptable, the committee shall then determine the incumbent's willingness to accept reappointment. If the incumbent indicates willingness to accept, the committee shall recommend reappointment to Senate without considering other candidates. Upon receiving the report of the nominating committee and the recommendation of Senate, the President shall recommend reappointment to the Board of Governors.

2. New appointments

If the incumbent is not to be recommended for reappointment at the end of a first term, or if the incumbent is nearing the end of a second term, or if the incumbent has died, resigned or been removed, then the following procedure shall be followed: the committee will invite nominations, by whatever means it considers appropriate, from any person or group; it will advertise the position internally, and also externally if this seems appropriate; and it will establish criteria against which nominations and applications may be measured.

The committee will consider all names placed before it and will develop a short list of candidates as its first step in proceeding towards a recommendation. These candidates will be invited to meet with the committee and/or with such other persons and/or groups as it may determine. After screening candidates, the committee shall select the person it regards as most suitable for the position and submit its recommendation for the appointment of that candidate, in confidence, to the members of the **Senate Research and Innovation Graduate & Research Council**, the Faculty deans and the Vice-President, Academic & Provost. If the committee feels that two or more of the candidates are well qualified, it may choose to submit the choice between these, in confidence, to the members of the **Senate Research and Innovation Graduate & Research Council**, the Faculty deans and the Vice-President, Academic & Provost.

The members of the **Senate Research and Innovation Graduate & Research Council**, the Faculty Deans and the Vice-President, Academic & Provost will then have the opportunity to indicate the acceptability of each candidate, and their choice among candidates, in a secret ballot which shall be returned to the chair of the nominating committee. The results of the ballot shall be made known to the nominating committee. If the results of the ballot indicate that no candidate is acceptable to a majority of the members of the **Senate Research and Innovation Graduate & Research Council**, the Faculty Deans and the Vice-President, Academic & Provost, the nominating committee shall resume its screening activities. If the **Senate Research and Innovation Graduate & Research Council**, the Faculty Deans and the Vice-President, Academic & Provost generally approve a candidate, the nominating committee shall recommend the appointment of that candidate to Senate. When more than one candidate is generally acceptable and the ballot results indicate no clear preference, the nominating committee shall select the

person it regards as most suitable for the position and recommend the appointment of that candidate to Senate. If the results indicate that the candidate is unacceptable to a majority of Senate, the nominating committee shall resume its screening activities. If Senate approves the recommendation it shall be forwarded to the President. Upon receiving the report of the nominating committee and the recommendation of Senate, the President shall recommend an appointment to the Board of Governors.

All such discussions, in the committee and in Senate, will be carried out in confidence.

6. Removal of the Office Holder before expiration of term

A. General principles

The Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International may only be removed from office for cause. Cause is to be understood in relation to the duties of the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International as indicated by all relevant University policies. Causes for removal include negligence, incompetence, unprofessional conduct, and inability to maintain the confidence of the University research community.

Dismissal for cause from an administrative position is not to be confused with the dismissal for cause of a tenured faculty member. The criteria used and the procedures to be followed are different.

B. Reconciliation

In cases where the President becomes aware of serious problems, for example through individual submissions or a general petition, the President will, where appropriate, seek to mediate the situation as early as possible. Especially in cases of widespread disaffection or dissatisfaction with the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International the process of reconciliation may involve the holding of a meeting with members of the Senate Research and Innovation Graduate & Research Council for a full and frank discussion of concerns.

C. The setting-up of a formal inquiry

If the process of reconciliation fails or is inappropriate, then the President should determine whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant an inquiry into whether there is cause for removal. The Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International will be informed in writing of the President's decision and the basis for it, and be given an opportunity to respond. If the President believes that formal proceedings are necessary, the President will set up a formal inquiry. At the same time, the President may choose to suspend the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International, without prejudice, financial or otherwise, for the period of the inquiry, if this is warranted by the general interests of the University and of the individuals involved, and is compatible with principles of natural justice. In the case of suspension, the President will appoint an acting Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International so as to facilitate the operation of research affairs during that time.

D. Formal inquiry

The President will appoint a committee of three senior faculty members and inform the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International. The Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International may challenge, in writing, a member or members of the committee for bias, apprehension of bias or conflict of interest.

The committee shall determine its own procedures. However, in all its proceedings it shall be guided by principles of natural justice. In particular, it shall make sure that the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International has full knowledge of every charge, and has every opportunity to respond to these charges. On completion of its work, the committee shall report to the President with a recommendation, supported by reasons, that the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International either (1) continue in office (or be reinstated if temporary suspension has occurred) or (2) be removed for cause. The President will then take appropriate action. The report of the committee shall be made available to the Vice-President, ~~University~~ Research and International, the Vice-President, Academic & Provost and, at the discretion of the committee, to other concerned parties within the Senate Research and Innovation Graduate & Research Council.

For Information**Open Session - Consent**

To: Senate

From: Senate Graduate Council

Presenter(s): Justin Wan
Interim Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

Agenda Item: **9.5 Report of the Senate Graduate Council**

Summary

[Senate Graduate Council](#) met on [October 23, 2025](#) and agreed to forward the following items to Senate for information as part of the consent agenda. On behalf of Senate, the following items were approved:

1. Graduate Studies Academic Calendar Updates

Council approved the following proposed minor changes to the Graduate Studies Academic Calendar for:

- a. [Section 7.1 Graduate students' supervisors and committees](#)
- b. [Section 7.4.5 Minimum requirements for PhD degree: Thesis examination](#)
- c. [Section 13.3 Residence requirements](#)

2. New Scholarships and Awards

Council approved the following awards: Faculty of Mathematics Provost's Distinguished Inclusivity Doctoral Entrance Award (Math PD-IDEA); Thomas G. Howe Memorial Graduate Scholarship; Frank Deeg International Experience Award.

3. Curricular Submissions

Council approved the following new courses, the deletion of courses, and proposed minor changes to existing courses and programs for:

- a. [Faculty of Engineering](#)
- b. [Faculty of Environment](#)
- c. [Faculty of Science](#)

Jurisdictional Information

As outlined in the council's [Terms and Reference](#), Senate Graduate Council is empowered to make approvals on behalf of Senate for a variety of matters:

- Receive for information and make recommendation to Senate as appropriate with respect to governance, regulations, policies, and matters relating to graduate education and Studies at the University.
- On behalf of Senate, consider and approve all new graduate courses, the deletion of graduate courses, and proposed minor modifications to existing graduate courses and programs, and provide Senate with a brief summary of Council's deliberations in this regard.
- On behalf of Senate, consider and approve all new graduate scholarships and awards, and proposed changes to existing graduate scholarships and awards. Any matter of controversy that might arise may be referred to Senate.

Governance Path

Senate Graduate Council: October 23, 2025

For Information**Open Session - Consent**

To: Senate

From: Senate Research & Innovation Council

Presenter(s): Charmaine Dean
Vice President, Research and International

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

Agenda Item: 9.6 Report of the Senate Research & Innovation Council

Summary

The first meeting of the [Senate Research and Innovation Council](#) took place on [October 16, 2025](#). The council reviewed the draft Research Strategic Plan. The full draft can be found in the October 16, 2025 Senate Research and Innovation Council meeting book, starting on [page 4](#).

Jurisdictional Information

As outlined in the council's [Terms and Reference](#), Senate Research and Innovation Council is empowered to provide advice and guidance on behalf of Senate for a variety of matters:

- Provide advice and guidance to Senate on strategic matters relating to research at the University, including strategic research plans, annual report of the Vice-President Research and International, advancing institutional priorities related to research, and identifying emergent needs and areas for consideration related to university research.

Governance Path

Senate Research and Innovation Council: October 16, 2025

For Information**Open Session**

To: **Senate**

Sponsor: Vivek Goel, President and Vice-Chancellor Office of the
Contact Information: President

Presenter: Vivek Goel, President and Vice-Chancellor Office of the
Contact Information: President

Date of Meeting: **November 24, 2025**

Agenda Item: **9.7.1 Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members**

Summary:

Tenure provides institutional support for faculty members' academic freedom, enabling them to pursue and disseminate knowledge and to attain understanding through their scholarship and teaching, in an atmosphere in which free inquiry and discussion are fostered. Tenure provides security of employment in these pursuits, rooted in the belief that the University and society at large benefit from honest judgments and independent criticisms rendered by scholars who are free from fear of possible consequences that might arise from offending individuals or groups.

When assistant professors are granted tenure, they are also promoted to the rank of associate professor.

Promotions of associate professors to the rank of professor recognize a high order of achievement in scholarship and teaching, and satisfactory performance in service. A continuous program of scholarship with positive peer review by nationally and internationally recognized scholars is essential for promotion to professor.

Faculty members may apply for tenure following initial appointments usually totaling six years. Tenured associate professors normally serve at least five years at that level before applying for promotion to professor.

The list provided below includes faculty members who are to be awarded tenure and/or promoted, effective July 1, 2025, having followed the procedures outlined in [Policy 77 – Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members](#). As required by section 6 of that Policy, this information is reported to Senate for information.

Jurisdictional Information:

Tenure, Promotion and Permanence Committees at the department/school, Faculty, and University levels consider applications and make recommendations to the next level. The University Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee makes recommendations to the President on these tenure, permanence and promotion candidates,

and on the comparability of standards across the University. The president considers the recommendations and renders decisions.

Governance Path:

1. The candidate informs their department/school chair of their intention to apply for tenure and/or promotion and submits a candidate's brief.
2. Supporting documentation is compiled for consideration by the department/school Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee. After consideration of those documents, a recommendation is made to the Faculty Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee.
3. The Faculty Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee considers all positive tenure, permanence and promotion recommendations from the previous level to ensure careful and appropriate deliberations compared to standards across the faculty. They review negative recommendations from the previous level, unless the candidate chooses to withdraw their application. They provide candidates facing a potential negative recommendation with an opportunity to respond to concerns. Following this, they deliberate and forward their recommendations to the University Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee and the President.
4. The University Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee considers the full tenure and/or promotion file of each candidate and makes a recommendation on tenure and/or promotion to the President.
5. The President considers all tenure and/or permanence and promotion recommendations from the Faculty and University levels and renders a decision.
6. Negative tenure and/or permanence and promotion decisions rendered by the President may be appealed to the University Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Advisory Committee.

Successful Candidates:**AWARDED TENURE AND PROMOTED TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:****Faculty of Arts**

Alana Cattapan, Political Science

Jordana Cox, Communication Arts

Daniel Harley, Stratford School of Interaction Design and Business

Heather Love, English Language and Literature

Adam Molnar, Sociology and Legal Studies

Henry Adam Svec, Communication Arts

Christopher Taylor, History

Tyler Thomas, School of Accounting and Finance

Sarah Turnbull, Sociology and Legal Studies

Leah Zhang-Kennedy, Stratford School of Interaction and Design Business

Wenyao (Will) Zhao, Stratford School of Interaction and Design Business

Faculty of Engineering

Sahar Pirooz Azad, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Saeed Ghadimi, Management Science and Engineering

Trevor Hrynyk, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Kunho Eugene Kim, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Daniel Lacroix, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Zhao Pan, Mechanical and Mechatronics Engineering
Mahla Poudineh, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Yimin Wu, Mechanical and Mechatronics Engineering

Faculty of Health

Jason Au, Kinesiology and Health Sciences
Zahid A. Butt, School of Public Health Sciences

Faculty of Mathematics

Yousra Aafer, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science
David Del Rey Fernández, Applied Mathematics
Liqun Diao, Statistics and Actuarial Science
Xi He, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science
Stephen Melczer, Combinatorics and Optimization
Sophie Sprikl, Combinatorics and Optimization

Faculty of Science

Shamrozé Khan, School of Optometry & Vision Science
Dale Martin, Biology

PROMOTED TO PROFESSOR:

Faculty of Arts

Frances Condon, English Language and Literature
Stephanie Denison, Psychology
Fraser Easton, English Language and Literature
Kate Lawson, English Language and Literature
Ashley Rose Mehlenbacher, English Language and Literature

Faculty of Engineering

Sibel Alumur Alev, Management Science and Engineering
Hyock Ju Kwon, Mechanical and Mechatronics Engineering
Guo-Xing Miao, Electrical and Computer Engineering
John Zelek, Systems Design Engineering

Faculty of Environment

Brad Fedy, School of Environment, Resources and Sustainability
Juan Moreno-Cruz, School of Environment, Enterprise and Development
Prateep Nayak, School of Environment, Enterprise and Development

Faculty of Health

Shannon E. Majowicz, School of Public Health Sciences

Samantha Meyer, School of Public Health Sciences

James Wallace, School of Public Health Sciences

Faculty of Mathematics

Bin Li, Statistics and Actuarial Science

David Saunders, Statistics and Actuarial Science

Faculty of Science

Avery Broderick, Physics and Astronomy

Brian Kendall, Earth and Environmental Sciences

Graham Murphy, Chemistry

Germán Sciaini, Chemistry

William Wai Lun Wong, School of Pharmacy

For Information**Open Session - Consent**

To: Senate

From: Thomas Duever
Interim Vice-President, Academic & Provost

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

Agenda Item: **9.8.1 Faculty Appointments and Leaves**

Summary

The Faculty Reports for Senators' information regarding the variety of appointments, reappointments, special appointments, leaves, and other matters of interest about individuals in the Faculties are available on the [Senate agenda page](#).¹

¹ <https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/sites/default/files/uploads/documents/all-faculty-november-2025.pdf>

For Information**Open Session**

To: Senate

Presenter(s): Charmaine Dean
Vice President, Research and International

Date of Meeting: November 24, 2025

Agenda Item: 9.9 **Awards, Distinctions, Grants, Commercialization Activity, International Engagements**

Recommendation/Motion

This item is for information purposes.

Summary

This report summarizes successful commercialization, research and international outputs and outcomes for the period mid-September to mid-October 2025.

Proposal/Rationale

This report provides a summary of significant monthly outputs related to; awards and distinctions; funded research; commercialization and entrepreneurship and internationalization activities.

Documentation Provided

Attached – Vice-President, Research and International: Report to Senate, November 2025.

**Vice-President, Research & International
Report to Senate
November 2025**

Introduction

This report to Senate highlights successful research, commercialization and international outputs and outcomes for the period September to mid-October 2025.

Awards and Distinctions

Diogo Barradas and Urs Hengartner (School of Computer Science) and Yue Hu (Mechanical and Mechatronics Engineering)

[International Conference on Availability, Reliability, and Security \(ARES\) Best Research Paper](#)

Barradas, Hengartner, and Yu have won the Best Research Paper Award at the 20th International Conference on Availability, Reliability and Security (ARES), held in Ghent, Belgium, from August 10 to 13, 2025 for their paper, "[On the Feasibility of Fingerprinting Collaborative Robot Network Traffic.](#)"

Anita Layton (Applied Mathematics)

[Ernest H. Starling Distinguished Lecture](#)

Layton received the Ernest H. Starling Distinguished Lecture of the American Physiological Society (APS) Water & Electrolyte Homeostasis (WEH) Section for her research in the mathematical modeling of kidney function.

Alfred Yu (Electrical and Computer Engineering)

[2025 Carl Hellmuth Hertz Award](#)

Yu was presented this award by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), for his extensive contributions to ultrasound imaging technology and therapeutic ultrasound.

Funded Awards

NSERC Alliance-Mitacs Accelerate

Joint NSERC Alliance-Mitacs Accelerate grants support projects of varying scale and complexity, from short-term smaller projects involving one researcher to long-term projects involving researchers across several universities, and from one-on-one collaborations with a single partner organization directly involved in the research to projects involving many partner organizations across multiple sectors.

In this period, the [Holistic Innovation in Additive Manufacturing \(HI-AM 2.0\)](#) received funding.

Ehsan Toyserkani and Mihaela Vlasea (Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering)

Title: Holistic Innovation in Additive Manufacturing (HI-AM 2.0)

Amount: \$10.9M

Partners: University of Alberta, University of Victoria, Western, Dalhousie University, University of British Columbia, McGill, Laval University, Advanced Powders Coatings Inc., Flat Chrysler Automobiles, Titanium Metals Corp., Pratt & Whitney Canada, Metal Powder Works, GKN Powder Metallurgy Inc., Kymera International and Fujifilm.

The project focusses on training highly qualified professionals (HQPs) and developing technologies that reduce the environmental footprint of advanced manufacturing. The work builds on the previous HI-AM Network that addressed the challenges that prevented the industrial adoption of metal additive manufacturing and to equip Canada for the ongoing disruptions in manufacturing as a result of digital technologies and geopolitical contexts. The current funding will support seventeen collaborative projects, covering topics such as process optimization for advanced alloys, multi-scale modelling, digital twin modelling, machine learning applications in quality assurance for additive manufacturing and efforts to scale production through multi-laser and large-envelope processes.

SSHRC Partnership Engage

SSHRC Partnership Engage grants provide short-term and timely support for partnered research activities that will inform decision-making at a single partner organization from the public, private or not-for-profit sector. The stakeholder-driven partnerships supported through Partnership Engage Grants are meant to respond to immediate needs and time constraints facing organizations in non-academic sectors. In the winter 2025 competition, Waterloo had two successful grants.

Steffanie Scott (Co-Applicant – Geography and Environmental Management)

Title: Towards a sustainable food system for all: Strengthening food sovereignty in Waterloo Region

Partner: Food System Roundtable of Waterloo Region

Amount: \$24,933

Kübra Gülnaz Bülbül (Management Science and Engineering)

Title: Bridging Innovation and Regulation: An Evidence-Based Evaluation Framework for XR in Pilot Training

Partner: Transport Canada

Amount: \$25,000

Commercialization and Entrepreneurship Highlights

Students and entrepreneurial researchers are drawn to the University of Waterloo for its distinct innovation ecosystem that helps facilitate social change, develop early-stage inventions and launch commercial ventures.

Pitchbook Annual 2025 Top Universities, Ranked by Number of Start-up Founders

Waterloo ranked 2nd Nationally (behind University of Toronto) but moved up from 21st to 18th globally in the 2025 Pitchbook ranking of the total number of **undergraduate founders** whose companies received a round of venture funding between Jan. 1, 2014, and Sept. 1, 2025.

In the same ranking, Waterloo maintained its 4th place rank Nationally but moved up from 96th to 75th spot globally for the count of **graduate founders** who have received a round of venture capital funding.

International Activities

In this period, the following delegations and MOUs were executed:

- 1) *Enhancing International Priorities and Partnership Connections:*
 - Hosted a delegation from the University of Twente, Netherlands with representatives from NovelT and seven Dutch startups and companies seeking to expand their presence in the Canadian market and the Waterloo Region.
 - Hosted a delegation from the University of Oulu, Finland to build on the successful student exchange partnership and explore opportunities for deeper, research-based collaboration. Specifically, the delegation focused on:
 - Research matchmaking aligned with Horizon Europe to identify avenues for interdisciplinary collaboration
 - Facilitating access to external funding through joint initiatives
 - Enhancing researcher and student mobility and global learning opportunities
 - Gaining insights into Waterloo's experiential learning and student support models, including co-op education
 - Exploring the Centers for Student Success and Teaching Excellence
- 2) *Supporting International Talent Pipeline Development and Student Mobility:*
 - New Memorandum of Understanding and Program Agreement drafted with the Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Brazil towards the goals of:
 - Increasing collaboration between innovation and entrepreneurship hubs, including Velocity at Waterloo and both Laboratório de Engenharia de Software (LES) and Genesis at PUC-Rio.
 - Supporting early-stage founders and researchers to transform research into market-ready solutions
 - Sharing mentorship, pilot opportunities, and cross-incubator access for startups
 - Supporting market validation, commercialization, and innovation corridor development between Brazil and Canada