

Senate

Open & Confidential Sessions

June 8, 2026

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

Needles Hall

NH 3407

Waterloo Campus

Think Differently | Act with Purpose | Work Together

2026 06 08 Senate Meeting Book

AGENDA

	1. Governance Resources		
	1.1. Link to Governance Resources		
	2. OPEN SESSION		
3:30 p.m.	3. Territorial Acknowledgement [Pawelko]		
3:35 p.m.	4. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes [Goel]		
	4.1 Conflict of Interest	Information	4
	4.2 Approval of the Agenda and Consent Items	Decision	
	4.3 Minutes of the May 4, 2026 Meeting	Decision	5
	4.4 Business Arising from the Minutes	Information	
3:40 p.m.	5. Report of the President		
	5.1 General Update [Goel]	Information	10
3:45 p.m.	6. Report of the COU Academic Colleague		
	6.1 Annual Report of the COU Academic Colleague [Kline]	Information	11
3:55 p.m.	7. Report of the Teaching Awards Committee		
	7.1 Teaching Award Winners [DeVidi]	Information	16
4:05 p.m.	8. Institutional Priority Discussion - AI Enablement		
	8.1 AI Principles [Fieguth, Smith]	Information	21
4:25 p.m.	9. Report of the Senate Executive Committee		
	9.1 Senate Engagement Working Group Final Report [Deakin, Shantz]	Decision	23
4:55 p.m.	10. Report of the Senate Graduate Council [Wan]		
	10.1 Faculty of Arts	Decision	65
	10.2 Faculty of Engineering	Decision	71
	10.3 Faculty of Mathematics	Decision	76
	10.4 Office of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs	Decision	78
	11. Consent Agenda (Open Session)		
	11.1 UARC Annual Report	Information	81
	11.2 Senate By-election Results	Information	
	Report will be available once the by-election closes on June 4, 2026.		
	11.3 Housekeeping Amendments to Policy 68 – Vice-President, Research and International [A]	Decision	88
	11.4 Amendments to Policy 77 – Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members [F]	Decision	95
	11.5 Report of the Senate AQUE Committee	Information	110
	11.6 Report of the Senate Graduate Council	Information	111
	11.7 Report of the Senate Research and Innovation Council	Information	113
	11.8 Report of the Vice-President, Academic and Provost	Information	
	11.8.1 Faculty Appointments and Leaves	Information	114
	11.8.2 Report of the Teaching Assessment Processes Office	Information	115
	11.9 Report of the Vice-President, Research and International	Information	126
	12. Items Removed from the Consent Agenda		

13. Other Business (Open Session)

14. CONFIDENTIAL SESSION

5:05 p.m.

15. Report of the Vice-President, Advancement and External Relations

5:15 p.m.

16. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

17. Consent Agenda (Confidential Session)

18. Other Business (Confidential Session)

19. Adjournment

The next meeting of Senate will take place in the Fall.

For Information**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Gen Gauthier-Chalifour
University Secretary

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

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 Items

Motion: To approve the agenda as presented/amended, and to approve or receive for information the items on the consent agenda, listed as items 11.1 – 11.9 and 17.1 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 12.

4.3 Minutes of the May 4, 2026 Meeting

Motion: To approve the open minutes of the May 4, 2026 meeting, as distributed.

Documentation Provided:

- Open minutes of the May 4, 2026 meeting (item 4.3)

4.4 Business Arising from the Minutes

There is no business arising from the minutes.

University of Waterloo
SENATE
Minutes of the May 4, 2026 Meeting

Present: John Abraham, Nasser Abukhdeir, Yasmeen Almomani, Veronica Austen, Michael Barnett-Cowan, Jordan Bauman, Andrew Chang, David Clausi, Martin Cooke, Cecilia Cotton, Ray Darling, Hans De Sterck, Laura Deakin, Charmaine Dean, David DeVidi, Michael Drescher, Thomas Duever, Andrea Edginton, Mark Ferro, Paul Fieguth, Bruce Frayne, Gen Gauthier-Chalifour (Secretary), Vivek Goel (Chair), Vikas Gupta, Peter Hall, Kevin Hare, Nadine Ibrahim, Marc Jerry, Acey Kaspar, Misha Khan, Scott Kline, Jochen Koenemann, Sachin Kotecha, Christiane Lemieux, John Lewis, Ondrej Lhotak, Christopher Lim, Jun Liu, Lili Liu, Shana MacDonald, Carol Ann MacGregor, Blake Madill, Heather Mair, Colleen Maxwell, Peter Meehan, Sushanta Mitra, Richard Myers, Carter Neal, Christopher Nielsen, Alex Pawelko, David Porreca, Neil Randall, Arya Razmjoo, Jacinda Reitsma, Sharon Roberts, Beth Sandore Namachchivaya, Rida Sayed, Mark Seasons, Marcus Shantz, Samir Sharma, James Skidmore, Karen Sunabacka, Su-Yin Tan, Christopher Taylor, Alexie Tcheuyap, Katie Traynor, Sharon Tucker, Diana Vangelisti, Bojana Videkanic, Justin Wan, Johanna Wandel, Mary Wells, Jeffrey Wilson, Stan Woo, Clarence Woudsma, En-Hui Yang

Regrets: Laith Alkhalwaldeh, Aubrey Basdeo, Raouf Boutaba, Helen Chen, Teresa Fortney, Murray Gamble, Rob Gorbet, Chris Houser, Achim Kempf, Brad Lushman, Pendar Mahmoudi, James Nugent, Nicholas Pellegrino, Jessica Rindlisbacher, Meray Sadek, Jagdeep Singh Bachher

Guests/Resources: Kathy Acheson, Ashley Day, Nenone Donaldson, LeeAnne Ferries, Jenny Flagler-George, Diana Goncalves, Jason Grove, Diane Johnston, Andrea Kelman, Jennifer Kieffer, Tony Ly, Nick Manning, Christine McWebb, Ian Milligan, Fayaz Noormohamed, Judene Pretti, Chris Read, Nadia Singh, Jacob Watson, Tim Weber-Kraljevski

Organization of Meeting: Vivek Goel took the chair and Gen Gauthier-Chalifour acted as secretary. The secretary advised that a quorum was present.

1. Governance Resources

This item was provided for information only.

2. OPEN SESSION

The Chair called the meeting to order and welcomed all members to the meeting. The Chair welcomed Samir Sharma as a new ex-officio student member of Senate. Sharma began their term as WUSA President on May 1, 2026.

The Chair highlighted several items on the consent agenda related to elections and appointments and encouraged senators to share the call for nominations for the Senate by-election, which closes on May 7, 2026, with colleagues who may be interested in serving on Senate.

3. Territorial Acknowledgement

Jochen Koenemann, Dean of the Faculty of Mathematics, provided the territorial acknowledgement and offered a personal reflection.

4. Approval of the Agenda and Minutes

4.1. Conflict of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest declared.

4.2. Approval of the Agenda and Consent Items

A member requested that item 11.2 be pulled from the consent agenda. The Chair confirmed the item would be heard under item 12: Items removed from the consent agenda.

Another member of Senate and the Senate Engagement Working Group (SEWG) requested to defer item 6.1 Bylaw 1 Amendments to the June meeting of Senate as they felt many faculty were not able to review the material, and that the incoming President should be involved in the setting of new Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure.

Members discussed that the Bylaw will have two readings which allows ample time for members to provide input.

The Chair noted the incoming President had been briefed on the work of SEWG and the materials presented.

De Sterck and Porreca moved to defer the item. The motion did not carry.

A motion was heard to approve the agenda as amended, and to approve or receive for information the items on the consent agenda, listed as items 11.1 and 11.3-11.8 of the Senate agenda. Porreca and Pawelko. Carried.

4.3. Minutes of the April 6, 2026 Meeting

There were no amendments to the minutes.

A motion was heard to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2026 meeting, as distributed. Skidmore and Porreca. Carried.

4.4. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. Report of the President

5.1. General Update

Vivek Goel, President and Chair of Senate, reported that a joint event with the Balsillie School of International Affairs was held on April 7, 2026. It brought together more than 200 leaders from the community, academia, government, and the public and private sectors who had previously participated in the 2025 CEO Challenge Summit. Through the Waterloo Region AI Coalition, the University is partnering with Communitech and other community organizations to support small and medium-sized businesses. The initiative is expected to expand over time to include non-profits and health-care partners, with the goal of improving productivity through AI adoption. It is creating co-op opportunities for students in these organizations. The Ontario Minister of Finance highlighted the initiative in the budget speech, underscoring the University's strong community partnerships.

The University continues to work with the Waterloo Region Health Network to work on concepts for innovative collaboration as the new facility on the North Campus is designed. Work continues to develop a vision for a shared set of initiatives around innovation in healthcare and improvements in the delivery of health services.

The University was pleased to host Waterloo Mayor McCabe's State of the City address on April 16, 2026 at the Fieldhouse, with over 400 people in attendance. The event demonstrated the University's engagement with the community and showcased the Fieldhouse.

On April 28, 2026, Minister of Finance, Francois-Philippe Champagne, tabled the Spring Economic Update, and more significantly, days later chose to visit the University of Waterloo

campus, toured a number of facilities, and engaged with students and faculty. Champagne commended UW students during the visit.

6. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

6.1. Senate Engagement Working Group Update

Laura Deakin and Marcus Shantz, Co-Chairs of the Senate Engagement Working Group, provided an update on the progress of the working group and an overview of the proposed Bylaw 1 amendments and draft Rules of Procedure, as included in the meeting materials. The proposed amendments include housekeeping changes, clarification regarding the calling of special meetings, and the introduction of informal sessions. The draft Rules of Procedure establish a procedural framework for the orderly, transparent, and equitable conduct of Senate business, while supporting respectful debate and consideration of diverse perspectives.

Members discussed the documents, including the process for requesting a special meeting, the use and limitations of speaking rules, the role and mandate of the Senate Executive Committee, and opportunities to encourage broader participation in Senate discussions. Some members commented positively on the addition of informal sessions.

A member requested that their feedback to the working group receive a response and asked about next steps for providing additional feedback. Gen Gauthier-Chalifour, University Secretary, noted that the working group would share an invitation to a future engagement session for members to provide further feedback. The final draft documents would be presented at the June meeting of Senate, should the working group determine they are ready for Senate approval.

7. Report of the Senate Undergraduate Council

7.1. Faculty of Science

David DeVidi, Chair of the Senate Undergraduate Council, spoke to the modification, as presented in the meeting materials.

A motion was heard that Senate approve the major modifications for the Biochemistry Specialization, Biology Specialization, and Biotechnology Specialization for the Faculty of Science, effective September 1, 2027, as presented. DeVidi and Deakin. Carried.

8. Policy

8.1. Amendments to Policy 70 – Student Petitions and Grievances

Tom Duever, Interim Vice-President, Academic and Provost, spoke to the amendments to Policy 70, as provided in the meeting materials. The draft provided has been through extensive consultation and reflects existing practices.

The undergraduate student members spoke to the inclusion of students in the consultation process, and their support of the recent amendments in response to student concerns. They noted their view that petition committees should have student representatives. Members discussed the sensitive materials that are provided to committee members, consistency between Faculties and that different programs have different requirements.

The Chair noted that the policy has been under review for a number of years and committed to ongoing conversations with students about where students could be included in the process as appropriate.

A member noted an editorial correction under 8.16 where the incorrect policy number is listed. It was confirmed this would be corrected in the final version.

A motion was heard that Senate approve the amended Policy 70 – Student Petitions and Grievances, as amended, effective June 1, 2026. Duever and Pawelko. Carried.

9. Annual Reports

9.1. Annual Report from FAUW

David Porreca, President of FAUW, presented the Annual Report. Porreca highlighted accomplishments from the past year, including personnel changes; governance and strategic planning initiatives, including a governance review that will be completed soon; events such as the Hagey Lecture Series; ongoing discussions related to the restructuring of the Board Pension and Benefits Committee; and policies currently in development. There were no questions.

9.2. Co-operative and Experiential Education Report

Judene Pretti, Interim Associate Provost, Co-operative and Experiential Education, presented the Co-operative and Experiential Education (CEE) Report, as provided in the meeting materials. Pretti highlighted the Student at the Centre approach and areas of focus for the year, including modern systems and data; a well-designed learning experience; strong employer partnerships; and the importance of research and expertise. There were no questions.

9.3. UCSA Annual Report on Student Appeals

David DeVidi, Co-Chair of the University Committee on Student Appeals (UCSA), spoke to the report, as provided in the meeting materials.

Members discussed AI-related appeals and how faculty determine whether AI has been used inappropriately. DeVidi noted that the number of AI-related cases is increasing and that, as a community, there is a need to explore what students should know before graduating and how knowledge and use of AI should be assessed.

The Chair noted that an update on the development of AI Principles would be provided at the June meeting of Senate.

10. Report of the Senate Research and Innovation Council

Charmaine Dean, Vice-President, Research and International, and Chair of the Senate Research and Innovation Council (SRIC), provided a verbal update on recent consultations related to defence research. Dean noted the University's longstanding involvement in defence-related research and the growing regional and national momentum related to dual-use applications and nation-building initiatives. Follow-up consultations hosted by the Office of the Vice-President, Research and International, with participation from all faculties, highlighted the broad scope of relevant research areas, including cybersecurity, health, artificial intelligence, food security, environmental monitoring, and global governance.

Dean emphasized the importance of academic freedom, oversight of partnerships, and reputational considerations, and noted that the University is well positioned to contribute in ways that align with its values, strengths, and broader societal contributions.

A member asked for clarification regarding weapons-related research. Dean noted that grant proposal calls are distributed broadly, include mechanisms for transparency, and should remain open to researchers to pursue. Another member emphasized the importance of recognizing the ongoing peace-related work being undertaken across the University, including within the Faculty of Arts.

11. Consent Agenda

The following items were approved/received for information as part of the consent agenda motion for approval under item 4.2.

- 11.1. Filling Vacancy on Senate Executive Committee – Appointment of the New Member
- 11.3. 2026 faculty at Large Senator By-Election – Call for Nominations

- 11.4. Report of the AQUE Committee
- 11.5. Report of the Senate Research and Innovation Council
- 11.6. Report of the Senate Undergraduate Council
- 11.7. Report of the Vice-President Academic and Provost
- 11.8. Report of the Vice-President, Research and International

12. Items Removed from the Consent Agenda

A senator requested to remove item 11.2 2026-2027 Senators to Board of Governors Election Results from the consent agenda. The senator asked for clarification of how the upcoming vacancy of the undergraduate student Board seat would be filled for the June Board meeting.

Gauthier-Chalifour confirmed that a motion to fill the vacancy would be brought forward to the May SEC and June Senate meetings. The Secretariat is working with the undergraduate student senators to bring a nomination forward.

The Chair called for nominations from the floor. There were none.

A motion was heard that Senate ratify the acclamation of the undergraduate and graduate student members to the Board of Governors for the 2026-2027 governance year. Pawelko and Porreca. Carried.

13. Other Business

There were no other items of business.

14. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:48p.m. The next meeting of Senate will be on Monday June 8, 2026.

May 4, 2026

Ashley Day
Associate University Secretary

For Information**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Vivek Goel
President and Vice-Chancellor

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

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 Information**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Scott Kline
Chair, Religious Studies; and COU Academic Colleague

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **6.1 Annual Report of the COU Academic Colleague**

The COU Academic Colleague reports annually to Senate. The following is a summary of meetings since the last report in June 2025.

Summary of Meetings**1. Academic Colleagues Meeting, August 12-13, 2025****Discussion Theme: The Council of Ontario Universities and Academic Colleagues**

As this was the first meeting of the new year, and there were many new Colleagues, COU staff provided an overview of the COU and the role of the Academic Colleague.

Updates and Reports—Highlights

Steve Orsini, COU President, provided an update on [COU's response to Bill 33](#). Orsini noted that COU had taken a public position that Ontario universities already maintain strong standards of transparency, accountability, and student success through established governance systems and policies. COU raised significant concern about Schedule 3 of Bill 33, stating that the legislation could undermine university autonomy, create unnecessary administrative burdens, and duplicate existing accountability measures without addressing the real causes of student access challenges. The COU reaffirmed that Ontario universities were intentionally established as autonomous institutions, protected from government interference through governing legislation and Royal Charters. Moreover, based on the principle of institutional autonomy, the Ontario university sector opposes the Ontario government's proposed regulatory powers over admissions and ancillary fees—also noting that admissions policies are already transparent and effectively managed through existing institutional processes and public information systems. Instead of imposing new regulations, the COU argued, the Ontario government should expand enrolment funding and student spaces to meet increasing demand. Regarding research security, Ontario universities should follow federal regulations and guidelines, which would have the benefit of avoiding unnecessary duplication resulting from the implementation of any provincial measures. [Note: [Bill 33 passed November 19, 2025](#)]

2. Academic Colleagues Meeting, October 22-23, 2025

Discussion Theme: Civil Discourse and Academic Freedom in Higher Education

Dr. Randy Boyagoda, Professor of English and Provostial Advisor on Civil Discourse at University of Toronto, spoke with Academic Colleagues on the topic of civil discourse and academic freedom in higher education, drawing on the work of the [U of T's Working Group on Civil Discourse](#). He explained that although the group did not settle on a single definition of "civil discourse," it generally means "thinking out loud together" as members of the university seek to deepen understanding, broaden perspectives, and contribute to the public good. He argued that maintaining space for civil discourse is essential for universities. He noted that recent global events have highlighted longstanding challenges in sustaining respectful disagreement and productive dialogue on campuses and in society more broadly. At the same time, these challenges present an opportunity to develop a distinctly Canadian approach to disagreement and dialogue that values openness, respect, and democratic engagement. Through its work, the group identified several major barriers to effective civil discourse: low levels of trust among leadership, faculty, students, and staff; differing perceptions of power and authority; the impact of social media and other technologies; debates around "institutional neutrality," including what the term means in principle and in practice; and the importance of context when determining appropriate responses to conflict or disagreement. During the discussion, Colleagues raised concerns regarding various understandings and responses related to "civil discourse" and "free expression," including the experiences of marginalized communities being silenced in the name of "un-civil discourse" when they challenged authority or structural injustice. One key takeaway is that U of T adopted an approach to "free expression" that prioritized cultivating a culture of free expression instead of developing clear policies—and there remains much work to do.

3. 320th Meeting of Council, October 23, 2025

In addition to attending to its governance responsibilities, Council engaged in a discussion on civil discourse in higher education, which was led by the Colleagues. Building on remarks by Randy Boyagoda in the Colleagues' meeting the previous evening, presenters outlined an argument for civil discourse through free speech principles, training, and supports for faculty and students. Of particular concern is social media's influence. In the face of disagreement, civil discourse must be rooted in empathy, respect, listening, and engagement. Challenges facing universities include discomfort with difficult conversations and the lack of sector-wide best practices (e.g., prioritizing policy, cultural transformation, training). Among other issues discussed were protecting faculty who engage in controversial scholarship and research, encouraging diverse perspectives, defining limits related to hate speech (noting the high bar established in law), and creating "brave spaces" for dialogue. Additionally, it was noted that learning and debate in universities may involve significant discomfort; but discomfort must be distinguished from being unsafe. Participants also stressed that civil discourse should align with equity, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility goals while cautioning that institutional policies may restrict speech in unintended ways.

4. Academic Colleagues Meeting, December 9-10, 2025

Discussion Theme: AI in Teaching and Research

[William Turkel](#), Professor of History at Western University, discussed the growing role of AI in teaching and research, emphasizing AI as a methodological tool rather than simply a technology. Drawing from his experience teaching 21st-century history, as well as many years engaging the study of science and technology, he argued that instructors must

prioritize adaptability and improvisation because AI evolves rapidly. For students, developing transferable skills and the ability to synthesize information is more important than memorizing facts or mastering fixed tools. Dr. Turkel noted that AI is reshaping the workforce and may accelerate changes to entry-level jobs, while also creating opportunities for universities to prepare students for more advanced responsibilities. He suggested AI will transform PhD education by placing greater emphasis on strategic thinking and proposal development over traditional comprehensive exams.

Vivek Goel, University of Waterloo President and Chair of the COU Artificial Intelligence Task Force, engaged Academic Colleagues as part of the task force's consultations. Colleagues highlighted both opportunities and risks associated with AI adoption. Key themes included the need for clearer academic integrity policies, AI literacy, responsible disclosure of AI use in assignments, institutional readiness to adapt to a new educational climate and culture, equitable access to AI tools, and preserving interpersonal collaboration within university communities.

Updates and Reports—Highlights

Steve Orsini, COU President, updated Colleagues on key sector priorities, highlighting ongoing financial pressures facing universities, worsened by further federal reductions to international student allocations. Orsini emphasized COU's advocacy for stable, long-term provincial funding through continued engagement with government officials, including a Lobby Day at Queen's Park and meetings with Minister Nolan Quinn. Orsini also discussed COU's work on artificial intelligence, focused on helping universities prepare students and support economic transformation. Colleagues reinforced universities' vital role in addressing Canada's productivity and innovation challenges.

5. Academic Colleagues Meeting, February 10-11, 2026

Discussion Theme: Outline of COU Paper on the Future of Postsecondary Education

Steve Orsini, the COU President, provided an advocacy update and sought feedback on a draft paper exploring the future of postsecondary education. He noted that COU's presentation to Ontario's Standing Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs received positive attention and significant media coverage. Developed with the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV), the draft paper aims to guide discussions on the future of higher education and support participation in national conversations alongside organizations such as Business + Higher Education Roundtable and Higher Education Strategy Associates. The paper highlights pressures including AI, globalization, economic change, and climate issues, while emphasizing universities' roles in talent development, research, and civic life. Priorities include lifelong learning, AI-enabled education, work-integrated learning, sustainability, stronger partnerships, and improved student supports, all dependent on long-term financial sustainability.

Updates and Reports—Highlights

Chris Evans, Executive Director, and Cindy Robinson, Director of Operations, Quality Assurance Secretariat, delivered a presentation which covered the role and importance of quality assurance at Ontario's universities and the key elements of the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF). In the discussion that followed, Colleagues shared comments on the timelines for new program approvals and the administrative workload associated with QAF requirements.

6. Academic Colleagues Meeting, April 14-15, 2026

Discussion Theme: Academic Delivery in the Artificial Intelligence Context

[Mark Daley](#), Chief AI Officer at Western University and Vice-Chair of the COU AI Task Force, discussed how artificial intelligence is reshaping higher education. He argued that AI's rapid advancement, including self-improving systems (namely, agentic AI, which he sees as a "game changer"), challenges universities' traditional role as primary sources of knowledge dissemination. In response, universities may increasingly emphasize their credentialing, social, and collaborative functions, including group problem-solving, clinical learning, and serving as neutral convenors for society and industry. In effect, Daley sees a comprehensive shift coming for universities: e.g., changing student demand for academic programming, new ways of transferring knowledge (both through teaching and research knowledge mobilization), and reassessing the value of a university education and the university experience. During the discussion, it was asserted that, while students may use AI to complete assignments, universities must help them understand the value of independent learning and skill development. The discussion also highlighted AI's potential to transform white-collar work, strengthen interdisciplinary research, and elevate the importance of humanities and arts. In other words, an integrated-AI world means major social and economic ramifications for which universities must be prepared—especially as some of these changes will challenge the underlying rationale for the modern university. These changes reinforce the need for institution-wide discussions regarding AI integration and strategic planning involving students, faculty, and communities. Throughout the discussion, several ethical concerns were also raised, including AI's concentration within a few corporations and their ability to influence global perspectives.

[Note: Much of Daley's presentation was based on his article, "[Rethinking the Role of Higher Education in an AI-Integrated World](#)," which appeared in *University Affairs*, in February 2026. I would highly recommend this to anyone interested in the future of the university.]

Updates and Reports—Highlights

Steve Orsini, President of COU, updated Colleagues on COU's ongoing discussions with the ministry and government officials regarding the [funding announcement in February 2026](#).

7. 321st Meeting of Council, April 16, 2026

The Academic Colleagues brought the topic of universities in an AI-integrated world to Council for discussion. Based on Mark Daley's presentation and the ensuing discussion in the Colleague's meeting the night before, the Colleagues highlighted five questions and themes:

- "What does a university become in a world where AI can outperform humans in many knowledge tasks? [Theme: Purpose of the University]
- "If AI can do the work, what are we actually teaching—and how do we preserve academic freedom while doing it?" [Theme: Students, Pedagogy, and Academic Freedom]
- "Assume fewer students, less funding, and widespread AI. What does the university look like?" [Theme: The Future Model ... Under Pressure]
- How is AI already transforming research? How might AI develop that will further change how we do research? [Theme: AI and the Transformation of Research; Note: This question is prompted, in large part, by the advent of agentic AI]
- What are the ethical challenges posed by AI as they relate to our understanding of being human, its impact on society and the economy, the generation of knowledge,

and the place of the university as space for learning? [Theme: Ethics, Society, and the Human Being]

Updates and Reports—Highlights

Steve Orsini, President of COU, briefed Council on ongoing discussions with the ministry related to the budget announcement in February 2026. He also noted that he was part of the AI discussion with Colleagues the prior evening; and he was looking forward to the publication of the COU's AI task force's report.

8. Academic Colleagues Meeting, May 13, 2026

Discussion Theme: Follow-Up on AI Discussion from the April Meetings

The Colleagues' presentation to Council generated significant conversation. Interest was expressed in having the Colleagues refine their speaking notes to share them with COU. Members also expressed interest in having the Colleagues consider the following questions: (1) What might be the best mechanism(s) to foster collaboration around AI adoption between Senates or equivalent, Academic Colleagues and Executive Heads? (2) How might Academic Colleagues contribute to advancing cross-departmental, cross-university conversations about AI on their own campuses? Several proposals regarding next steps and potential Colleague-led initiatives (or studies) were discussed. Preparatory work will begin following the [public release of the COU AI Task Force's report on May 29, 2026](#). Starting in August 2026, Colleagues will likely embark on work that will complement recommendations in the task force's report.

For Information**Open Session**

To:	Senate
Presenter:	David DeVidi Associate Vice-President, Academic
	Justin Wan Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs
Date of Meeting:	June 8, 2026
Agenda Item:	7.1 2026 Teaching Award Winners

Summary

In January 2026, Senate appointed the membership of two teaching awards committees. The committees have now completed their work and will announce the recipients at the June 8 meeting of Senate. Senate will receive presentations from two award recipients: Nijani Nagaarudkumaran (AETS) and Brent Doberstein (DTA).

Distinguished Teacher Awards (DTA) Winners**Rania Al-Hammoud**

Rania Al-Hammoud, Associate Professor, Teaching Stream, Associate Chair, in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, is recognized as a supportive, enthusiastic, and hands-on educator. Her dedication to student success and inclusive teaching creates an environment where students feel empowered to grow both academically and personally. One student reflected on her impact: "Dr. Rania Al-Hammoud has been the most influential professor in my undergraduate studies; her guidance and encouragement have had a profound effect on my personal and professional growth."

Another student highlighted her teaching style: "She redesigned the curriculum to include at-home hands-on experiments using household materials paired with virtual collaborative sessions that connected us as a globally dispersed team of students."

A colleague emphasized her broader contributions: "Rania also demonstrates a consistent commitment to inclusive teaching. She incorporates physical models and demonstration kits to support conceptual understanding, particularly for learners who benefit from visual and kinesthetic approaches."

Yu-Ru Liu

Yu-Ru Liu, professor in the Department of Pure Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics, is known for her thoughtful, organized, and student-centered teaching. She is deeply committed to fostering inclusive learning environments and supporting students both inside and outside the classroom. One student shared: "Professor Liu was a great lecturer! She was always answering students' questions, very organized, and set the course up to ensure students learned as much as possible. I was really touched when she recognized my hard work – it helped improve my confidence and made me even more motivated."

Another student described her teaching approach: "She structured the course so we were not spectators but active participants, as mathematicians. Proof-writing ceased to feel like sorcery."

Professor Liu always met uncertainty with patience and clarity. She helped me recognize relevant ideas, and little by little, material that once felt difficult became trivial."

A colleague highlighted her leadership and impact: "Yu-Ru has demonstrated outstanding leadership. Her tireless efforts have significantly enhanced WiM's flagships programs and launched new initiatives, all while fostering strong collaboration with various academic and administrative units within the Faculty of Mathematics."

Daniel Smilek

Daniel Smilek, professor in the Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts, is recognized for his engaging, enthusiastic, and highly effective teaching. With over two decades of experience, he consistently creates dynamic learning environments where complex ideas become accessible and compelling. One student reflected: "He is the best lecturer I have had over my four years at this university. First, he is notably enthusiastic in teaching and this content, which drew me in to his lectures and the subject. His presenting/public speaking is very succinct, enjoyable and easy to follow. Rather than being a lecture that is monotone, hard to understand or hard to follow, you actually have to try hard not to be engaged when listening to him."

Another student highlighted his teaching style: "He is very engaging; he explains such complex concepts in simple terms that makes students want to come to his class. He answers questions and has a vast knowledge of the subjects that he can connect things that are seemingly unrelated in a matter of seconds. For many teachers it is the content and material that makes the class enjoyable, however for Daniel Smilek, it is himself as a professor and person that made his course so impactful."

A colleague emphasized his broader impact: "Over the course of his career he has published over 180 scientific peer reviewed journal articles in top journals in the field, and nearly every one of this long list of publications has a current or past trainee as a co-author, typically as first!"

Brent Doberstein

Brent Doberstein, Associate Professor, Interim Associate Chair of Graduate Studies in the Department of Geography and Environmental Management, Faculty of Environment, is known for his engaging, approachable, and deeply impactful teaching. His passion for the subject and genuine connection with students create a welcoming environment that inspires curiosity and long-term academic growth. One student shared: "What truly distinguishes Dr. Doberstein from other profs is his kindness, approachability, and dedication. instructor; his lectures are always engaging, easy to understand, and insightful. His down-to-earth nature creates a comforting environment where students are at ease asking questions and excited to attend class."

Another student highlighted his broader influence: "Dr. Doberstein was one of the most widely beloved professors I encountered over my undergraduate degree, and it was easy to understand why. Dr. Doberstein's warmth, depth of knowledge and passion for the subject made classes engaging, and the lessons I learned from him continue to shape my work every day."

A colleague emphasized his lasting impact: "I have lost count of the number of students who have told me that they have pursued a minor, or transferred into our programs because Brent's teaching, his passion for the topic, and his ability to connect with students has inspired their interest in the discipline."

Amit & Meena Chakma Award for Exceptional Teaching by a Student (AETS) Winners:

Alexa Bennett

Alexa Bennett believes exceptional teaching extends far beyond course content. When she designed a 9-week field course in Ghana, she built an entire learning experience, from field trips to coastal erosion sites and lab activities on microplastics in fish, to community engagement with local Non-

Governmental Organizations and nightly debrief sessions to help students process what they were seeing.

"My approach centres on creating place-based learning opportunities where students can engage deeply with the topics they study, follow their curiosity, and connect theory with real-world contexts through direct experience," Bennett says.

The care she brought to every dimension of the course left a deep impression. When a student fell ill, she arranged clinic access and stayed with them through treatment. When logistical chaos threatened to derail a flight connection mid-journey, she acted quickly enough to save the group hours of delay.

"Without her guidance this course would not have been possible, and without her caring personality and leadership, this course would not have been nearly as enjoyable," wrote one nominating student.

Her teaching draws on innovative methods, including cross-cultural debates with students from the University of Cape Coast, flexible assignments that allowed students to demonstrate learning through blogs or videos, and weekly one-on-one check-ins with every student. For Bennett, those methods reflect a deeper intention: "I want students to recognize that to be a researcher or a scientist is not to separate ourselves from our humanity. Rather, science is a way of engaging with the world in informed, ethical, and responsive ways."

Amy Tai

Before Amy Tai's first session of SYDE 223, she reached out to previous instructors and teaching assistants to ask what had worked well. She then surveyed her own students about their goals, adjusted her approach based on their feedback throughout the term and spent her evenings designing activities that made exam preparation feel like something other than dread.

One of those activities became a memorable end-of-term tradition: an elaborate class-wide puzzle built from more than 20 practice sheets, each leading to a letter, the completed message reading "You are going to do great."

That same spirit carried through everything Tai did in the course. Her PhD research in computer vision shaped how she taught and pushed her to prioritize understanding over memorization. "In research, you're constantly asking why something works and adapting ideas to new problems," she says, "so I tried to bring that mindset into the classroom by focusing on conceptual understanding, encouraging questions, and showing how abstract ideas connect to real-world problem-solving."

She also made the course's long-term relevance explicit. Having gone through the engineering at Waterloo herself, she remembered data structures and algorithms as critical for software interviews and wanted students to see that value before it was in hindsight. She organized mock interviews and LeetCode sessions for students searching for co-op placements, helped students refine their résumés and tagged them on LinkedIn at the end of term to support their professional networks.

For one student who entered the course with a long history of struggling with programming, the effect was lasting. "Her teaching reshaped how I viewed myself as a learner in technical subjects," that student wrote, "which is something I had not experienced or expected to experience with a programming course."

Jeffrey Lee

Jeffrey Lee's title in the fall 2025 term was teaching assistant for ME 380. In practice, for much of the term, he took on the role of course instructor. When the course instructor required emergency medical leave, Lee stepped in without hesitation. Lee maintained the curriculum, held weekly meetings with every design group and provided high-level technical feedback on fabrication and test validation throughout the term. Professor Armaghan Salehian, who nominated him for the award, said Lee's

"composed demeanor and professional competence mitigated potential disruptions, allowing the class to focus on learning during a period of uncertainty."

Much of what makes Lee effective traces back to his own experience as a Mechatronics student. "I remember how intimidating it can feel to be surrounded by so many smart and hardworking people," he says. "At times, that made me hesitant to ask questions because I didn't want to seem like I was falling behind." Because of that, he works deliberately to lower the barrier by building an approachable environment where students feel comfortable raising their hand in class, stopping by office hours or sending a quick question over Teams. "Having this openness to communication allows me to respond quickly and often resolve confusion in just a few minutes, potentially saving students hours of frustration," he says.

For one student who entered MTE 380 after a long period of illness and academic uncertainty, that presence made all the difference. "It was the first time in a long time that I felt someone on a teaching team truly believed in me and wanted me to succeed," she wrote. "Being successful in MTE 380 became a major source of confidence for me heading into fourth year and beyond."

Nijani Nagaarudkumaran

Nijani Nagaarudkumaran has been a teaching assistant in Optometry and Vision Science for more than four years, teaching laboratory courses in microscopy, ocular anatomy and neuroanatomy. Beyond her extensive TA experience in leading undergraduate students, Nagaarudkumaran has also mentored new graduate student teaching assistants through their first teaching experiences, sharing resources and providing ongoing support.

Her approach has been shaped both by experience and by deliberate investment in her own development as an educator. Completing the University of Waterloo's Fundamentals of University Teaching program helped her identify effective teaching strategies, including open-ended questioning to draw out student thinking and drawing diagrams to support visualization before checking comprehension. Her doctoral research reinforced the same instinct. "Throughout my research career, I have had to communicate my research to audiences from varying backgrounds," Nagaarudkumaran says. "I believe this has shaped the way I teach. Students appreciate it when you can simplify concepts to help them understand."

Her genuine support of her students came through clearly in what students wrote about her. "Whenever I had a question she could not immediately answer, she always took the initiative to research it and fostered a collaborative learning environment where we expanded our knowledge together," wrote one nominating student. For those who went through her labs during some of the most demanding years of their academic lives, the effect went beyond the material. "I can wholeheartedly say that Nijani was one of the main reasons I felt excited to show up to school and lab," wrote another.

"My main goal has always been to ensure that students have a positive learning experience and are in an environment where they feel comfortable to ask questions," Nagaarudkumaran says. "I am extremely happy to have contributed to their education in optometry school."

About the Awards:

The **Distinguished Teacher Awards (DTA)** are awarded to exemplary instructors at the University of Waterloo. The awards are open to all who teach at the University, and the main criterion of the award is a record of excellent teaching. The committee considers: evidence of intellectual vigour and communication skills in the interpretation and presentation of subject matter; evidence of educational impact beyond the classroom; the instructor's concern for and sensitivity to the needs of students; and a clear indication that the nominee has a favorable and lasting influence on students, and, where relevant, on colleagues. The DTA is awarded to four instructors annually and individuals are

announced at the April meeting of Senate. The committee is appointed by Senate and consists of three undergraduate students, two graduate students, one alumni representative, three members of faculty (typically previous winners of the award), and the associate vice-president, academic as chair.

The **Amit & Meena Chakma Award for Exceptional Teaching by a Student (AETS)** awards are open to all students who have a formal teaching role at the University of Waterloo. Up to four awards are given annually in recognition of excellence in teaching of all kinds by registered students (e.g., teaching assistant, laboratory demonstrator, sessional lecturer). The selection committee considers intellectual vigour and communication skills in the interpretation and presentation of subject matter. Concern for and sensitivity to the academic need of the students is an important criterion. The committee is appointed by Senate and consists of three undergraduate students, two graduate students, two members of faculty, and the associate vice-president, graduate studies, and postdoctoral affairs as chair.

For Information**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Paul Fieguth, AVP, Academic Operations
Gregory Smith, Chief Information Officer

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **8.1 University of Waterloo AI Principles**

Summary

The proposed UW AI Principles have been discussed and presented to a great many groups over the course of nearly a year. The AI Principles are being brought forward to Senate for awareness and discussion.

Proposal/Rationale

The current set of principles have been listed as “proposed” for nearly a year, and there are many other AI-related initiatives taking place all over campus. The University is seeking to have established AI principles, so that we have a common, UW-wide agreed-upon foundation to refer to as AI ideas are proposed, and the basis upon which to judge them.

Based on extensive consultations (as listed on the second page), the proposed AI principles are:

Safe & Fair Use: Responsible, ethical, inclusive AI

We proactively consider the responsible and ethical use of AI, including energy use and climate impacts, protecting privacy, respecting data rights, compliance with laws and policies, and actively checking for bias, working to make AI safe and fair. (*Act with Purpose, Work Together*)

Purpose First: AI that matters

We use AI deliberately to enhance learning, research, and campus life. (*Act with Purpose*)

Human Agency: People in control

AI supports human judgment. We remain accountable for outcomes. (*Act with Purpose, Work Together*)

Shared Learning: Empowering our community

We equip students, staff, and faculty members with the skills to engage with AI confidently and critically. (*Work Together*)

Exploration: Courage to experiment

We explore, learn from mistakes, and iterate thoughtfully, sparking fresh ideas and innovative solutions. (*Think Differently*)

Jurisdictional Information

N/A

Governance Path

Deans Council – September 24, 2025

Executive Council – October 2, 2025

Council of Academic Leaders – October 30, 2025

Faculty Relations Committee – October 30, 2025

Graduate Students Relations Committee – November 4, 2025

Undergraduate Students Relations Committee – November 5, 2025

Executive Council – November 6, 2025

Deans Council – November 26, 2025

Senate Undergraduate Council – December 9, 2025

Research Operations Council – December 10, 2025

Staff Relations Committee – December 11, 2025

Senate Graduate Council / Senate Research & Innovation Council – January 13, 2026

Deans Council - May 6, 2026

Senate – June 8, 2026

Documentation Provided

N/A

For Approval**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Laura Deakin
Marcus Shantz
Co-Chairs, Senate Engagement Working Group

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **9.1 Senate Engagement Working Group Final Report**

Recommendations

That Senate approve the following governance documents, as presented to Senate:

- Rules of Procedure of the University of Waterloo Senate;
- University of Waterloo Senate Roles and Responsibilities; and
- Procedures for Senate Elections and Appointments;

to take effect immediately following adjournment of the June 8, 2026 meeting; and

That approval of these documents shall expire on June 30th, 2028, unless renewed, amended, or replaced by Senate prior to that date.

And

That Senate approve the revisions to Senate Bylaw 1, as presented to Senate, to take effect immediately following adjournment of the June 8, 2026 meeting; and

That the revisions to Senate Bylaw 1 approved on June 8, 2026, shall expire on June 30, 2028, unless renewed, amended, or replaced by Senate prior to that date.

Summary

On September 22, 2025, Senate passed a motion to establish an ad hoc Working Group to review current practices and opportunities to enhance senator engagement. Over the past several months, the [Senate Engagement Working Group \(SEWG\)](#) met 13 times as part of its mandate to strengthen Senate engagement and effectiveness. Through discussions, the Working Group has developed a suite of governance and procedural documents intended to reduce barriers to participation, enhance transparency, and support meaningful engagement by senators.

Updates on the work of the SEWG were provided to Senate on January 26, 2026, and regular updates were provided to the Senate Executive Committee. Feedback from Senators was elicited following the January 26, 2026 meeting and could be submitted through an online feedback form or direct email to the Co-Chairs. Draft documents outlining proposed changes to Senate Bylaw 1 and proposed rules of procedure were shared with Senate in late April for discussion at the May 4 meeting. Two additional documents outlining proposed election procedures and roles and responsibilities for Senators were shared with Senators on

May 14, 2026 in anticipation of an engagement session held by the SEWG on May 19, 2026, and open to all senators to discuss and provide feedback on the draft documents.

The resulting documents reflect extensive discussion and deliberation by the Working Group, informed by feedback received through the engagement process. A final report from the co-chairs is also provided to accompany the resulting documents and recommendations.

Jurisdiction

In accordance with the Senate Engagement Working terms of reference:

2. Responsibilities

- Review existing governance frameworks and processes as outlined in the work plan, including but not limited to:
 - Nominations and Elections: Review current practices and make recommendations as appropriate to increase participation from among a diversity of UW community members, with a view to bolstering Senate and committee/council discussions through a wider range of perspectives.
 - Senator Roles and Responsibilities: Review current practices and make recommendations as appropriate to provide clarity of roles and responsibilities for individual senators, the chair, and committee/council chairs.
 - Rules of Order: Review current practices and make recommendations as determined appropriate regarding expectations for participation in Senate processes, discussions, and committees/councils.
- Consult with senators and stakeholders to gather input, as applicable to the working groups mandate,
- Draft documents, reports, and recommendations for consideration

Governance Pathway

- Senate: September 22, 2026 (establishment of working group)
- Senate: October 20, 2025 (membership approval)
- Senate: January 26, 2026 (informational update)
- Senate: May 4, 2026 (Bylaw 1 first reading, Rules of Procedure for information)
- Engagement Session for Senators: May 19, 2026 (information)
- Senate Engagement Working Group: May 26, 2026 (endorsement)
- Senate Executive Committee: May 27, 2026 (provided for information via email)
- Senate: June 8, 2026 (Bylaw 2 second reading, and endorsement of Rules of Procedure, Roles and Responsibilities, Procedures for Senate Elections and Appointments)

Documentation

- Senate Engagement Working Group Final Report
- Rules of Procedure of the University of Waterloo Senate
- University of Waterloo Senate Roles and Responsibilities
- Procedures for Senate Elections and Appointments
- Amendments to Senate Bylaw 1
- Additional Recommendations
- Correspondence Received: Letter from Senator J. Nugent

Report to Senate on Recommendations from the Senate Engagement Working Group (SEWG)
Laura Deakin & Marcus Shantz

This report summarizes the rationale behind the four documents recommended to Senate for the June 8, 2026 meeting.

As Co-Chairs, we believe that this report reflects the broad direction and majority perspectives of the SEWG members. However, the group did not achieve consensus on every issue or recommendation.

Over the past year, the SEWG met extensively, holding 13 meetings over approximately 20 hours to consider what it means for a university senate to function effectively. Our work included reviewing governance practices at peer institutions, examining the Senate Engagement survey results from the past three years, and listening carefully to the different ways Senators experience participation and engagement within Senate.

One key insight from this work is that individual Senators understand "engagement" in different ways. For some, engagement is primarily reflected in robust debate during Senate meetings, more visible dissent in voting, and greater opportunities for individual senators to influence agenda-setting. These are important democratic values. Nothing in the proposed reforms is intended to diminish them. Rather, we believe the recommended changes strengthen democratic accountability by clearly defining the authority of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and the Chair of Senate by establishing transparent mechanisms through which Senate may review and appeal their decisions.

Many other Senators tended to describe engagement in different terms. Some emphasized the importance of collegial trust, feeling engaged when colleagues extend one another the benefit of the doubt, when committees are trusted to do their work, and when discussion is focused on constructive improvement of proposals. Others highlighted the importance of meetings that are manageable and predictable in length. Some Senators expressed disengagement when time invested in preparing for an agenda item did not lead to discussion because earlier items ran over time. Some also observed that open-ended debate can unintentionally favour a small number of confident speakers, while discouraging participation by others.

Our proposals are therefore intended to balance values that are sometimes in tension with one another.

In preparing the four documents presented for approval on June 8, the Working Group reviewed governance practices at several Canadian universities. We are confident that these proposals are consistent with contemporary university governance practices in Canada. We also intend to prepare a short companion guide, as a practical orientation tool, to assist Senators in understanding how the proposed documents work together to clarify the role of Senate, responsibilities of Senators and the Chair, as well as the conduct of meetings and procedures of Senate.

The four documents should be understood as part of a broader set of possible changes to Senate processes, space and meeting format, some of which are outlined in the additional recommendations, that together can help create conditions to support our goal of hearing from a wider range of participants.

Sunset Clause

The motions for approving these documents include a *sunset clause*, specifying that approvals for the new documents and the changes to Bylaw 1 will expire on June 30, 2028 unless renewed, amended, or replaced by Senate prior to that date. We propose this approach in recognition that the rules and procedures set out here may be improved by future review and refinement, informed by our actual experience in working with them over the 2026-2027 Senate year.

Overview of the Proposed Documents

1. Revisions to Senate Bylaw 1

The two most significant amendments to By-Law 1 are explicit processes for calling special meetings and the introduction of "informal sessions".

Special Meetings

The proposed revisions respecting special meetings in sections 3.04 and 3.04.1 are intended to balance the right of individual Senators to request special meetings with the institutional responsibility to ensure that Senate meetings operate within the Senate's legal and governance framework.

Some Senators have suggested that these revisions expand the power of the SEC. We respectfully disagree.

Section 3.04.1(b) gives SEC a limited procedural role to determine whether a proposed meeting concerns matters within Senate's jurisdiction, seeks action that Senate actually has the authority to take, or is otherwise procedurally or legally appropriate for Senate consideration. This includes ensuring that circulated materials do not expose the institution or individual members to legal risk, such as potentially defamatory content or disclosure of protected private information.

Importantly, section 3.04.1(c) provides a clear safeguard by allowing any SEC decision not to call a special meeting to be appealed to the full Senate. If a majority of Senators support the appeal, the special meeting will proceed regardless of SEC's initial decision. The provisions further require that these matters must be addressed "expeditiously" and "promptly", ensuring that decisions on time-sensitive issues are not unduly delayed.

Informal Sessions

The proposal for informal sessions in section 16 is intended to create space for discussion, reflection, information-sharing, and exploratory conversation in formats that encourage broader participation than is typically possible in a formal debate.

We heard some concern that informal sessions could be misused to either make decisions outside established procedural rules, or, conversely, to avoid timely decision-making on an important topic. The proposed framework includes clear safeguards to address these concerns. Section 16.02(b) explicitly prohibits binding decisions during informal sessions, and any Senate business requiring formal action must return to formal session for debate and decision. In addition, the Rules of Procedure include provisions that empower the Senate to move informal business to a formal session where appropriate.

2. Rules of Procedure of the University of Waterloo Senate

The proposed Rules of Procedure are intended to clarify how Senate meetings operate in practice and to make Senate processes more transparent, predictable, and accessible to Senators.

The proposed speaking rules in section 3.4 are intended to encourage broader participation and more focused debate by establishing reasonable expectations regarding speaking time.

Sections 4.4 through 4.8 establish a clear process by which senators may request agenda items. Once again, it has been suggested that these rules expand the power of the SEC. We respectfully disagree. Rather than concentrating authority, the proposed rules promote transparency and accountability in agenda-setting, and provide meaningful oversight by the full Senate that can overturn the SEC's decision. Under section 4.7, the Secretary is required to notify the entire Senate of any agenda items requested by Senators that were excluded from the meeting agenda. Section 4.8 further enables a Senator to appeal such an exclusion to Senate for determination. Taken together, these provisions enhance transparency and procedural fairness by making agenda processes more explicit, understandable, and subject to review by Senate itself.

3. University of Waterloo Senate Roles and Responsibilities

This document is intended primarily as a guidance and orientation resource, rather than as a disciplinary code. While some universities have adopted more formalized codes of conduct for Senators, often including complaint and enforcement mechanisms, we chose not to recommend such an approach, since disciplinary matters are covered elsewhere in University policies.

Instead, this document articulates shared expectations and principles that support collegial governance. These include preparation, respectful participation, confidentiality, academic freedom, and institutional responsibility. The document also clarifies expectations respecting the role of the Chair, including the responsibility to facilitate fair, orderly, inclusive, and efficient meetings.

Some concerns were raised regarding references to Senators "having regard to the interests of the University as a whole." This language reflects the reality that Senators serve on a formal institutional governing body whose decisions affect the entire University. The majority of the Working Group does not view this language as inconsistent with academic freedom or the right of Senators to criticize institutional practices and decisions. The document explicitly affirms the importance of constituency perspectives, dissent, and diverse viewpoints. In any event, both academic freedom and freedom of expression have overarching protection through other University policies.

4. Procedures for Senate Elections and Appointments

The process for appointing Senators to Senate committees was the subject of extensive discussions within the SEWG. The approach we recommend largely codifies practices that we have been following at the University of Waterloo for several years, and to the best of our knowledge, reflects common practice at most peer institutions. Under this process, the

Secretariat is responsible for developing a slate of committee members that seeks to balance representation and support diversity across committees.

We heard from a few Senators who argued that the committee appointment process should place greater emphasis on open, contested elections for committee positions. In particular, they suggested that elections should be encouraged for SEC seats, because of the importance of the SEC and the belief that SEC will be empowered by the proposed By-Law amendments and Rules of Procedure. As we understand it, the concern is that the slate process is biased and not adequately democratic since the slate is developed by a committee rather than promoting open nominations. From this perspective, allowing for nominations from the floor when the slate is presented is insufficient, because the candidate nominated from the floor is at a disadvantage to the individual identified in the slate, whose name was recommended by SEC and circulated to Senators in advance.

The Working Group discussed these concerns over the course of several meetings. A strong majority voted to put forward recommending Senate approve our current procedures with the slate-based selection process. This process obliges the SEC to consider factors such as diversity, faculty representation from both teaching and research streams, committee succession planning, governance experience, and workload distribution when developing committee slates. For example, the SEC slate presented for this meeting reflects balance across multiple dimensions, including gender, teaching and research streams, continuity and renewal, and experience with members across all Faculties. We believe that such balance is necessary for effective governance. Diversity strengthens decision making, providing legitimacy and accountability by ensuring a broad range of perspectives are included. Balanced committee composition enhances trust and engagement in Senate processes.

The Working Groups also heard from some members in the majority who were concerned that normalizing committee elections could tilt Senate governance into an adversarial or political process. They suggested that an unintended consequence of open elections might be that otherwise qualified Senators might choose not to stand for committee election because they do not wish to participate in a public contest with other candidates. Elections may tend to privilege visibility and confidence, and may not support balance across academic roles, experience and representation.

In our view, the slate process respects the authority of the Senate, which retains the final decision on whether or not to approve a proposed slate. Senators may continue to nominate candidates from the floor, understanding that additional nominations may impact the overall balance of a carefully constructed slate, as elections would be held when positions are contested. This combined approach, slates supplemented by floor nominations, is the process currently used to approve committee membership, and SEWG recommends that it be continued. It reflects an intentional effort to balance the principle of diversity in committee composition with the democratic value of elections and open participation.

5. Additional Recommendations

SEWG also discussed a number of broader ideas for promoting Senate engagement that do not necessarily require formal adoption through bylaws or procedural rules. In order to not lose track of those ideas, we chose to compile them into a companion set of additional recommendations, which are attached to this report. These recommendations reflect themes and suggestions that emerged through consultation and discussion, including ideas relating

to orientation, meeting culture, inclusion, communication, physical space, and broader participation in Senate governance. They are offered as possible directions for future consideration and experimentation.

Conclusion

This report reflects the SEWG's effort to respond thoughtfully to the varied ways Senators understand engagement, participation, and effective governance. The recommendations are not intended to prescribe a single model of engagement, but rather to clarify procedures, set shared expectations, and create conditions that support inclusive, transparent, and effective Senate deliberation. This report and our proposed documents are not a final statement on Senate engagement but are a foundation for continued reflection and improvement. The inclusion of a *sunset clause* and additional recommendations reflect a commitment to learning from experience and to adapting governance practices over time.

We would like to thank the members of the Senate Engagement Working Group, the Secretariat, and the many Senators who provided thoughtful feedback throughout this process, including those who expressed concerns or criticisms. Official correspondence to the working group from a Senator is included as a distinct document. All of this demonstrates the care that Senators bring to their work, and their commitment to effective and collegial governance.



Rules of Procedure of the University of Waterloo Senate

Part 1: Matters Not Covered by These Rules

These Rules of Procedure are supplemental to the Senate's bylaws and the University of Waterloo Act, 1972, which constitute the primary authorities governing the conduct of Senate proceedings.

The Rules of Procedure are a regulation of the Senate adopted to provide a procedural framework that facilitates the orderly, transparent, and equitable conduct of Senate business.

These rules are intended to ensure that all members entitled to speak may do so, that debate proceeds in a respectful and substantive manner, **that shared and collegial governance is upheld**, and that diverse perspectives, both supporting and dissenting, are considered. Decisions of Senate shall be made on a clear and well-informed basis, consistent with the Act, the bylaws, and sound procedural principles.

Part 2: Definitions

The following definitions are in use throughout, except as context requires otherwise:

- The Board shall mean the Board of Governors of the University of Waterloo
- The Chair shall mean the Chair of meetings of the Senate, or the chair of one of its committees as context requires
- Councils of Senate shall mean the Councils and Committees of the University of Waterloo Senate
- University shall mean the University of Waterloo
- The Act shall mean the *University of Waterloo Act, 1972*



Part 3: Rules and Procedures of the Senate

3.1 Application

The provisions of this Regulation apply to all general and special meetings of Senate and may provide guidance to meetings of Senate committees and councils.

3.2 Presiding Authority

The chair of Senate shall preside over meetings, is responsible for maintaining order and decorum, and for ensuring that proceedings are conducted in accordance with this regulation.

3.3 Reference Authority

Where a matter of procedure is not addressed in this regulation, Bourinot's Rules of Order, most recent edition, shall govern. Senate relies primarily on Part II of Bourinot's, which outlines Rules and Usages for Assemblies Generally.

3.4 Speaking Rules

A member may speak to a motion or discussion item for up to two (2) minutes at a time, unless the chair permits the member to speak for a longer period.

A member who has already spoken to a motion or discussion item shall not be recognized to speak for a second time on the same motion or discussion item unless all other members who wish to speak have been recognized.

Subject to the discretion of the chair, a member shall not normally speak more than twice on the same motion or discussion item.

The mover of a main motion shall have the right of reply, which shall not exceed five (5) minutes.

3.5 Recognition and Order

No member shall speak unless recognized by the Chair. Members shall address all remarks through the Chair and shall confine remarks to the matter under consideration.

3.6 Procedural Motions

When a motion is under debate, no motion shall be received except the following, which shall have precedence in the order listed:

- to adjourn the meeting;
- to recess;
- to defer debate;
- to put the question/call the question (closure);
- to refer or commit;



- to amend;
- to divide the motion.

3.7 Closure

A motion to put the question shall require the affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the members present and voting.

3.8 Suspension of Rules

Unless the Senate has resolved into an informal session as set forth in By-Law 1, no rule set out in this section may be suspended except by the affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the members present and voting.

3.9 Questions on Items for Information

- a. Where an item is presented to Senate for information, is not accompanied by a motion, and is not noted on the agenda for discussion, members may ask questions of clarification when recognized by the chair, and the person presenting the report may answer. Items for information shall be submitted in accordance with rule 4.6.
- b. Questions under this section shall be limited to requests for factual clarification or explanation of the content of the report.
- c. The Chair has discretion to proceed to the next item on the agenda without hearing from every member who wishes to ask a question.
- d. The Chair shall have the authority to rule questions out of order where, in the Chair's judgment, they exceed the scope set out in subsection "b" above.
- e. If, following a report, a member wishes Senate to take action or engage in substantive debate, the member shall do so by submitting a motion in accordance with the agenda procedures set out in section 4 of this regulation.

3.10 Extension of Meeting Time

Meetings of Senate shall conclude no later than time scheduled in the agenda, unless extended in accordance with the following:

- a. At the chair's discretion, by no more than ten minutes and no more than once.
- b. A motion to extend the duration of a meeting shall specify the length of the proposed extension and shall be decided without debate. The chair may invite a member to make a motion to extend.
- c. A motion to extend the duration of a meeting shall require the affirmative vote of two-



thirds (2/3) of the members present and voting.

d. Further extensions shall require a separate motion under this section.

Part 4: Order and Scope of Business

4.1 Approved agenda to be followed

Business shall proceed in the order set out in the agenda approved by Senate, unless Senate resolves otherwise.

4.2 New Business

During a meeting, no substantive item of business shall be introduced that does not appear on the agenda as circulated in advance, except with the affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the members present and voting.

4.3 Matters Beyond Senate's Jurisdiction

Senate shall consider only matters within its statutory authority and mandate.

Where a question arises during a meeting as to whether a proposed motion or amendment falls within the jurisdiction of Senate, the chair shall rule on the question, subject to appeal to Senate. An appeal of the chair's ruling shall be decided by a simple majority of the members present and voting.

4.4 Right to Submit Agenda Items

Any member of Senate may submit a request to place an item on the agenda of a general meeting of Senate.

4.5 Form and Timing of Submission

A request under subsection 4.4 shall be submitted in writing to the Secretary of Senate during normal business hours not less than twenty-four (24) hours before the start of a scheduled Senate Executive Committee meeting, and shall include:

- a clear description of the proposed item;
- the form in which the item is proposed to come forward (information, discussion, or motion);
- where applicable, the text of any proposed motion; and
- a brief statement of relevance to Senate's mandate.

4.6 Consideration by the Senate Executive Committee

The Senate Executive Committee shall consider all properly submitted agenda requests and shall determine whether:



- the item is to be placed on the agenda;
- the item should be referred to a committee or other body prior to Senate consideration; or
- the item is outside the jurisdiction of Senate or otherwise not appropriate for inclusion on the agenda;
- the item is to be heard in formal or informal session.

4.7 Notice of Decision

Where the Senate Executive Committee determines not to place an item requested by a member or members on the agenda, the secretary of Senate shall provide the requesting member and the Senate with written notice of the decision and a brief explanation, **along with access to the original agenda request and related materials.**

4.8 Challenge of Agenda Exclusion

A member who has properly submitted an agenda request that was not placed on the agenda (or, if the agenda request included a formal motion and was placed on the agenda to be heard in informal session), may move that the item be added to the agenda, and such motion shall be decided by a simple majority of members present and voting.

Part 5: Voting

5.1 Participation and voting in online meetings

Where a meeting is conducted in whole or in part by electronic means, the chair shall ensure that:

- all participants are able to hear and be heard by one another;
- procedures are in place for recognition of speakers;
- votes can be taken and recorded in a manner that ensures accuracy and integrity.

Members participating electronically shall be deemed present for purposes of quorum and voting.

5.2 Abstentions

An abstention occurs when a member chooses not to vote either in favor or against a motion. Only votes cast “for” or “against” are counted when determining whether a motion is approved. A senator may request that their abstention be noted in the minutes.

University of Waterloo Senate Roles and Responsibilities

Role and Responsibilities of Senate

The Senate shares responsibility for governing the University of Waterloo together with the Board of Governors. The [University of Waterloo Act, 1972](#) (“the Act”), sets out the respective roles of the Senate and the Board, **which are exercised in a spirit of shared responsibility, mutual respect, transparency, and collegial governance**. The Senate’s primary responsibility is to oversee the academic affairs of the University. The Board’s primary responsibility is to oversee the University’s business, administration and finances, however, the Senate may make recommendations on any matter related to the University’s operations to the Board of Governors.

The Senate conducts its business through [committees](#) that bring forward recommendations at regularly scheduled meetings throughout the governance year.

Role and Responsibilities of Senators

The Senate is composed of faculty, students and ex-officio members from different parts of the University, and Senators are encouraged to bring perspective from their respective communities to inform decision making. Senators are also encouraged to be mindful of the statutory mandate of the Senate, which is to make decisions for the entire university.

In their service on the Senate, Senators are expected to:

Governance Principles

- (a) Exercise their best judgment in making decisions, having regard to the interests of the University as a whole.
- (b) Offer perspective from their own experience and from their respective communities at the University, to inform good decision making.
- (c) Uphold academic standards and program quality, including oversight of curriculum.
- (d) Uphold core principles expressed in University policies (such as academic freedom, freedom of expression, **collegial governance**, ethical behaviour, and the promotion of equity, diversity, inclusion and accessibility) in Senate decision-making.
- (e) Consider the impact of decisions on student experience and success.

Conduct and Participation

- (f) Prepare diligently for meetings by reviewing materials in advance, seeking clarification where necessary, and contributing thoughtfully and respectfully to deliberations. While all perspectives merit consideration, consensus is not required, and decisions duly adopted by Senate represent the collective judgment of the body.

- (g) Participate constructively by engaging in respectful discussion of matters which are brought before Senate and its various bodies, including committees, councils, subcommittees, and working groups.
- (h) Maintain confidentiality of information discussed in confidential sessions.
- (i) Participate in orientations, trainings or reviews to develop greater understanding of the work of Senate and the roles and responsibilities of Senators.
- (j) Serve actively on committees and working groups as assigned.

Procedural Responsibilities

- (k) Provide advanced notice to the Secretary when unable to attend a meeting.
- (l) Declare any conflicts of interest.
- (m) Be familiar with the *Rules of Procedure of the University of Waterloo Senate*, including processes for questions, motions, and agenda items, and seek guidance from the Secretariat as needed.

Role Awareness

- (n) Recognize that Senate standing committees, councils, subcommittees, and working groups support Senate by developing recommendations and, where authorized, exercising delegated responsibilities in accordance with Senate bylaws.
- (o) Recognize that all Senators have the same duties, roles, and responsibilities in their capacity as Senators.

Role and Responsibilities of the Chair of Senate

- (a) In accordance with the Act, the President of the University serves as chair of the Senate, and the Vice-President, Academic, shall serve as vice-chair.
- (b) The Chair will guide Senate in fulfilling its academic governance responsibilities, ensuring that deliberations and decisions align with the University's mission, academic priorities, and long-term strategic goals.
- (c) The Chair is responsible for maintaining order and decorum during meetings as outlined in Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure and will do so with fairness and impartiality. In exercising this responsibility, the Chair is empowered to:
 - recognize speakers and control the order of participation;
 - rule on questions of procedure and order, subject to appeal to Senate as set forth in Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure;
 - invite members to make motions or to speak to points of debate;

- enforce time limits and ensure relevance of debate;
- call a member to order for disruptive conduct;
- suspend or adjourn a meeting in the event of disruption or loss of quorum; and
- take such other actions as necessary, consistent with the Senate Bylaws and Rules of Procedure, to ensure the effective conduct of business.

(d) The Chair will foster constructive, inclusive, and respectful debate, and ensure that all members have the opportunity to contribute while maintaining focus and efficiency.

(e) The Chair does not normally participate in debate, but may provide factual context to inform discussions.

(f) The Chair may temporarily delegate the chair in order to fully participate in debate and to vote on a motion.

(g) The Chair will support informed decision-making by ensuring clarity in motions, voting procedures, and outcomes. While consensus is not required, the Chair will, where appropriate, encourage it.

(h) The Chair will oversee the identification and management of conflicts of interest and promote ethical conduct among Senate members.

(i) The Chair will promote transparency by ensuring that Senate decisions, rationales, and key discussions are clearly communicated to the broader university community.

University of Waterloo

Procedures for Senate Elections and Appointments

Matters Not Covered by These Procedures

These Procedures are supplemental to the Senate's bylaws and the University of Waterloo Act, 1972, which constitute the primary authorities governing the election of members to Senate.

[The University of Waterloo Act, 1972](#) (hereinafter referred to as the Act), in Sections 18, 20, 21 and 23-26 defines the Senate composition, term of office, eligibility, re-election, and terms of membership.

[Senate Bylaw 3](#) governs the selection of members of Senate.

The membership of each Senate Committee and Council shall be appointed according to the Terms of Reference for each body.

Election of Members to Senate

Election Principles

Participation and Engagement

The election process shall promote active participation and meaningful engagement from the community, ensuring that all eligible members are informed, encouraged, and able to take part.

Equality of Opportunity

All nominees shall have an equal opportunity for election. Election procedures shall be applied consistently and without unfair advantage or disadvantage.

Transparency

The election process shall be clear and understandable and made accessible to the entire university community. Election results and reporting shall be communicated clearly, openly, and in a straightforward manner, ensuring transparency for all stakeholders.

Integrity and Fairness

The process shall uphold fairness and impartiality at all stages, ensuring confidence in the legitimacy of election outcomes.

Election Procedures for Faculty

Senate elections shall be conducted using a two-stage process in which all nominees are considered sequentially for Faculty-specific and at-large positions, without requiring category selection at the time of nomination.

Stage One: Faculty-Specific Nominations and Elections

1. Nominations

Eligible faculty members shall be nominated for election to Senate following the call for nominations issued by the Secretariat. Each nominee shall be affiliated with a Faculty for the purposes of conducting Faculty-based election. In accordance with Senate Bylaw 3: Section 2.01b, each nomination shall be signed by the required number of members of the constituency from which the member is to be elected. Eligibility of nominees shall be verified by the Chief Returning Officer, in accordance with Senate Bylaw 3.

2. Faculty Elections

An election shall be conducted within each Faculty to fill the vacant Faculty-specific seats. All eligible nominees affiliated with the Faculty shall be included on the ballot for that Faculty. Nominees elected in this stage shall be declared elected to Senate.

3. No Acclamations

In the event that the number of nominations is less than or equal to the number of vacancies, the candidate(s) shall not be elected by acclamation but shall instead be subject to a yes/no vote within the Faculty.

Stage Two: At-Large Faculty Nominations and Elections

4. At-Large Elections and Ongoing Eligibility

Following the completion of Faculty-specific elections, a subsequent call for nominations and election shall be conducted to fill any vacant at-large Senate seats. Nominees not elected in the Faculty-specific elections shall automatically remain eligible for the at-large election and shall be included on a single at-large ballot without needing to resubmit their nomination, unless they opt out by notifying the Secretariat.

New nominations may be submitted in accordance with Senate Bylaw 3. The Secretariat shall publicly release the results of the Faculty-specific elections prior to the opening of the nomination period for at-large seats, ensuring transparency and clarity in the process.

Election Procedures for (AFIW) Faculty

Faculty elected from the affiliated colleges and the federated university shall be elected according to the procedures of their respective institutions. The presidents or chief academic officers of each institution shall confirm election results with the university secretary.

Election Procedures for Graduate Students

1. Nominations

Eligible graduate students shall be nominated for election to Senate following the call for nominations issued by the Secretariat. Eligibility of nominees shall be verified by the Chief Returning Officer, as per Senate Bylaw 3.

2. Elections

An election shall be conducted to fill any vacant Senate seats allocated to Graduate Students. All eligible nominees shall be included on the ballot. Nominees elected shall be declared elected to Senate.

3. No Acclamations

In the event that the number of nominations is less than or equal to the number of vacancies, the candidate(s) shall not be elected by acclamation but shall instead be subject to subject to a yes/no vote among the graduate students.

Election Procedures for Undergraduate Students

In accordance with Senate Bylaw 3, for undergraduate student constituencies, the nomination period is determined in consultation with the Waterloo Undergraduate Student Association.

The Waterloo Undergraduate Student Association election rules as described in the Association's Elections and Referenda Procedures regulating campaigning for undergraduate student elections, including spending limits, shall be followed. The Waterloo Undergraduate Student Association Elections and Referenda Committee decisions may be appealed to the University Secretary, who shall act as chief returning officer, and whose decision is final.

Nomination and Appointment of Elected Members to Senate Standing Committees and Councils

Much of the work of Senate is conducted through its committees, which undertake detailed review, discussion, and oversight on matters within Senate's jurisdiction before bringing recommendations forward for Senate's consideration. The effectiveness of Senate therefore depends in significant part on the strength, balance, and functioning of its committee system.

Nomination Principles

In developing the list of nominees for Senate committees and councils, the Senate Executive Committee will strive to balance fairness, broad participation, democratic principles and the effective functioning of Senate. The objective is to recommend a slate that supports the effective **and collegial** governance of the University of Waterloo while maintaining confidence in the openness and integrity of the process.

The Senate Executive Committee will consider the following principles when developing the list of nominees:

Respect for Member Preferences

The process shall take into account the stated interests and preferences of members of Senate when determining appointments to committees and councils.

Balance of Experience and Renewal

The composition of committees and councils shall aim to maintain continuity through the inclusion of returning members, while also incorporating new members to bring fresh perspectives.

Diversity and Representation

The process shall promote diversity and gender balance in the composition of committees and councils, reflecting the breadth of the University community.

Equitable Distribution of Responsibilities

Appointments shall consider the overall workload of members, seeking to distribute responsibilities fairly and ensuring members are aware of expected time commitments.

Nomination and Appointment Procedures

1. Responsibility for the Nomination Process

1.1 Pursuant to Senate bylaw #2, the Senate Executive Committee is responsible to present a list of nominations for committees and councils of Senate by the last meeting of the academic year.

1.2 Secretariat is responsible for initiating the nomination process and for preparing the list of nominees under the direction and supervision of the Senate Executive Committee, according to the procedures set out below.

2. Committee Preference Survey

2.1 Following the completion of Senate elections, a Preference Survey shall be distributed by the Secretariat to all continuing and newly elected faculty and student Senators.

2.2 The survey shall:

- Act as a centralized, neutral, and equitable tool to gather preference data;
- Invite Senators to rank their preferred committee assignments;
- Provide an opportunity to indicate committees on which they do not wish to serve; and
- Collect any additional relevant information regarding availability or interest.

2.3 Committee preferences will be considered alongside committee requirements, ensuring alignment with the principles of fairness, equitable opportunity, and workload balance.

3. External Consultation and Outreach

3.1 The Secretariat shall conduct outreach to relevant stakeholders to support the completion of committee memberships.

3.2 This may include consultation as appropriate based on the composition of the committee, with:

- The AFIW Presidents
- The Alumni Engagement Task Force
- FAUW for appointed roles such as the Planning and Finance Committee
- Senate Graduate Council: Postdoctoral Scholar, Regular Faculty, Associate Dean Research
- Senate Research and Innovation Council: Associate Dean, Grad Studies, Heads of Research Centres, Regular Faculty, Post doc scholar
- Senate Undergraduate Council: VPA/VPEd Society students

4. Development of the Membership Slate

4.1 The Secretariat shall develop a proposed membership slate for all Senate Standing Committees and Councils.

4.2 In doing so, the Secretariat shall:

- Consider member preferences;
- Ensure a balance of experience and continuity;
- Promote diversity and representation;
- Distribute responsibilities equitably; and
- Align appointments with committee mandates.

4.3 The Secretariat may consult with Committee Chairs, Deans, and relevant governance bodies as needed.

5. Presentation to Senate Executive Committee

5.1 Following the completion of the steps set out above, the proposed membership slate shall be presented to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), **normally** at its May meeting.

5.2 The slate shall be made available to all Senators immediately following approval by the Senate Executive Committee.

5.3 Senators may indicate interest in positions for which they were not selected by notifying the Secretary ~~to the SEC~~ in advance of the ~~next Senate Senate Executive Committee~~ meeting.

6. Approval by Senate

6.1 The final membership slate shall be presented to Senate for approval at its June meeting.

6.2 Senators or Senators-elect may be nominated from the floor, ensuring an open and participatory process. **Self nominations are permitted.**

6.3 Where multiple candidates are nominated for a position, an election shall be conducted ~~during the meeting immediately following the meeting at which~~ the slate is presented. Nominees shall not address Senate during the conduct of the election

7. Term of Appointment

7.1 Unless otherwise stipulated in a Senate bylaw or Committee Term of Reference approved by the Senate, the term of appointment to a Senate Standing Committee or Council shall be one year (September 1 – August 31).

7.2 All appointments shall expire at the conclusion of the governance year (August 31).

8. Vacancies During the Governance Year

8.1 The Senate Executive Committee shall have the authority to fill committee vacancies that arise during the governance year.

8.2 In doing so, the Senate Executive Committee shall continue to apply the guiding principles set out in Section 5.2.

8.3 Any such appointments shall be reported to Senate for information at the next regular meeting.

8.4 A student member who graduates at the end of the winter term may continue to serve until the conclusion of the governance year.

Proposed Amendments to Senate Bylaw 1

A bylaw relating generally to the business and affairs of Senate of the University of Waterloo, and its Committees and Councils.

BE IT ENACTED as a bylaw of Senate of the University of Waterloo, as follows:

1. Interpretation

1.01	In all the bylaws of Senate,	
	a.	"year" means the twelve-month period dating from September 1 of one year to August 31 of the succeeding calendar year.
	b.	"Senate" means Senate of the University of Waterloo.
	c.	"SEC" means the Executive Committee of Senate as established in the Senate bylaws.
1.02	Throughout all the bylaws of Senate of the University of Waterloo:	
	a.	Where the title "president" appears, an acting president or president pro tem, so designated by the Board of Governors, shall serve in the place of the president, with the latter's full rights and responsibilities.
	b.	Where the title "vice-president, academic & provost" appears, an acting vice-president, academic & provost or vice-president, academic & provost pro tem, so designated by the president and/or the Board of Governors, shall serve in the place of the vice-president, academic & provost, with the latter's full rights and responsibilities.
	c.	Where the title "vice-president, administration & finance" appears, an acting vice-president, administration & finance or vice-president, administration & finance pro tem, so designated by the president, shall serve in the place of the vice-president, administration & finance, with the latter's full rights and responsibilities.

d.	Where the title "vice-president, advancement and external relations" appears, an acting vice-president, advancement or vice-president, advancement pro tem, so designated by the president, shall serve in the place of the vice-president, advancement, with the latter's full rights and responsibilities.
e.	Where the title "vice-president, university relations" appears, an acting vice-president, university relations or vice-president, university relations pro tem, so designated by the president, shall serve in the place of the vice-president, university relations, with the latter's full rights and responsibilities.
f.	Where the title "vice-president, research and international" appears, an acting vice-president, research and international or vice-president, research and international pro tem, so designated by the president and/or the Board of Governors, shall serve in the place of the vice-president, research and international, with the latter's full rights and responsibilities.
g.	Where the title "associate vice-president, academic" appears, an acting associate vice-president, academic or associate vice-president, academic pro tem, so named to serve by the president, shall serve in the place of the associate vice-president, academic, with the latter's full rights and responsibilities.
h.	Where the title "associate vice-president, graduate studies and postdoctoral affairs" appears, an acting associate vice-president, graduate studies and postdoctoral affairs or associate vice-president, graduate studies and postdoctoral affairs pro tem, so named to serve by the president, shall serve in the place of the associate vice-president, graduate studies and postdoctoral affairs, with the latter's full rights and responsibilities.
i.	Where the title "deputy provost, integrated planning and budgeting" appears, an acting deputy provost, integrated planning and budgeting or deputy provost, integrated planning and budgeting pro tem, so designated by the president, shall serve in the place of the deputy provost, integrated planning and budgeting, with the latter's full rights and responsibilities.
j.	Where the titles "dean of each faculty" appear, an acting dean, or dean pro tem, so named to serve by the vice-president, academic & provost, shall serve in the place of the dean, with the latter's full rights and responsibilities.

2. Schedule of meetings

2.01	The schedule of meetings for Senate and its committees and councils shall be approved by the chair of Senate and published by the Secretariat prior to the new year.
------	--

3. Meetings of Senate

3.01	<p>General meetings</p> <p>Senate shall normally hold eight (8) general meetings during each year. Notice of each meeting shall be communicated to the university community in such places and ways as may be designated from time to time by Senate.</p>
3.02	<p>Place of meetings</p> <p>Meetings of Senate may be held:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. in-person upon the campus of the university, or;b. via telephone, electronic or other communications facilities that permit all participants to communicate with each other during the meeting, orc. in-person upon the campus of the university with simultaneous participation via telephone, electronic or other communications facilities that permit all participants to communicate with each other during the meeting. <p>The specific space of any given meeting shall be at the sole approval of the chair of Senate and shall be communicated with the notice of agenda as in section 3.03 of this bylaw.</p>
3.03	<p>Notice of an agenda and background material for general meetings</p> <p>Notice in writing of each general meeting and the agenda and available background material for any such meeting, shall be available to all members of Senate at least seven (7) days prior to the date of each such meeting.</p>

3.04	<p>Special meetings</p> <p>a. Special meetings of Senate shall be called by one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The chair of Senate, in the case of extraordinary circumstances (including, without limitation, time-sensitive appointments requiring approval by Senate and the Board of Governors) or emergency situations, as determined by the chair in the chair's sole discretion; ii. The chair of Senate, upon the receipt of a request of the Executive Committee SEC for such meeting; or iii. The secretary of Senate, upon receipt by the secretary of a written request for such meeting signed by at least twenty (20) members of Senate, subject to 3.04.1 below. <p>b. Special meetings shall be called promptly. b. In considering and administering requests for special meetings, the Executive Committee SEC, the secretary and the chair shall act expeditiously, having regard to the nature and urgency of the matter under consideration.</p> <p>c. Notice in writing of each special meeting, together with the agenda and available background material shall normally be available to each member of Senate at least seven (7) days prior to the date of the meeting, provided that the chair of Senate shall have the power and authority to abridge such seven-day period when, in the chair's absolute discretion, the urgency of any item of business to be dealt with at such meeting so requires.</p> <p>d. Notice in writing of each special meeting shall be communicated to the university community in such places and ways as may be designated from time to time by Senate.</p>
3.04.1	<p>a. A request for a special meeting pursuant to 3.04(iii) shall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. include a brief description of the proposed item, along with the text of the proposed motion, ii. be submitted to the secretary during normal business hours not less than twenty-four (24) hours before the start of a scheduled Senate Executive Committee SEC meeting, <p>b. Upon receipt of a request for a special meeting pursuant to 3.04(iii), the Secretary shall forward the request to the Executive Committee SEC, which shall promptly decide to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. call the meeting, ii. refer the matter to a committee or other body of Senate, or iii. not call the meeting, on the grounds that item is outside the jurisdiction of Senate or is otherwise not appropriate for inclusion on the agenda.

	<p>c. If the Executive Committee SEC decides not to call a meeting requested under 3.04(iii), or to refer the matter,</p> <p>i. the secretary shall promptly notify all members of Senate with written notice of the decision and a brief explanation, along with the original written request for the meeting</p> <p>ii. any member may initiate an appeal of the decision by requesting written request that the secretary submit the question to Senate, whereupon the secretary shall promptly organize a vote, and shall forward the written appeal request to all Senators, and</p> <p>iii. if a majority of members vote in favour of holding the special meeting, the chair or secretary shall promptly call the special meeting, with notice provided pursuant to 3.04(b) and 3.04(c) above.</p>
3.05	<p>Participation and voting in online meetings</p> <p>Where a meeting is conducted in whole or in part by electronic means, the chair shall ensure that:</p> <p>a. all participants are able to hear and be heard by one another;</p> <p>b. procedures are in place for recognition of speakers;</p> <p>c. votes can be taken and recorded in a manner that ensures accuracy and integrity.</p> <p>Members participating electronically shall be deemed present for purposes of quorum and voting.</p>

4. Committees and councils - agenda and background material to be available

4.01	Notice in writing of each general meeting of any committee or council shall be available at least seven (7) days prior to the date of each such meeting.
4.02	The agenda and available background material for any general meeting of any committee or council shall normally be available at least seven (7) days prior to the date of each such meeting.

5. Quorum

5.01	At all meetings of Senate and of its committees and councils, a majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business and affairs of the body.
------	--

6. Meetings in open session

6.01	Subject to section 7 of this bylaw, all general and special meetings of Senate and its committees and councils shall be open to members of the university community, the public-at-large, and representatives of the news media. Senate will make every effort to hold its meetings in a room sufficiently large to accommodate those who indicate to the secretary of Senate, two full working days in advance of the meeting, their desire to attend. Meetings will be broadcast for members of the University community to observe the proceedings virtually.
6.02	Non-members in attendance at meetings shall not disrupt the proceedings of the meeting nor cause any disturbance by unreasonable noise or vocal expression. The chair may remove any such person when, in the chair's sole judgment, such person is engaging in improper or disruptive conduct that is detrimental to Senate carrying out its business.

7. Meetings in closed session

7.01	<p>Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of this bylaw, and provided that all meetings shall begin in open session, Senate and its committees and councils shall have the right to hold any meeting or part thereof in closed session. This provision may exclude therefrom all persons, save for members and such resource persons as may be agreed should be in attendance, for the purpose of considering confidential financial matters of the university or where intimate financial or personal matters of any person may be disclosed, unless such person requests that such part of the meeting be open to the public.</p> <p>The Executive Committee SEC shall determine for purposes of the Senate agenda whether any matter is of a confidential nature and such matter shall be so designated on the agenda for such Senate meeting and shall be designated and described in a manner consistent with maintaining the confidentiality of such matter.</p> <p>The chair or chair(s) of any committee or council of Senate will determine whether any matter before the committee or council is of a confidential nature and such matter shall be so designated on the agenda for such meeting and shall be designated and described in a manner consistent with maintaining the confidentiality of such matter.</p> <p>Senate or its committees or councils shall initially deal with any such confidential matter in closed session, but, after receiving the pertinent information relative to the confidential matter, may direct that the matter be thereupon considered in open session.</p>
------	---

8. Declarations of conflict of interest

8.01	At the beginning of each meeting of Senate or any of Senate's committees or councils, the chair will call for members to declare any conflicts of interest with regard to any agenda item. For agenda items to be discussed in closed session, the chair will call for declarations of conflict of interest at the beginning of the closed portion of the meeting. Members may nonetheless declare conflicts at any time during a meeting.
8.02	A member shall be considered to have an actual, perceived or potential conflict of interest, when the opportunity exists for the member to use confidential information gained as a member of Senate, or any of Senate's committees or councils, for the personal profit or advantage of any person, or use the authority, knowledge or influence of the Senate, or a committee or council thereof, to further her/his personal, familial or corporate interests or the interests of an employee of the university with whom the member has a marital, familial or sexual relationship.
8.03	Members who declare conflicts of interest shall not enter into debate nor vote upon the specified item upon which they have declared a conflict of interest. The chair will determine whether it is appropriate for said member to remove themselves from the meeting for the duration of debate on the specified item(s).
8.04	Where Senate or a committee or council of Senate is of the opinion that a conflict of interest exists that has not been declared, the body may declare by a resolution carried by two-thirds of its members present at the meeting that a conflict of interest exists and a member thus found to be in conflict shall not enter into debate on the specified item upon which they have declared a conflict of interest. The chair will determine whether it is appropriate for said member to remove themselves from the meeting for the duration of debate on the specified item(s).

9. Representations to meetings

9.01	Any members of the university community, or of the public-at-large, wishing to make representations to any meeting of a committee or council shall file with the secretary of the relevant committee or council, at least two full working days prior to the date of such proposed meeting, written notice to that effect with such notice to designate the nature of the proposed representations.
9.02	The chair of any committee or council may limit the time to be allotted to members of the university community and the public-at-large for committee or council representations.

~~10. Time limit on representations~~

10.01	The chair of any committee or council may limit the time to be allotted to members of the university community and the public-at-large for committee or council representations.
------------------	---

11. Secretary

11.01	The university secretary shall be the non-voting secretary of Senate.
11.02	The university secretary shall appoint one or more associate secretaries of Senate to act as secretary of Senate in the absence of the university secretary.
11.03	The university secretary, or designate, shall be the non-voting secretary of each committee or council of Senate.

~~12. Limit on service on committees~~

12.01	An elected member of Senate shall not serve on more than one of the Executive, Finance or Long Range Planning Committees.
------------------	--

13. Term of office

13.01	Except where specified by Senate bylaws, the term of office on committees or councils shall be one year, with members eligible for re-election.
-------	---

14. Bylaws - general

14.01	The passage of a new bylaw or amendment(s) to an existing bylaw is accomplished in two readings by Senate. At the first reading, such discussion as is deemed appropriate by Senate shall take place. At the second reading, further discussion may take place and the vote on the document shall be taken. The two readings shall take place at different, but not necessarily consecutive, meetings of Senate.
14.02	No proposed bylaw or amendment(s) will be given reading unless it has been bound into or accompanies the agenda portfolio distributed in advance of the meeting.
14.03	Any proposed bylaw or amendment(s) shall include the proposed wording of the bylaw or amendment(s), and where appropriate, a summary of the reasons for such bylaw or amendment(s).
14.04	In order to be approved by Senate, any new bylaw or amendment(s) to bylaws must receive the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the members of Senate present and voting at the meeting.

15. Faculty constitutions

15.01	Each faculty and each academic department and school of the university may adopt a formal constitution governing its operations, provided that each such constitution and any amendments thereto shall be inoperative and ineffective until approved by Senate. No provision of the constitutions shall be inconsistent with any provisions of The University of Waterloo Act, 1972 , as
-------	--

	amended, and no provision of any constitution shall be exempt from the provisions of any of the bylaws or established policies of the university which are within the final jurisdiction of Senate, except as expressly approved by Senate.
--	---

16. Meeting Formats

16.01	<p>Formal Session</p> <p>Senate shall conduct its formal business in sessions governed by the procedures set out in this by-law and any regulations that may be adopted by the Senate from time to time.</p>
16.02	<p>Informal Session</p> <p>Senate may resolve into informal session for the purpose of discussion or receiving reports and other information, subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. A motion to resolve into an informal session will not be considered unless the informal session was included in the agenda that was circulated in advance for the meeting.b. No motions may be made and no votes taken which are binding on the Senate, except a motion to rise from informal session.c. Any record of discussion and action items may be shared with Senate but shall not form part of the official minutes of Senate.d. The chair of the Senate may choose to designate the Secretary or a member of the Senate to act as chair for the purpose of actively participating in the discussion.e. The chair of the Senate or designate shall have discretion to vary or waive any formal rules of procedure adopted by the Senate.

Additional Recommendations

Over the course of our meetings, SEWG members discussed many ideas for enhancing engagement in the Senate. Many of these did not fit easily in the formal documents we have proposed.

In addition to the documents that outline Senate procedures, roles, and responsibilities, the following recommendations and ideas are offered for future consideration by the Senate Executive Committee and the Secretariat as they continue to developing plans to strengthen engagement. Collectively, they aim to clarify the impact of Senate's work, create more opportunities for meaningful participation, and encourage active and inclusive engagement among senators.

Framing and tone-setting

1. Develop a stronger onboarding process where Senate orientation should include opportunities for relationship-building, shared reflection on goals for the academic year, and discussion of how senators work together in a collegial environment.
2. Consider involving Indigenous Elders, Knowledge Keepers, or community members engaged in EDI-R initiatives in annual retreats, orientation activities and other points during the year, to focus attention on the shared commitments and values that guide our work together.
3. Evaluate the feasibility of scheduling Senate meetings earlier in the day, including through a pilot or trial period, to determine whether alternative meeting times improve participation, reduce scheduling conflicts, and support more effective engagement throughout the duration of meetings.
4. Consider scheduling a pre-meeting gathering beginning 30 minutes prior to the start of the meeting, to create opportunities for informal interaction and socialization among senators before meetings.
5. Senate meetings should continue to include land acknowledgements, but shorter and more focused acknowledgements would create space for other opening elements, such as pedagogy or research presentations from faculty, input from students, or teaching from Indigenous Elders or Knowledge Keepers.
6. Consider a dedicated strategic session to allow Senators to come together to identify emerging issues important to the institution.

Inclusion, participation, and meeting culture

7. Consider periodic reporting, education and training from the Offices of Indigenous Relations, EDI-R, and/or external sources to promote a Senate culture that invites inclusion and participation from all members.
8. Incorporate informal meeting formats, including small-group discussions and facilitated conversations, as complementary tools for engagement and deliberation. These formats can expand the range of participation opportunities available to senators, encourage the sharing of diverse perspectives, and support more interactive discussion of complex issues. To accommodate these sessions within meeting agendas, consideration may be given to streamlining routine business items where appropriate.

9. Support the onboarding and ongoing engagement of newer senators through initiatives such as mentorship opportunities, peer support, and other mechanisms that help senators build familiarity with Senate processes, ask questions, and participate confidently in deliberations over time.
10. Explore including staff as members of Senate. The exploration could be conducted by a small ad hoc working group and the Secretariat to provide a recommendation to Senate.
11. Participate in external initiatives, such as *Women in Governance*, to promote gender parity.
12. Extend the invitation to the pre-Senate student lunch to include a few Senators who could connect with students about particular items on the agenda.
13. Demonstrate respect for senators' and guest speakers' time by adhering to scheduled meeting end times and avoiding unannounced extensions whenever possible.

Physical space and technology

14. Senate should explore mechanisms, technological or otherwise, that allow meeting participants and the chair to better "read the room," including clearer visibility of members who want to speak (this could be as simple as inviting members to raise their hands when they want to speak in addition to activating their microphone).
15. Support and continue efforts to replace fixed seating with more flexible furnishings in order to accommodate a wider variety of meeting formats and room configurations, including informal discussions and table-group work.
16. More flexible furnishings would also enhance the Senate chambers' usefulness for a broader range of university events and activities.
17. Review the current use of WRPS and special constables at Senate meetings and, where appropriate, reduce their visible presence at meeting entrances to help foster a more welcoming and accessible environment for all participants.

Encouraging candidacy and participation in Senate elections

18. Promote awareness of Senate service and encourage prospective candidates through existing University forums and communication channels, including Faculty Council meetings, leadership meetings, and targeted communications from current senators and the Secretariat, or by hosting annual information sessions for prospective Senate candidates prior to elections.
19. Seek the advice of the offices of EDI-R and Indigenous Relations concerning outreach to prospective candidates prior to annual election cycles.
20. Review and reduce the nominator requirements for elected senators in Senate By-law No. 3, with particular attention to ensuring that nomination processes do not

create unnecessary barriers to candidacy. As part of this review, consider whether faculty nominator requirements continue to serve an essential purpose. Currently, faculty require at least 5 nominators, while undergraduate senators require 100 nominators.

21. Develop a communications plan to provide regular updates to the University Community on the work of Senate, including examples of decision items, strategic discussions, academic priorities, and the impact the work has had on the campus community.
22. Enable and support senators in their role as communication facilitators between Senate and the broader University community by encouraging regular reports on Senate activity to their Faculty Council meetings, and by providing templated materials and other communication resources to support effective engagement.

May 20th, 2026

Dear Co-Chairs Senate Engagement Working (SEWG) group and University Secretary:

Thank you for your invitation to provide feedback regarding the SEWG's materials. I would ask that you please forward this letter to the entire SEWG and to receive it as official correspondence to the University Secretary.

Despite the SEWG's stated purpose to "reduce barriers to participation, enhance transparency, and support meaningful engagement by senators," I fear what has been arrived at in the draft documents does the opposite.

Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the May 19th Engagement Session due to the short notice and conflicts with a teaching workshop that afternoon. I would encourage the SEWG to hold at least one additional engagement session at an alternative time of day and day of the week. This would also provide proper time to review the numerous documents posted on the SEWG webpage before the meeting.

I am happy to further discuss my comments below and to discuss alternative proposals for achieving the objectives of SEWG.

Draft Bylaw 1 Amendments

3.04.1 [New Addition]

Given the extremely small number of petitioned meetings Senate has had in its history, creating new barriers to call a special meeting is completely unwarranted, and undemocratic.

The proposed section 3.04.1 would create new barriers for senators to petition for a special meeting. I remind you that senators are elected and petitioning special meetings is a common practice in democratic organizations. If twenty elected senators wish to hold a special meeting, then a sixteen-member SEC should not be permitted to interfere with this democratic practice. The proposed grounds for the SEC to reject a petition for a special meeting are too broadly defined (e.g., "otherwise not appropriate for inclusion on the agenda"). Moreover, the proposed appeal process (3.04.1.c) fails to provide transparency and meaningful engagement in the case of the SEC deciding not to call a petitioned meeting. Although the Secretary would in that case inform senators with a "brief explanation, along with the original written request for the meeting," these documents are not a substituted for open deliberation on the matter.

The proposed bylaw change would not give Senators an open forum for debating the SEC's decision to block the special meeting petition. Open deliberation is a fundamental principle of democracies because it allows people to ask questions and seek clarity, to hear and possibly modify arguments that may change one's original position before they vote on the matter. Creating opportunities for debate and deliberation is why we hold senate meetings instead of just asking senators to vote electronically on senate matters from their office.

12.01 [Deletion]

The deletion of 12.01 is ill-advised. The purpose of 12.01 is to prevent a small number of Senators from having disproportionate influence over Senate through their roles on multiple important Senate committees. Obviously, a clause like 12.01 permits participation of more senators on senate committees and so aligns with the stated mandate of SEWG. While the names of Senate committees in this clause may need updating from time to time, the principle it codifies should not be discarded as is being proposed.

Procedures for Senate Elections and Appointments Nomination and Appointment of Elected Members to Senate

Standing Committees and Councils [New Addition]

The entire practice of the SEC/Secretary nominating a "slate" is undemocratic, runs counter to equity goals, and does not necessarily lead to the "effective functioning of Senate" (the definition of which is open for interpretation).

Allowing SEC to nominate slates prejudices a fair election process because it disadvantages and discourages those who wish to run for election to a committee if they are not "pre-chosen" by the SEC. This runs counter to two "Election Principles" elsewhere stated in the document, namely Equality of Opportunity ("All nominees shall have an equal opportunity for election. Election procedures shall be applied consistently and without unfair advantage or disadvantage."); and Integrity and Fairness ("The process shall uphold fairness and impartiality at all stages, ensuring confidence in the legitimacy of election outcomes.").

The stated "Nomination Principles" appear neutral—after all, who disagrees with fairness, broad participation, democratic principles, and an effective Senate? However, the apparent neutrality of this document belies underlying disagreement over what an effective Senate entails and so what qualities would make a candidate suitable to this end. In other

words, the choice of the most suitable candidates for Senate committees is not a technocratic exercise but rather a deeply political position.

The slate-nomination process introduces conscious and unconscious biases throughout the slate selection process, privileging the ideologies and backgrounds of those already in positions of power (namely, SEC members, but also the Secretary who leads much of the process on behalf of the SEC). At worst, SEC-nomination slates encourage group think (referred to positively in the document as a goal to "maintain continuity"). Disagreement or discontinuity/nonconformism can benefit Senate committees by generating more critical discussion and dynamism (i.e., innovation). But those who disagree with the views SEC members (i.e., the majority view at least) may be cast aside during the slate-nomination process.

While the slate process is partially being rationalized in the name of "Diversity and Representation," this is called into question by the fact that the SEC itself is selected through a normal election (i.e., there is no special mechanism to ensure equitable representation during the SEC election). This means that prevailing biases or inequities will likely be embodied in the composition of the SEC. In turn, these biases will be reproduced through who the SEC believes is suitable and not suitable for various positions. One way this plays out is through the social networks that people are part of (as an extreme example, if you are golfing buddies with the President, then he is more likely to know you and to look favourably on you as a suitable candidate for an important committee position).

Rather than encourage equity, senators coming from equity-seeking and historically disadvantaged groups may be discouraged from putting their names forward for election to committees after the SEC nominates the "preferred" slates for committees (which does not include them).

If the University is truly concerned with equitable representation on Senate Committees, then it would use its complete control over ex-officio appointments to Senate Committees to ensure that these ex-officio appointments are from equity-seeking and historically disadvantaged groups.

Moreover, it is unclear in the document how "diversity" is being defined? Does this include diversity of professorial streams/ranks? Does this include socio-economic class backgrounds? Does this include ideological diversity? What process will be used for identifying diversity amongst candidates (e.g., how will this be worded in the survey)? Without answers to these questions, it's impossible to ascertain whether the Committee Preference Survey will indeed be a "neutral and equitable tool." And notably, there doesn't

even seem to be any consultative role for the Office of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion & Anti-Racism, nor FAUW's Equity Committee.

Instead of SEC-endorsed slates, candidates for Senate committees should have the opportunity to provide candidate statements and speak to other senators who then vote in an election. Other possible hybrid solutions might include a survey of senator's interests for being on committees but avoid the announcing of slates in cases where a position is contested and so requiring an election.

Approval By Senate [New Addition]

Section 7.3 states that: "Where multiple candidates are nominated for a position [from the slate and from the floor], an election shall be conducted during the meeting the slate is presented. Nominees shall not address Senate during the conduct of the election."

- This provision runs against basic democratic principals. If passed, this clause would mean that candidates would not have any time to campaign or even present their qualifications for the position to Senators so there could be an informed vote. Given the considerable advantage that a SEC-endorsed candidate would have, it is only fair to allow candidates to address Senate and ideally to have time to campaign for the position.

9. Vacancies During the Governance Year

Section 9.1 states that "The Senate Executive Committee shall have the authority to fill committee vacancies that arise during the governance year."

- It is more democratic to hold by-elections. Given the significant power being given to Senate Executive Committee in these proposed changes, it is especially important that vacancies on SEC are filled through a proper election.

University of Waterloo Senate Roles and Responsibilities [New Addition]

Is this document providing guidance or is it binding (e.g., grounds for potential discipline)? While some of the guidance could be useful to new senators, I would take issue with this document if it were in any way binding.

- What does "having regard to the interests of the University as a whole," even mean? How can the "University as a whole" ever be properly defined, and perhaps more importantly, who defines this? Having to conform to some top-down notion of the

"interests of the University as a whole" runs counter to academic freedom which explicitly includes "the freedom to criticize the University." Academics are also responsible to society, professional bodies, the honest pursuit of truth/knowledge, etc. What happens when these other responsibilities come into conflict with what the University administration may deem as "the interests of the University as a whole"?

- (d) How is "the promotion of equity, diversity, inclusion" being defined here?

Rules of Procedure of the University of Waterloo Senate [New Addition]

3.4 Speaking Rules:

- How long does a member have to introduce their motion? This should be longer than 2 minutes.
- What is the practice at other universities? Do they put a time limit of 2x2mins on senators?

3.9 Question on Items for Information

- Given the importance and implications arising out of some "Items for Information," the proposed rules seem restrictive: "b. Questions under this section shall be limited to requests for factual clarification or explanation of the content of the report."
- If passed, this regulation could undermine the stated goals of SEWG which are to "reduce barriers to participation, enhance transparency, and support meaningful engagement by senators." Requiring members who wish to have "substantive debate" on an agenda item put forth a motion at the following meeting, will discourage transparency and participation--especially given the convoluted and challenging pathway that is being suggested for members who wish to make motions (see below).

Part 4: Order and Scope of Business [New Addition]

4.6 Consideration by the Senate Executive Committee

This proposed regulation would significantly increase the powers of SEC to set the agenda rather than simply "prepare" the agenda as is the wording currently in Bylaw 2. Giving the SEC this much power runs against the stated aims of the SEWG. If the SEWG would like to increase senator engagement and participation, they should be making it easier, not

harder, for democratically elected senators to put forward motions to the senate for debate.

4.8 Challenge of Agenda Exclusion

There are two problems with the appeal process for when the SEC rejects a Senator's proposed agenda item:

1. There ought to be a requirement for the Secretary to circulate the background materials provided by the member related to their motion as part of the agenda package for the meeting where the appeal will be heard. This will ensure that senators are voting in an informed manner.
2. Requiring a majority vote on appeal to simply have an item added to the agenda is too high of a threshold, especially considering current practice which allows twenty members to call a special meeting. An academic institution should not be afraid of debate and discussion.

Thank you for reviewing these comments. I look forward to your response. Given the amount of time it has taken me to go through these documents, I question whether adequate time has been given to Senators to thoroughly read over and consider all these proposed changes. I therefore strongly recommend that the SEWG request additional time for senators to properly review materials and become engaged in this important process. Thank you for your work.

Sincerely,

James Nugent (Senator, Faculty-at-Large)
Associate Professor, Teaching Stream
School of Environment, Resources and Sustainability

For Approval**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Senate Graduate Council

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

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **10.1 Report of the Senate Graduate Council: Faculty of Arts – Major Modifications**

Recommendation/Motion

That Senate approves the major modifications to the Master of Catholic Thought (MCT), Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Applied Philosophy, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philosophy, Master of Arts (MA) in Philosophy, and the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Religious Studies programs for the Faculty of Arts, effective September 1, 2026, as presented.

That Senate approves the major modifications to the Master of Accounting (MAcc) program for the School of Accounting and Finance, effective May 1, 2027, as presented.

Summary

[Senate Graduate Council](#) met on [April 16, 2026](#) and [May 25, 2026](#) and agreed to forward the following items to Senate for approval as part of the regular agenda.

- a. Master of Catholic Thought (MCT).
- b. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Applied Philosophy.
- c. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philosophy.
- d. Master of Arts (MA) in Philosophy.
- e. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Religious Studies.
- f. Master of Accounting (MAcc).

The full proposal can be found in the April 16, 2026 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 396](#) and the May 25, 2026 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 148](#).

Proposal/Rationale

Master of Catholic Thought (MCT) Program:

Proposed changes:

- 1) Removing the Master's Research Paper study option.
- 2) Adding a Thesis study option as the Program's sole option.
- 3) Replacing the course requirements with new courses (current courses being retired). The new requirements include the following courses:
 - CT 600 Foundations of Catholic Thought
 - CT 620 The Human Person
 - CT 630 The Catholic Church in the World
 - CT 640 Catholicism and Social Justice

Rationale:

Following recommendations made in the cyclical review of the Master of Catholic Thought (MCT) program in July 2020, St. Jerome's University (SJU) engaged an educational consultant with experience in small Catholic liberal arts contexts to recommend, among other things, ways to increase enrolments in the MCT program while at the same time maintaining rigorous academic standards. This consultant visited the campus in July 2024 to conduct interviews with faculty, students, senior leaders, and partners in the Diocese of Hamilton. During the fall of 2024, he also conducted an environmental scan and surveyed prospective participants in SJU's non-credit Certificate in Catholic Leadership program, students in the current MCT program, and alumni of the program. While a small program generates a small data N, he presented the results of this review to members of the MCT Advisory Committee and senior leaders at SJU in January 2025. Key findings included:

- Strong recommendation not to add to number of courses. The core curricular elements in the program were considered a strength.
- Components of the program valued most were more academic and personal than pragmatic with students and prospective students valuing the opportunity to engage deeply in theology and personal faith formation outside of a seminary context. The ideal program would link faith development and work in a variety of fields including education, pastoral ministry, and health care.
- Students enjoyed the opportunity to explore an area of particular interest in a focused way.
- There were some differences in priorities among current and prospective students. Current students expressed concern about timely degree completion and preferred in-person classes. Prospective students expressed interest in scheduling flexibility and online courses.
- Expanding online options would allow the possibility of recruitment beyond the Diocese of Hamilton and potentially allow cross-registration with similar graduate programs at other institutions.
- The consultant's modeling suggests that, to run four courses, there would need to be 33 student-course enrolments (students in seats, not total students in the program) for the program to be sustainable.

Acting on direction from the SJU VP Academic and Dean, the MCT Advisory Committee considered multiple name changes, new course retirements and new courses, course delivery modes, a variety of strategies to increase enrolments through recruitment, potential academic partnerships, and possible new program outcomes. The MCT Advisory Committee determined that the core academic content should remain, consistent with the external program review recommendations; but the delivery of the content should be modified to align with student demand and SJU resources. Put in a slightly different way, the current Graduate Level Degree Expectations (GLDEs) should remain as a guide for the program's academic content (no changes to the program's learning outcomes); and the academic content in the program should be delivered through a revised course structure.

The following major modification to the MCT program is the result of a comprehensive review of the program, which took place through the Summer and Fall of 2025. It is prompted by recommendations resulting from the 2019-2020 cyclical review of the program, which emphasized the need to focus on program sustainability. This modification is informed by student and alumni input, an environmental scan of similar Master's-level programs, and an assessment of SJU resources available to deliver the program. The overarching objective with this modification is to enhance the student experience by (a) retaining rigorous academic standards; (b) providing students with increased access to courses (e.g., all courses online), and (c) creating opportunities for students to pursue their specific academic interests while working closely with a supervisor and supervisory committee (e.g., through the Master's Thesis). There are no changes to the program's learning outcomes.

The proposed program changes were reviewed by the Quality Council (QC) in March 2026, and the QC confirmed that the changes may proceed as major modifications.

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Applied Philosophy; Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philosophy; Master of Arts (MA) in Philosophy Programs:

The following research fields are being added:

- 1) Anti-Racist Philosophy and Decolonial Philosophy
- 2) Feminist Philosophy

The following research fields are being removed:

- 1) Language, Logic and Metaphysics
- 2) Mind and Cognitive Science

The faculty complement in Philosophy has changed dramatically over the last fifteen years through departures, retirements, and hiring. While we maintain strength in the "Philosophy of Science and Mathematics", and in the "Ethics and Political Philosophy" research fields, this is not so for the other fields that we list. There are no philosophers with full-time appointments in Philosophy with graduate supervision in their contracts who specialize in metaphysics, philosophy of mind, or cognitive science. We have only one who specializes in each of logic and philosophy of language. It is therefore misleading to applicants that we list "Language, Logic, and Metaphysics" and "Mind and Cognitive Science" as two of our four research fields. We propose to close these two research fields and add the following two research fields: "Feminist Philosophy" and "Anti-Racist Philosophy and Decolonial Philosophy." For each of these new research fields, we have five graduate supervisors available within the Department. These are growing subdisciplines in philosophy, and our department is one of only a small number in the country that can claim sufficient strength in

them to list them as research fields. Indeed, these represent significant strengths of our department, which are important to highlight. The change will make it much easier for potential applicants who work in these areas to find the Department, and it will forestall confusion from those who work in the areas in which we no longer offer supervision. There are no changes to the programs' learning outcomes.

Current and recent graduates have been consulted about the changes and are supportive.

Note: The proposed new fields are clearly sub-disciplinary areas within the broader discipline of the program and they are not sufficiently distinct from the parent degree to be considered new programs themselves. The proposed changes were reviewed by the Quality Council (QC) in April 2026, and the QC confirmed that the changes may proceed as major modifications.

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Religious Studies Program:

- 1) Changing the program name from PhD in "Religious Studies" to PhD in "Religion, Culture, and Society".
- 2) Removing the "Religious Diversity in North America" graduate research field.
- 3) Updating the course requirements to include RS 740 and 750 as required courses and remove RS 700 and 710.
- 4) Updating text to account for the Faculty of Arts reorganization.

The joint PhD in Religious Studies program is being revised to a program in Religion, Culture, and Society. Learning outcomes will be similar, but with less emphasis on North American-specific content. Applicant interest in North American religion has been dropping, and faculty retirements necessitate an expanded range of acceptable topics. Additionally, the Faculty of Arts reorganization process has identified faculty with relevant expertise out of the Religious Studies Department who could fruitfully contribute to the PhD if the scope is broadened. A broad discussion and reassessment process following the PhD program cyclical review has led to these proposed changes, with input and support from current and former students, faculty at both institutions, outside reviewers, and staff. With the removal of the Religious Diversity in North America graduate research field, the required courses on North America need to be replaced with appropriate courses. The elimination of the Religious Studies Department under the Arts reorganization requires fine-tuning of language, such as replacing references to the Department with references to the program and clarifying that it is the Joint PhD Director (not the new School Director) who is referenced in the program/plan. As part of a reconsideration of milestones in the recent program cyclical review process, certain procedures are being modified, such as allowing students to do the language milestone and thesis proposal after the comprehensive exams. All of the program changes proposed in this document have already been passed by our joint program partners in the Religion and Culture Department at Wilfrid Laurier University and been passed by the WLU Graduate Faculty Council. Modified language here attempts to conform as closely as possible to their new plan language while adhering to the institutionally-specific requirements of the University of Waterloo.

Master of Accounting (MAcc) Program:

Proposed changes:

- 1) Degree requirements continue to include eight approved courses; learning outcomes and course descriptions for the courses are being revised.
- 2) Revise the admission requirements to expand eligibility from four specified UW undergraduate programs (Bachelor of Accounting & Financial Management, Bachelor of Math/Chartered Professional Accountancy Studies, Bachelor of Science/Chartered Professional Accountancy Studies, or Bachelor of Sustainability & Financial Management) to applicants holding any four-year Honours Bachelor's degree (or equivalent), with at least a 75% average across all courses taken.
- 3) Expand program delivery to include a Toronto option that leverages existing educational space and extends the program's reach into the highly populated Greater Toronto Area, attracting both full-time and part-time students.
- 4) Revise the tuition structure from a per-term amount to a per-course amount.
- 5) Update admission intake to occur in each of the three academic terms: Spring, Fall and Winter.

Rationale:

The rationale for these changes reflects the revised learning outcomes of the Chartered Professional Accountants (CPA) Professional Education Program, which will be fully integrated into the curriculum. At the same time, the program is undertaking a comprehensive update of its overall curriculum to ensure continued relevance and academic strength.

In parallel, expanded admission eligibility supports institutional growth objectives by broadening access beyond current pathways and enabling the program to attract a larger, high-quality applicant pool. Building on the program's strong reputation, these changes are expected to drive substantive enrolment growth and associated revenue, strengthening the program's financial contributions to the University. This change has been recommended in the last two cyclical reviews by external reviewers.

Leveraging existing space to expand delivery into the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) further advances the University's strategic priorities by increasing reach, visibility, and impact. The GTA location is particularly attractive to both full-time students, due to the region's high population, and part-time students, given its proximity to major financial and business districts, allowing professionals to conveniently balance work and study.

In addition, the tuition structure will be adjusted from a per-term to a per-course basis, accommodating both full- and part-time students. The total tuition amount will remain the same.

The introduction of two additional intake periods (adding Spring and Fall) to the current Winter intake aligns strategically with the timing of undergraduate degree completions at UW (non-SAF students) and at other Canadian universities. By coordinating admissions with these graduation cycles, the program can more effectively attract new students who will be pursuing advanced accounting education, supporting the expansion of the MAcc program to new student markets.

Collectively, these enhancements position the program for long-term growth, sustainability, and long-term success.

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 Arts: January 23, 2026

Faculty of Arts: February 26, 2026

Senate Graduate Council: April 16, 2026

Senate Graduate Council: May 25, 2026

Senate: June 8, 2026

Documentation Provided

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

Appendix B: [Proposed Changes – School of Accounting and Finance](#)

The full proposal can be found in the April 16, 2026 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 396](#) and the May 25, 2026 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 148](#).

For Approval**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Senate Graduate Council

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

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **10.2 Report of the Senate Graduate Council: Faculty of Engineering – Major Modifications**

Recommendation/Motion

That Senate approves the major modifications to the Master of Business, Entrepreneurship and Technology (MBET) and the Master of Management Science (MMSc) programs for the Faculty of Engineering, effective September 1, 2026, as presented.

Summary

[Senate Graduate Council](#) met on [April 16, 2026](#) and agreed to forward the following items to Senate for approval as part of the regular agenda.

- a. Master of Business, Entrepreneurship and Technology (MBET).
- b. Master of Management Science (MMSc).

The full proposal can be found in the April 16, 2026 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 429](#).

Proposal/Rationale

Master of Business, Entrepreneurship and Technology (MBET) Program:

Proposed changes:

- 1) Updating the admission requirements wording to align with the minimum admission requirements for Master's degree regulations.
- 2) Revising the number of references that are required for admission from three to two.
- 3) Updating the course requirements.
- 4) Adding the following Graduate Specializations to the program:
 - AI and Digital Transformations

- New Venture Creation and Commercialization
- Product Management and Innovation

Rationale:

The MBET program was first launched in 2002 to meet a very particular need: a place where entrepreneurs could learn how to start a new venture while actually working on it. The program was meant to be an immersive experience that integrated learning with the many tasks involved in building a new venture. It is important to remember that this predated Velocity (2008) and was only shortly after Communitech appeared (1997). MBET was the first major foray into teaching entrepreneurship at the University of Waterloo. Over its 23 years, MBET has supported many successful ventures such as FluidAI and Membio and has been a true academic home for entrepreneurship on campus. However, in the years since its inception, many other options have appeared for entrepreneurs: incubators have sprung up both generalized (e.g., Accelerator Centre) and specialized in fields such as health, fashion, and fintech. MBA programs have added entrepreneurship options. And there are now a surfeit of online resources for budding entrepreneurs. Basically, the initial case for the MBET program has weakened over time. Importantly, we have seen this play out in student numbers as it has become increasingly difficult to meet our recruitment targets despite repeated attempts to market in different ways, in different locations, and to different audiences. Without a significant refresh, the MBET program is unlikely to have a viable future. We want to ensure that however we revise the program, it can still serve the original function of supporting entrepreneurs in their journeys and the entrepreneurial spirit that motivated the decision to create the program in 2002 remains. The MBET is not an MBA with some entrepreneurship courses, it is an entrepreneurial approach to business.

Over the years, about 1/3 of our MBET students have started new ventures. The others have become active in the entrepreneurship ecosystem, gone into the corporate world and taken on roles such as product management, or been involved in organizational innovation. We have interviewed our current full-time and part-time MBET students as well as spoken with alumni of the program. The response to the changes we are proposing was uniformly positive, to the extent that a few of our current students indicated that they would be interested in transferring to the revised program next year, if that would be possible. We have also had students specifically say that with the program changes, they are going to strongly recommend MBET to new people they hadn't considered before. The students also recommended some features (courses, timing, requirements) that we have incorporated into this proposal.

The revised full-time option will be significantly easier to administer. Courses will be offered in a standard one-semester format rather than with classes throughout the year, as is currently done. Students will get marks as most do, i.e., at the end of each term, and teaching will now also be on a regular semester cycle. The new format allows MBET students to take non-MBET specific courses which opens up the possibility to offer Conrad's BE courses to MBET students. Having graduate specializations adds advising complexity, however, as we will now need to support students deciding which specialization to take, if any, and it does make scheduling slightly more complex to ensure we offer courses during specific terms to allow students to complete specializations.

The revised part-time option will be slightly more difficult to administer as a result of the changes. The current format (Friday night & all-day Saturday once every three weeks, approximately) requires careful planning to allow students to do different specializations. As well, because the part-time option runs over three years, there will be different versions of

the MBET for the next two years. We have a plan to manage the transition. The impact of program changes won't be felt until the 2027-28 academic year because the first year of the revised part-time option is a mandatory four courses, i.e., no different to administer than our current part-time option. After that, a number of approaches will allow students the ability to take elective courses.

The three graduate specializations were chosen by first considering the recommendations of the previous Cyclical Review. One comment from the reviewers was: "The faculty of Conrad should carefully evaluate their curriculum to identify sequences that would more clearly define the course offerings supporting student product profiles, namely intrapreneurship... and a founder track." The reviewers also noted that we should have a stronger technical component. The new Graduate Specializations do that. Intrapreneurship is represented through the Product Management and Innovation specialization, the founder track by New Venture Creation and Commercialization which is essentially the current version of MBET, and greater technical components both by the new course, Emerging Technologies, as well as the proposed Graduate Specialization in AI and Digital Transformations.

The proposed revisions to the program do not result in any changes to the current learning outcomes.

The requirements for the new specializations are outlined below:

1. Graduate Specialization in AI and Digital Transformations

To receive the Graduate Specialization in AI and Digital Transformations, students must successfully complete the following courses:

- BE 605 Project Management (0.50)
- BE 645 AI Business Applications (0.50)
- BE 650 Digital Transformations (0.50)
- BET 613 Corporate Finance for the Technology-based Organization (0.50)
- Either:
 - BET 615 Corporate Innovation and Consulting (0.50)
 - Or both:
 - BET 615A Corporate Innovation and Consulting: Part 1 (0.25)
 - BET 615B Corporate Innovation and Consulting: Part 2 (0.25)

2. Graduate Specialization in New Venture Creation and Commercialization

To receive the Graduate Specialization in New Venture Creation and Commercialization, students must successfully complete the following courses:

- BE 630 Sales (0.50)
- BET 603 Entrepreneurial Finance for the Technology-based Enterprise (0.50)
- BET 608 Business Model Validation (0.50)
- Either:
 - BET 604 New Technology-based Venture Creation (0.50)
 - Or both:
 - BET 604A New Technology-based Venture Creation: Part 1 (0.25)
 - BET 604B New Technology-based Venture Creation: Part 2 (0.25)

3. Graduate Specialization in Product Management and Innovation

To receive the Graduate Specialization in Product Management and Innovation, students must successfully complete the following courses:

- BE 605 Project Management (0.50)
- BE 630 Sales (0.50)
- BET 613 Corporate Finance for the Technology-based Organization (0.50)
- BET 617 Product Management (0.50)
- Either:
 - BET 615 Corporate Innovation and Consulting (0.50)
 - Or both:
 - BET 615A Corporate Innovation and Consulting: Part 1 (0.25)
 - BET 615B Corporate Innovation and Consulting: Part 2 (0.25)

Master of Management Science (MMSc) Program:

Proposed changes:

- 1) Changing the name of the “Master of Management Science (MMSc) - Management of Technology” program to “Master of Management Science (MMSc) - Business Analytics”.
- 2) Updating the course requirements. The new requirements include the following courses:
 - MSE682 Organizational Strategy and Innovation
 - MSE683 Analytics and Decision-Making
 - MSE689 Statistical Learning and Data Science
 - At least 5 additional MSE courses

Rationale:

- 1) One of the goals in our Department’s 2024 strategic plan was to reimagine our online program. This goal originates from the "Final Assessment Report" from our latest cyclical review in 2022. One of the eight recommendations provided by the reviewers was to revitalize our online program by shifting its focus toward data analytics. As noted in the cyclical review report, this shift would align the program more closely with the MMSc program on campus and build on the Department’s strengths in Operations Research and Information Systems, as well as the growing industry demand for data analytics professionals. Accordingly, the Department decided to revitalize the MMSc - Management of Technology Online program through pedagogical innovation, stronger integration within the Department, and updated course materials in response to the reviewers’ comments from the last cyclical review. This plan was also approved by the Dean.
- 2) The proposed name change addresses the changing market needs and reflects the program’s evolving focus on the integration of business, innovation, and analytical decision-making. It also aligns with our Department’s core strengths in Organizational Behaviour, Management of Technology, Information Systems, and Operational Research, which define the program’s interdisciplinary foundation and applied orientation.
- 3) The proposed changes directly implement recommendations from the program’s most recent review, titled “The Refurbishment Report,” conducted by five faculty members and one staff member. The report specifically advises renaming and refocusing the program, in line with the Dean’s request. It also notes that the program “lacks a unifying theme or critical mass” and would benefit from stronger thematic specializations. Our proposed name, Business Analytics, addresses both concerns.

4) We aim to make the program more flexible and appealing by reducing the number of required core courses from 6 to 3, allowing students to take at least 5 elective courses instead of 2, while keeping the number of total courses the same.

5) The revised structure remains fully aligned with program learning outcomes while enhancing coherence and flexibility. Although the balance between core and electives has shifted, the program still requires eight courses. Focusing the core on foundational management science skills and expanding elective options supports the review's recommendation to strengthen the "Analytics" pillar. The updated electives directly reinforce outcomes in evidence-based decision-making, analytical reasoning, innovation, and business strategy under uncertainty.

6) Feedback from Strategic Fuel's 20 interviews (with 17 students and 3 alumni of the program) that took place in 2023 indicates strong support for a clearer program identity, more analytics-focused content, and greater elective choice. Students reported difficulty understanding the current program branding, expressed a preference for programs with a strong analytics focus, and sought pathways to leadership without pursuing an MBA. They also noted that the existing six core courses limit flexibility. These findings confirm that both the proposed renaming and the expanded elective structure directly address students' needs and expectations.

7) The tuition rate for the program will remain unchanged, supporting accessibility, competitiveness, and student satisfaction.

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: November 3, 2025

Senate Graduate Council: April 16, 2026

Senate: June 8, 2026

Documentation Provided

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

The full proposal can be found in the April 16, 2026 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 429](#).

For Approval**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Senate Graduate Council

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

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **10.3 Report of the Senate Graduate Council: Faculty of Mathematics – Major Modifications**

Recommendation/Motion

That Senate approves the major modifications to the Master of Actuarial Science (MActSc) and the Master of Actuarial Science (MActSc) – Co-operative programs for the Faculty of Mathematics, effective January 1, 2027, as presented.

Summary

[Senate Graduate Council](#) met on [May 25, 2026](#) and agreed to forward the following items to Senate for approval as part of the regular agenda.

- a. Master of Actuarial Science (MActSc).
- b. Master of Actuarial Science (MActSc) – Co-operative Program.

The full proposal can be found in the May 25, 2026 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 157](#).

Proposal/Rationale

Master of Actuarial Science (MActSc) and the Master of Actuarial Science (MActSc) - Co-operative Programs:

Rationale for changes:

Applicants regularly ask us if the MActSc program has a work placement component. It is an important factor when choosing between our program and competitors such as the MFI program at the University of Toronto. In addition, our graduates are primarily competing with undergraduate students in co-op programs when looking for employment after graduation. As such we have decided to add a co-op component to make our program more competitive. Current students were consulted about the possibility and all agreed that work experience is vital to their education and that it would have factored into their decision at the time of application. We have also consulted the program advisory board; all board

members welcome this change. The program will retain a transfer-in only option without the co-op requirement, so that in a worst-case-scenario, students who are unable to find a position can still graduate from the program. The co-op program/option will be supported by Co-operative Education. In conjunction with the creation of the co-operative version of the program, we are amending the existing version to be transfer-in only with no co-operative requirements/milestones so that students who are unable to locate a work experience will still be able to obtain their degree.

The number of courses offered is also being reduced from 15 to 12, and the number of courses required for the degree is being reduced from 12 to 11. The previous version of the program required students to take 15 courses (5 per term) however students only needed to pass 12 courses to achieve the degree. In our 2024 cyclical review, the review committee recommended that we reduce the number of in-class hours each week. As such, we have reduced the required number of courses to 11 by combining topics that were covered in more than one course and eliminating some topics that were considered non-essential. The proposed course structure maintains the original program learning outcomes. The existing professional actuarial exam exemptions (i.e. course equivalences) are also maintained, with the exception of the IFoA CP1 exam (which had been provided by ACTSC 633). Students were consulted about the reduction in courses and all students except for one agreed that reducing courses was preferable even with the loss of the CP1 exemption. In addition, ACTSC 615 Economics will now be an optional course and not required for the degree. This course maps to the Society of Actuaries Verification of Educational Experience – Economics credit. We have observed in recent cohorts that many students qualified for this recognition based on economics courses taken during their undergraduate degree. Moreover, there are additional courses offered at the University and by third parties that students could take to achieve the credit.

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 Mathematics: April 28, 2026

Senate Graduate Council: May 25, 2026

Senate: June 8, 2026

Documentation Provided

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

The full proposal can be found in the May 25, 2026 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 157](#).

For Approval**Open Session**

To: Senate

From: Senate Graduate Council

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

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **10.4 Report of the Senate Graduate Council: Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs – Major Modifications**

Recommendation/Motion

That Senate approves the major modifications to the 2026 Graduate Studies Academic Calendar, effective September 1, 2026, as presented.

Summary

[Senate Graduate Council](#) met on [April 16, 2026](#) and agreed to forward the following item to Senate for approval as part of the regular agenda.

- a. Proposed changes for regulations on graduate work-integrated learning and course outlines.

The full proposal can be found in the April 16, 2026 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 444](#).

Proposal/RationaleSection 13.2.3 Academic progression: Good academic standing*Description and rationale for proposed changes:*

This section currently states that students not in good academic standing may be identified as being in 'conditional standing' or 'alternatively may be required to withdraw'. We are strengthening this 'alternative' language. When this was introduced as a section in the Calendar, it was acknowledged that there is uneven application of 'conditional standing' across Faculties and programs. While this is still the case, it should be explicitly stated that approval is required by the Associate Dean to move directly to Required to Withdraw (RTW).

Proposed Calendar copy:

A student is deemed to be in Good Academic Standing when they are satisfying their academic requirements which, depending on the program may include:

- Minimum grade performance in courses. All graduate students are required to achieve grades in the courses presented in fulfilment of the degree requirements that meet or exceed the minimum academic performance as indicated by the academic program.
- Minimum cumulative average, at least 70%; higher minimum averages may be required by the academic program.
- Successful completion of milestones / examinations within articulated time limits. Specific examples include the Academic Integrity Module for all graduate students; comprehensive or qualifying examinations for PhD students; and in some academic programs, proposal presentations or defenses.
- Satisfactory progress in research in preparation for the successful presentation or defense of a student's Master's Research Paper (MRP), Master's or PhD thesis, as determined by the student's supervisor or advisory committee.

All students admitted under standard admissions begin their program in Good Academic Standing. A student will lose their status of Good Academic Standing if one or more of the following outcomes occur:

- The student achieves a failing grade in any course or achieves a grade in an individual course that does not satisfy the minimum required performance.
- The student's cumulative average is less than 70% or is less than that required by the academic program.
- A student does not successfully complete a milestone requirement or examination within the time limits specified in this Calendar or by the Department/School or Academic Program.
- A student is deemed to be progressing in research at an unsatisfactory rate.

Normally, a student deemed not to be in Good Academic Standing will be placed on Conditional Standing. In exceptional cases, a student may be Required to Withdraw at the recommendation of the Graduate Officer and with approval from the Associate Dean (Graduate Studies).

When students are placed on Conditional Standing, they will receive confirmation of the steps, and timeframe, to restore Good Academic Standing. At the end of each term, the performance of each student in Conditional Standing will be assessed by the program against the shared plan. If, by the end of the time stipulated, they have not demonstrated appropriate progress, they will be Required to Withdraw.

Normally, a student can be placed in Conditional Standing at most once during their graduate program; therefore, a repeated failure to meet the requirements to stay in Good Academic Standing normally results in a requirement to withdraw.

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

Senate Graduate Council: March 3, 2026

Senate Graduate Council: April 16, 2026

Senate: June 8, 2026

Documentation Provided

Appendix A: [Proposed Changes – Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs](#)

The full proposal can be found in the April 16, 2026 Senate Graduate Council Meeting Book, starting on [page 444](#).

For Information

Open Session - Consent

To: **Senate**

Sponsor: Thomas Duever, Interim Vice-President, Academic and Provost
Contact Information: Office of the Provost

Date of Meeting: **June 8, 2026**

Agenda Item Identification: **11.1 Report of the Interim Vice-President, Academic and Provost on the University Appointments Review Committee**

Summary:

Annual University Appointments Review Committee (UARC) Report

Members of the University Appointments Review Committee (UARC), appointed by the Vice-President, Academic & Provost in consultation with Deans' Council and the President of the Faculty Association, advise on regular faculty appointments with a duration of more than two years. UARC members review hiring processes and provide advice to the Dean before a hiring recommendation is sent to the Vice- President, Academic & Provost for approval. Generally, UARC monitors the hiring process to ensure that positions were properly advertised, that both the letter and the spirit of the hiring procedure were followed and that there was a thorough search for candidates with attention to equity. In accordance with Policy 76 – Faculty Appointments, the committee reports to Senate annually, via the Vice-President, Academic & Provost, on its activities and operations. As of July 1, 2024 UARC administration is overseen by the Associate Vice-President, Faculty and Academic Life.

From September 1, 2024 to August 31, 2025, UARC reviewed a total of 34 proposal for regular faculty appointments. For comparison purposes, the total number of proposals reviewed in years past was as follows:

YEAR	NUMBER OF PROPOSALS
September 1, 2009 – August 31, 2010	58
September 1, 2010 – August 31, 2011	79
September 1, 2011 – August 31, 2012	87
September 1, 2012– August 31, 2013	68
September 1, 2013 – August 31, 2014	70
September 1, 2014 – August 31, 2015	85
September 1, 2015 – August 31, 2016	69
September 1, 2016 – August 31, 2017	90
September 1, 2017 – August 31, 2018	102
September 1, 2018 – August 31, 2019	87
September 1, 2019 – August 31, 2020	50
September 1, 2020 – August 31, 2021	66
September 1, 2021 – August 31, 2022	135
September 1, 2022 – August 31, 2023	91
September 1, 2023 – August 31, 2024	77
September 1, 2024 – August 31, 2025	34

POINTS OF INTEREST:

Of the files reviewed, the following information can be extracted (with figures from the last cycle (2023- 2024) provided):

CATEGORY	2024-2025	2023-2024
Female Candidates	16 (of 34)	34 (of 77)
Male Candidates	18 (of 34)	41 (of 77)
Gender Unknown	0 (of 34)	2 (of 77)
Probationary Appointments	29 (of 34)	56 (of 77)
Definite Term Appointments	0 (of 34)	13 (of 77)
Total Candidates	34	77

REVIEW PROCESS:

Appointment proposals from academic units and faculties were generally timely, and department chairs/school directors have been helpful in providing any additional information requested. In accordance with Policy 76, UARC members were able to complete most reviews within 5 working days unless there was some missing information and discussions with the chair/director or dean were required.

ADMINISTRATION:

Administration information concerning UARC can be found at: [University Appointments Review Committee](#). Links to information and documents include an overview of Submission of Files to UARC; Summary of Recruiting Efforts for UW Faculty Positions; Checklist for UARC File Submission; Overview of Chair’s Memo to the Dean; Conflict of Interest in Hiring Committees, Equitable Recruitment and Selection Toolkit.

UARC MEMBERSHIP:

	2024-2025	CURRENT
Chair, UARC	Gerry Schneider	Julia Roberts
Secretary	Katherine Thorne	Adrienne Dwyer
Faculty of Arts	Julie Robson Julia Roberts	Julie Robson Anna Drake
Faculty of Engineering	Marianna Polak Ladan Tahvildari	Armaghan Salehian Ladan Tahvildari
Faculty of Environment	Dan Cockayne Jennifer Dean	Dan Cockayne Jennifer Dean
Faculty of Health	Scott Leatherdale Lora Giangregorio	Scott Leatherdale Steven Mock
Faculty of Mathematics	Kevin Hare Pengfei Li	Kevin Hare Pengfei Li
Faculty of Science	Brian Dixon Shoufa Lin	Deborah Jones Shoufa Lin

FACULTY TOTALS

Faculty	# of files	Gender			Residency				Appointment Type			
		Female	Male	Unknown	Canadian	Permanent Resident	Foreign Academic	Unknown	Tenure	Permanent	Probationary	Definite Term
Arts	5	4	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5	0
Engineering	9	2	7	0	7	0	2	0	1	0	8	0
Environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health	4	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
Math	8	2	6	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	8	0
Science	8	5	3	0	7	1	0	0	2	0	6	0
TOTAL	34	16	18	0	24	3	7	0	5	0	29	0

Professorial Rank - Tenure Stream Faculty				Professorial Rank - Teaching Stream Faculty			Results			
Lecturer	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Full Professor	Accepted	Declined	No Offer	Pending
0	3	0	0	2	0	0	5	0	0	0
0	7	0	1	1	0	0	8	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0
0	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0
0	6	0	2	0	0	0	5	2	1	0
0	26	1	4	3	0	0	24	8	2	0

Regular Faculty Appointments Reviewed by UARC September 1, 2024 to August 31, 2025

Faculty	Files	Gender			Residency			
		Female	Male	Unknown	Canadian	Permanent Resident	Foreign Academic	Unknown
	TOTAL							
ARTS	5	4	1	0	3	2	0	0
ENG	9	2	7	0	7	0	2	0
ENV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HEALTH	4	3	1	0	4	0	0	0
MATH	8	2	6	0	3	0	5	0
SCIENCE	8	5	3	0	7	1	0	0
TOTAL	34	16	18	0	24	3	7	0

Tenure	Probationary - Tenure Stream		Probationary - Teaching Stream			Definite Term				
	F	M	TOTAL	F	M	TOTAL	F	M		
TOTAL										
0	0	0	3	2	1	2	2	0	0	0
1	0	1	7	2	5	1	0	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	8	2	6	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	1	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	0
5	3	2	26	12	14	3	2	0	0	0

Lecturer			Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream			Assistant Professor, Tenure Stream			Associate Professor, Tenure Stream			Full Professor, Tenure Stream		
TOTAL	F	M	TOTAL	F	M	TOTAL	F	M	TOTAL	F	M	TOTAL	F	M
0	0	0	2	2	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	1	7	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	1	0	0	0	2	1	1
0	0	0	3	2	1	26	3	14	1	1	0	4	2	2

For Information**Open Session - Consent**

To: Senate

From: Genevieve Gauthier-Chalifour
University Secretary

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **11.3 Housekeeping Amendments to Policy 68 – Vice-President, Research and International [A]**

Summary

At its May 14, 2026 meeting, 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 reflect the scope of the position and title as it will be utilized during the current [vice-presidential search process](#). Reference to “International” is removed, following a review and restructure of the Office of the Vice-President, Research and International which resulted in a shift of the international portfolio to the Associate Vice-President, Strategic Enrolment Management.

The amendments are reflected in the enclosed redlined version of the Policy and are provided to Senate for information. They will similarly be provided to the Board of Governors at its meeting in June 2026.

Documentation Provided

- Policy 68 – Vice-President, Research and International [A] [Amended]

Appendix A – Policy 68 (Redlined)

University of Waterloo Policy 68

Vice-President, Research ~~and International~~

Established:	21 November 1988
Revised:	27 October 1998 28 October 2014 28 February 2020. Amended, official titles only. 28 October 2025. Amended, official titles only.
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, Research ~~and International~~ provides leadership in research throughout the University and externally. 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, Research ~~and International~~ is a senior faculty member of considerable scholarly stature. 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, 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 Research and Innovation Council, and being the external representative for the University with regard to research and research-related issues. The Vice-President, 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, Research ~~and International~~ is chair and academic mentor of the Senate Research and Innovation Council. Together with the Faculty deans, 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, 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, Research ~~and International~~ for any prolonged period, arrangements should be made for the President to appoint an Acting Vice-President, Research ~~and International~~ for a period of no more than one year.

If the office of the Vice-President, 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, 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, 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, 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, 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, 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 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 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 Council, the Faculty deans and the Vice-President, Academic & Provost.

The members of the Senate Research and Innovation 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 Council, the Faculty Deans and the Vice-President, Academic & Provost, the nominating committee shall resume its screening activities. If the Senate Research and Innovation 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, 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, 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, Research ~~and International~~ the process of reconciliation may involve the holding of a meeting with members of the Senate Research and Innovation 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, 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, 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, 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, Research ~~and International~~. The Vice-President, 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, 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, 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, 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 Council.

For Approval**Open Session - Consent**

To: Senate

From: Vivek Goel, President and Vice-Chancellor
Thomas Duever, Interim Vice-President, Academic and Provost

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **11.4 Amendments to Policy 77 – Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members [F]**

Recommendation/Motion

That Senate approve the amended Policy 77 – Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members, as presented.

Summary

The proposed amendments to Policy 77 - Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members represent a targeted approach to move the Tenure, Permanence, and Promotion (TP&P) timeline at the University of Waterloo ahead by one month, as well as to update the title of the policy to include Permanence, which has been previously overlooked.

The Faculty Relations Committee (FRC) has identified challenges with the current TP&P timeline, specifically the effect on the ability of Faculties to secure reference letters. Following discussions at FRC and with the Faculties, it was determined that a shift in the timing for reaching out to potential referees for TP&P cases would be beneficial.

Under the current timeline, requests to potential external referees typically do not begin to be sent out until August, when many referees are on vacation and overcommitted to other reviews from institutions that reach out earlier. It was found that, on average, Faculties contact 11.8 referees per candidate to secure five letter writers, with an overall acceptance rate of 43%. Moving the timeline ahead is intended to improve the acceptance rate and reduce the number of requests required. Adjusting the timeline is also intended to provide more time for the Departmental Tenure, Permanence, and Promotion Committees (DTPPCs) and Faculty Tenure, Permanence, and Promotion Committees (FTPPCs).

As the timeline is embedded within Policy 77, FRC voted to approve the proposed amendments at its December 11, 2025 meeting, following the approval path outlined in Policy 1 for Class F policies. As this was a targeted approach, FRC determined that the changes constituted a minor amendment and addressed them directly, rather than forming a Faculty Policy Drafting Committee (FPDC).

FFRC determined that the proposed amendments should proceed through the remaining approval steps at this time so that they would come into effect for the 2027-2028 TP&P cycle. This timing avoided adversely affecting faculty members in the 2026-2027 cycle by reducing their preparation time by one month.

FRC also approved the minor amendment to update the title of the policy to include Permanence at its April 2, 2026 meeting.

Jurisdictional Information

Policy 77 is a Class F policy, as described in Policy 1 – Initiation and Review of University Policies. With respect to development, minor amendments may be dealt with directly by the FRC. The approval route for Class F polies is from the FRC to the President, then to Senate, and finally to the Board of Governors.

Governance Path

- FRC: December 11, 2025 and April 2, 2026 for the title change.
- Senate: June 8, 2026

Documentation Provided

- Policy 77 – Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members [Amended]

Policy 77 – Tenure, Permanence and Promotion of Faculty Members

Established: June 5, 2000

Last Updated: September 1, 2024

Revised: February 28, 2020. Amended, official titles only.

Class: F

<https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-additional-information>

1. INTRODUCTION

Universities exist to develop society's intellectual resources and to preserve its intellectual traditions. Their primary functions are to preserve, evaluate, develop, and transmit knowledge, intellectual skills and culture. The modern university is expected to provide intellectual leadership to society, to contribute in a major way to the coordination of knowledge and the development of artistic, philosophical, scientific, and technological ideas, and to provide a fertile intellectual environment in which new knowledge and ideas can evolve. To achieve these goals, faculty members must be effective and committed teachers and scholars, constantly striving to expand and communicate their knowledge, ideas and understanding for the benefit of society.

Tenure and Permanence

Tenure and Permanence are meant to provide institutional support for academic freedom (see the Article on Academic Freedom in the Memorandum of Agreement between the University and the Faculty Association). The pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and the attainment of understanding through scholarship and teaching, which are essential functions of a university, occur best in an atmosphere in which free inquiry and discussion are fostered. Free inquiry and dissemination of knowledge may at times bring a faculty member into conflict with society, governments or the University itself. Tenure and permanence provide security of employment against pressures that might arise from such conflicts, 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 giving offense to powerful individuals or groups.

Tenure and Permanence provide stability for both individual faculty members and the University. Tenure and Permanence provide a faculty member with an environment conducive to long-term scholarly work and development as an educator. The University, for its part, is assured of a continuing group of teachers and scholars committed to the University, around which it can plan and from whom it can draw its academic leadership.

Professional Conduct

All faculty members are expected to conduct themselves in relations with colleagues, staff and students across the University in such a way as to promote the academic well-being of all concerned. Faculty members should avoid denigrating the character and professional competence of others, and should pass judgment on the work of colleagues only in the proper academic forums. Further, they should refrain from actions that prevent others from pursuing their legitimate activities and should strive to be helpful, readily contributing their time and expertise for the overall benefit of the academic community.

2. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

The standards outlined here guide all decisions made at each stage of a regular faculty appointment, beginning with the original decision to hire. Because these standards are

intended to apply university-wide to faculty members engaged in complex intellectual endeavours, they cannot be expressed in absolute quantitative terms. Nonetheless, they do provide a framework around which qualitative judgments can be made by academic administrators and by those serving on tenure, permanence and promotion committees.

The University expects all faculty members to maintain high standards in all aspects of their university work. To this end, the University exercises judgments on performance in the basic areas of a faculty member's academic responsibilities. Such judgments must be made with the greatest possible care and fairness as they are reflected in decisions regarding salary, reappointment, tenure/permanence, and promotion.

It is the responsibility of department Chairs to assess the performance of each probationary or definite-term regular faculty member annually and each tenured or permanent faculty member every two years, to provide a written performance review, and to be available to discuss it upon request. Performance reviews are especially important in helping new faculty members gauge their progress towards meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure/permanence. Annual/Biennial performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure/permanence and promotion considerations, together with reports from referees and more extensive career reviews carried out by the Department Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee (DTPPC).

Teaching

University teaching is informed and enriched by the research, scholarship and service of its faculty. The University expects its regular faculty members to keep academic programs and courses current with developments in their fields and, where appropriate, to communicate both their discoveries and their commitment to scholarship and research.

The purpose of teaching is to facilitate learning. Thus, effective teaching draws the strands of a field together in a way that provides coherence and meaning, places what is known in context, lays the groundwork for future learning, and opens the way for connections between the known and the unknown. Effective teaching is an important goal of the University and consists of much more than what happens in the classroom. As detailed in the University's Framework for Teaching Effectiveness, and its Addendum.

University teaching encompasses a wide range of activities. It takes many different forms (e.g., undergraduate and graduate courses, graduate seminars, online education, project and thesis supervision), has many different components (e.g., synchronous lectures and tutorials, asynchronous learning elements, setting and grading of assignments and examinations, interaction with students outside the classroom, curriculum development), and can occur in many different environments (e.g., large lecture theatres, small seminar rooms, off-campus short courses and workshops, clinics, laboratories, one-on-one supervision, virtual platforms).

All faculty members from both streams are expected to contribute to undergraduate teaching. Where feasible, tenure stream faculty are expected to contribute to graduate teaching and to participate in project/thesis supervision. Where feasible and depending on the needs of their unit, Teaching Stream faculty are also eligible to contribute to graduate teaching and to participate in project/thesis supervision.

For purposes of assessing teaching, it is useful to single out particular sorts of contributions to the quality of teaching and learning that extend beyond course instruction and supervision. Some such activities are those that improve an individual instructor's performance, the quality of the classes they teach or the supervision they provide, while others (referred to as educational leadership activities) have a substantial positive impact

on the quality of teaching and learning beyond the individual faculty member's courses, the programs in which they teach, or the students they supervise.

In all of their teaching activities, faculty members are expected to be fair in the evaluation of student work and constructive in their comments. They are expected to be available to students for interviews and consultations outside the classroom at reasonable times. They must always respect the integrity of their students and carefully avoid any exploitation of them for private advantage. They must maintain strict confidentiality with regard to students' personal lives and political and religious views. They must comment on academic progress and provide judgments on character only to appropriate persons and in appropriate circumstances, and must always be as fair and as objective as possible when making assessments and providing letters of reference.

Scholarship

The University expects Tenure Stream faculty members to be active participants in the evolution of their disciplines and professions. Where feasible, faculty members are expected to seek external funding to support their scholarly work.

Scholarship may take several equally valuable forms. One is the discovery of new knowledge, which may differ from discipline to discipline, and includes the generation of new concepts, ideas, principles and theories. A second form involves the innovative coordination, synthesis or integration of knowledge. This type of scholarship seeks and promotes understanding in a broader context by organizing knowledge in a new and useful way, by illustrating new relationships between the parts and the whole, by relating the past in a new way to the present and future, or by demonstrating new and significant patterns of meaning. Scholarship may also be observed in new and useful applications. Indeed, significant new applications of knowledge to the problems of society represent important scholarly contributions. Novel applications may take many forms, such as creative writing, design, fine and performing arts, innovative clinical or professional practice, and the discovery, development and transfer of technology for societal benefit. Peer-reviewed research with respect to pedagogy and peer-reviewed research with respect to innovative teaching also constitute scholarly activity.

Although any of these scholarly activities may be carried out on a confidential basis, the expectation of the University is for communicated scholarship. In general, only work that is accessible for peer review or professional adjudication can be considered in assessing scholarship for performance reviews, tenure or promotion. Regardless of the discipline and type of scholarship, the key ingredients are the originality, quality and impact of the scholarly work.

Faculty members are expected to meet the ethical standards for scholarship in their particular fields of endeavour; to observe the University's guidelines and policies with respect to ethical conduct in research; and more generally, to act with integrity, truthfulness and honesty in the conduct and communication of their scholarly work.

Service

In addition to their primary duties of teaching and scholarship, regular faculty members have a responsibility to participate in the effective functioning of the University through service on committees, student advising, coordination of activities and in administrative positions. It is important that all faculty members be willing to assist with administrative duties when their help is needed. Many faculty members also provide valuable service to groups outside the University, such as disciplinary or professional organizations, conferences, journals and granting councils. Community service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities is normally considered as service to the University.

3. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

Peer assessment forms the basis for determining the suitability of a faculty member for the granting of tenure/permanence or for promotion. Insofar as possible, tenure, permanence and promotion committees shall base their assessments on evidence that is first-hand and direct.

Assessment of Teaching

University teaching involves much more than "classroom performance". As described in the University's Framework for Teaching Effectiveness, teaching includes many dimensions, including Design, Implementation, Learning Experience, and Professional Development. It is normal that different dimensions are emphasized at different times in a teaching career. Hence, it is important to develop a fair assessment of effectiveness across the candidate's full spectrum of teaching activities. A holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness includes examining these various dimensions, as relevant, and using appropriate instruments in each case.

Teaching effectiveness should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from multiple sources, often including self-reflection from the faculty member (often via a teaching dossier, annual/biennial performance reports, etc.), peer reviews of teaching, student course perception survey data and comments, evaluations of graduate supervision (where applicable), and possibly other sources. The opinions of former students can also be of value if solicited on a systematic basis.

Assessment of Scholarship

The University relies primarily on external referees and members of the DTPPC to judge a candidate's scholarly record. Although the University looks for evidence of active continuing scholarship, the volume of scholarly output is less important than its quality, originality and impact.

A candidate for tenure, permanence or promotion with a non-zero scholarship weighting must provide examples of their scholarly work for examination by referees and the DTPPC. The candidate is responsible for documenting contributions made to team research and jointly authored work. Joint work with students supervised by the candidate should be identified. The candidate must also provide an overview of their scholarly work to date, information about work in progress and a general indication of future plans.

High quality contributions to the synthesis of knowledge (e.g., books, monographs, review articles) and to non-traditional forms of scholarship (e.g., artistic exhibitions and performances, innovative design) can provide direct evidence of effective scholarship. Consulting reports and planning documents that are accessible for peer review and evidence of having produced improvements in clinical or professional practice may also be submitted as evidence of a candidate's scholarly contributions.

Other evidence of activity and standing as a scholar includes supervision of student research, invitations to present "keynote" addresses, election to and awards received from professional and disciplinary societies, service as a referee for journals and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees.

The primary assessment of quality, originality and impact is made by referees and DTPPC members on the basis of examining examples of the candidate's work. Other less direct indicators include the rigour of the review processes for journals and conferences in which the candidate has published, the standards of publishing houses for books, and the extent to which other scholars have made reference to the work. In areas such as the fine and performing arts, similar information may be derived from the prestige of exhibitions and performances to which the candidate has contributed, professional reviews and the receipt of awards or prizes.

Assessment of service

Candidates for tenure/permanence or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the DTPPC to assess its quantity and quality. Where necessary, the DTPPC should obtain statements from those who have personally observed the candidate's service contributions both internal and external to the University. In the case of those positions with higher than typical assignment of duties for service (i.e. weighting of 40% or more), it is especially important to ensure sufficient evidence to evaluate the quality and quantity of service activity of a tenure/permanence or promotion candidate. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship or teaching.

4. TIMING AND CRITERIA

Candidates for tenure/permanence and promotion must apply to the department Chair not later than ~~June~~May 1 in order that their applications can be considered by the DTPPC and FTTPC during the fall term.

Consideration for tenure/permanence

A faculty member holding a second probationary Tenure Stream appointment is entitled to formal consideration for tenure, and a faculty member holding a second probationary Teaching Stream appointment is entitled to formal consideration for Permanence, which normally occurs during the second year of the second probationary appointment. However, the candidate may choose to postpone consideration until the third year. Employment as a regular faculty member beyond the second probationary appointment is possible only if tenure/permanence has been granted.

In exceptional circumstances, for instance where extensive experience was acquired at UW or elsewhere prior to the probationary appointment at UW, an individual may be considered for tenure/permanence earlier than the second year of the second probationary appointment. Such early consideration requires the agreement in advance of the candidate and the DTPPC plus the written agreement of the Dean. If either the DTPPC or the FTTPC recommends against tenure/permanence, early tenure/permanence consideration shall cease and the candidate must wait for tenure/permanence consideration until the final year of the second probationary appointment.

The granting of tenure to a probationary Assistant Professor carries with it appointment at the rank of Associate Professor, and the granting of permanence to a probationary Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream carries with it appointment at the rank of Associate Professor, Teaching Stream.

For Tenure Stream faculty members, the expectations for the granting of tenure are: a record as a good teacher committed to academic and pedagogical excellence; a record of high-quality and peer-assessed scholarly or creative work (normally demonstrated by publication or presentation in suitable academic or artistic forums); and a record of professional, university or community service. See sections II. and III. The granting of tenure normally will require a record of strong performance in both scholarship and teaching, with satisfactory performance in service. However, a candidate may also qualify for appointment as a tenured Associate Professor by virtue of very strong performance in scholarship or teaching with at least satisfactory performance in the other two areas.

Tenure is not a right: it must be earned by a record of good performance. By the time candidates are considered for tenure they will have had ample opportunity to develop their teaching skills and to make original contributions to their fields of endeavour. These original contributions must be of sufficient magnitude to give witness to a candidate's depth of understanding and scholarly and professional competence. Committees and external referees will be concerned not so much with the volume of scholarly output as with the

depth of understanding and degree of scholarly competence it demonstrates. Particular attention will be paid to assessing the likelihood that candidates will continue their scholarly activities once tenure has been awarded.

Candidates for tenure should have demonstrated their willingness to participate in service activities as described in Section II. However, service expectations are lower for probationary faculty than for tenured faculty, and service is not weighted as heavily as scholarship or teaching in tenure considerations.

Standards for Promotion

The standards to which faculty members strive for the granting of permanence and promotion on the Teaching Stream are broadly parallel to those on the Tenure Stream, but with important differences that reflect the different roles that faculty members on the two streams serve.

The expectations for the granting of permanence are: a record as a strong teacher committed to academic and pedagogical excellence; and a record of satisfactory professional, university or community service. While the default weights for a Teaching Stream faculty member are 80% Teaching and 20% Service, there are Teaching Stream faculty members with lower Teaching weights due to a higher Service load. For Teaching Stream faculty members with a service weighting of at least 40%, expectations for Service are higher than "Satisfactory" and increase as the weighting increases, because of the prominence of this part of their roles. Notwithstanding this higher service weight, as Teaching Stream faculty members, the expectation is still that a record as a strong teacher is maintained, regardless of their Teaching weight, recognizing that those with less than 80% Teaching may have less opportunity to demonstrate the quality of their teaching as those with 80% Teaching.

In exceptional cases, an Assistant Professor, Teaching Stream may have a non-zero Scholarship weighting as part of their appointment. In such cases, the granting of permanence normally will require a record of strong performance in teaching and good performance in scholarship, in addition to a record of service as described earlier. However, a candidate may also qualify for appointment as a permanent Associate Professor, Teaching Stream by virtue of very strong performance in teaching with at least satisfactory performance in scholarship, in addition to a record of service as described earlier. Generally, the expectations for the quality of scholarship will be the same as that for promotion to Associate Professor in the Tenure Stream, though the expectations for quantity must be moderated to recognize the time and opportunity their appointment provides to pursue scholarship.

Consideration for promotion to Professor

In principle, a tenured Associate Professor may apply in any year for promotion; however, it is unusual for such a promotion to occur prior to five years of full-time service in the rank of Associate Professor. If an application for promotion is unsuccessful, the candidate becomes eligible to reapply two years thereafter.

Promotion to the rank of Professor recognizes a high order of achievement in both scholarship and teaching by tenured Associate Professors, together with satisfactory performance in service. Although evidence of strong teaching performance is required, normally the greatest emphasis is placed on scholarship and achievement within an individual's discipline. However, in exceptional cases, a tenured Associate Professor may be promoted on the basis of an outstanding teaching record accompanied by a continuing and long-standing record of satisfactory or better scholarship and service.

A continuous program of scholarship with positive peer review by nationally and internationally recognized scholars is essential for promotion to Professor. For clinical

faculty, the relevant scholars will often be nationally and internationally recognized practitioners in the relevant fields, and may not have academic appointments. The candidate's record is to be judged in comparison with the records of faculty members recently promoted at UW and other universities of comparable standing. Promotion to Professor is not an assured step in the career of a Tenure Stream faculty member, and some will not attain this rank.

Consideration for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream

In principle, a permanent Associate Professor, Teaching Stream, may apply in any year for promotion; however, it is unusual for such a promotion to occur prior to five years of full-time service in the rank of Associate Professor, Teaching Stream. If an application for promotion is unsuccessful, the candidate becomes eligible to reapply two years thereafter.

Promotion to the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream recognizes a high order of achievement in teaching and educational leadership by permanent Associate Professors, Teaching Stream, together with at least satisfactory performance in service. (Associate Professors, Teaching Stream with service weightings at least 40% must demonstrate at least strong service.)

A continuous record of strong teaching and of impact beyond the classroom via educational leadership activities is essential for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream. The candidate's record is to be judged in comparison with the records of faculty members recently promoted at UW and other universities of comparable standing. Promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream is not an assured step in the career of a faculty member, and some will not attain this rank.

In exceptional cases, an Associate Professor, Teaching Stream may have a non-zero Scholarship weighting as part of their appointment. In such cases, promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream normally will require a record of high order of achievement in teaching and good performance in scholarship, in addition to a record of service as described earlier. However, a candidate may also qualify for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream by virtue of outstanding performance in teaching together with long-standing satisfactory performance in scholarship, in addition to a record of service as described earlier.

5. TENURE, PERMANENCE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEES

Department Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee (DTPPC)

The DTPPC shall be chaired by the department Chair and shall include four to six tenured or permanent faculty members elected by the tenured, permanent and probationary faculty of the department. The Chair and elected members shall be voting members of the DTPPC. Normally, a majority of the DTPPC's voting members should be from the tenure stream; a majority of the DTPPC's voting members should be at the rank of Professor or Professor, Teaching Stream; the DTPPC should include both men and women; and the DTPPC should include at least one member from the Teaching Stream. In addition, the Dean may appoint a non-voting advisor to the DTPPC.

In small departments or where there are too few faculty members at the rank of Professor or Professor, Teaching Stream to constitute a majority on the committee, or where there are insufficient appropriate Teaching Stream faculty members available to serve on the committee, the Dean, after consultation with the department and with the written approval of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost, may make other arrangements respecting the size and composition of the DTPPC. Nevertheless, if Teaching Stream faculty are likely to be evaluated for permanence or promotion, the Dean should strongly consider inviting a Teaching Stream faculty member from a related discipline to join the DTPPC.

In departments that include clinical faculty, when such faculty are likely to be evaluated for tenure or promotion, the DTPPC should include members with the requisite expertise to

evaluate the scholarly contributions of the clinical faculty. Where this is not possible, a department, in consultation with the Dean, should strongly consider inviting a faculty member with such expertise from a related discipline to join the DTPPC.

By ~~May~~April 1 each year the Chair shall report the DTPPC membership to the Dean and to the department's tenured, permanent and probationary faculty, and shall invite those who wish to be considered for tenure/permanence or promotion to apply by ~~June~~May 1.

Faculty Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee (FTPPC)

The FTPPC shall be chaired by the Faculty Dean and shall include at least five tenured or permanent faculty members broadly representative of Faculty program areas and elected by the tenured, permanent and probationary members of the Faculty. A majority of the FTPPC's elected members shall be from the tenure stream and a majority shall be at the rank of Professor or Professor, Teaching Stream. The FTPPC should include both men and women and include at least one member from the Teaching Stream. FTPPC members may not serve simultaneously on a DTPPC in the same Faculty.

The Dean and elected members shall be voting members of the FTPPC, and the Vice-President, Academic & Provost shall appoint an additional voting member who shall be a tenured or permanent faculty member from outside the Faculty. The University Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Advisory Committee (UTPPAC) shall appoint a non-voting advisor from amongst its members. The Dean shall report the membership of the FTPPC to the Vice-President, Academic & Provost and to the Faculty's regular faculty.

University Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Committee (UTPPC)

The UTPPC shall be chaired by the Vice-President, Academic & Provost and shall include the Faculty Deans, the Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs and the Vice-President, Research and International. In addition, the UTPPC shall include two non-voting student members, one undergraduate and one graduate, appointed by the Vice-President, Academic & Provost in consultation with the President of the Federation of Students and the President of the Graduate Student Association. The UTPPC shall be advisory to the President on individual tenure, permanence and promotion cases, and on the comparability of standards across the University.

University Tenure, Permanence and Promotion Advisory Committee (UTPPAC)

The UTPPAC shall consist of the Chair plus six additional tenured or permanent faculty members jointly appointed by the Vice-President, Academic & Provost and the FAUW President for three-year terms. A majority of the UTPPAC's appointed members shall be from the tenure stream and at least five shall be at the rank of Professor or Professor, Teaching Stream. Additionally, the committee should include both men and women and should include at least one member from the Teaching Stream. The UTPPAC Chair shall appoint a member of UTPPAC to each FTPPC, with no member serving on the FTPPC in their own Faculty. Otherwise, members of UTPPAC may not serve on any DTPPC or FTPPC.

The UTPPAC is advisory to Senate through the Vice-President, Academic & Provost concerning tenure, permanence and promotion standards, policies and procedures, and may recommend changes to the Vice-President, Academic & Provost. UTPPAC shall report to Senate annually on its activities.

6. TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

Application for tenure or promotion to Professor

The candidate shall inform the department Chair in writing by ~~June~~May 1, and shall meet with the Chair to discuss the procedures to be followed.

Candidate's brief

For candidates in the Tenure Stream, by ~~July~~June 1 the candidate shall submit a brief

supporting the application for tenure or promotion. The brief must include a curriculum vitae, copies of relevant scholarly work, a summary of the candidate's contributions in scholarship, teaching and service, and any other relevant information the candidate feels may be useful to the DTPPC and FTTPC. The candidate must also submit, by ~~July~~June 1, the names of at least three arms-length external referees who can assess their published work.

For candidates in the Teaching Stream, by ~~July~~June 1 the candidate shall submit a brief supporting an application for permanence or promotion. The brief must include a curriculum vitae, a summary of evidence of the candidate's contributions in teaching, in service, and in scholarship (where relevant), along with a teaching dossier and other relevant information the candidate feels may be useful to the DTPPC and FTTPC. The candidate must also submit, by ~~July~~June 1, the names of at least three referees, as described in more detail later in this Policy.

The teaching dossier should include the following sections:

- Teaching Responsibilities
- Statement of Teaching Philosophy
- Strategies Used to Teach Effectively
- (Optional) Scholarship
- Educational Leadership (required for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream)
- Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
- Goals in Future Teaching along with Appendices

Annual Performance Reviews

The Chair shall provide the DTPPC with copies of all written assessments made of the candidate within the department.

Referees for Tenure Stream candidates

For candidates in the Tenure Stream, external opinions of a candidate's scholarly contributions are sought in all tenure and promotion cases; normally at least three external reviews are obtained. External referees shall be both external to UW and at arms-length from the candidate.

The DTPPC shall consider the candidate's list of referees and normally will suggest additional names. After consulting with the Dean, the Chair shall inform the candidate of the pool of potential referees. The candidate may challenge, in writing to the DTPPC, a potential referee for bias, apprehension of bias, perceived conflict of interest or unsuitability. If the DTPPC and the candidate do not agree on the pool of potential referees, at least half of the referees contacted must be from those approved by the candidate.

Letters soliciting comments from referees shall be sent by the Dean. Referees shall be sent copies of this Policy, and shall be asked to assess the candidate's scholarly work and, if possible, to compare it with the scholarly achievements of others recently tenured at their own institutions or others of similar standing. Informal contacts with potential external referees by the department Chair, DTPPC or FTTPC members, or the candidate are inappropriate.

Referees for Teaching Stream candidates

For candidates in the Teaching Stream, confidential and objective assessments of the candidate's contribution in teaching are sought in all permanence and promotion cases. Normally at least three such reviews are obtained.

Appropriate expertise to evaluate a candidate in the Teaching Stream will generally require a substantial understanding of the culture of teaching at Waterloo and the opportunities for taking part in teaching activities both inside and outside of formal course-based teaching available to Waterloo faculty members. Where a referee is required for the assessment of educational leadership, this assessment will generally depend less on Waterloo-specific factors, although it will also benefit from an understanding on the referee's part of the opportunities that are available to faculty members at Waterloo. Since teaching contribution includes both activities that are part of formal course-based teaching and activities outside of formal teaching, as detailed in the University's Framework for Teaching Effectiveness and Addendum, the expertise required to evaluate a teaching contribution will be somewhat specialized and possibly highly variable. Those who count as appropriate referees will vary depending on the nature of the teaching contribution the candidate has made. For candidates for permanence, at least two of the three referees will come from outside the candidate's department, though possibly from within their Faculty. For promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream, at least two of the referees must be from outside of the candidate's Faculty, one of which can be internal to the University and one of which must be external to the University.

The DTPPC shall consider the candidate's list of referees and normally will suggest additional names. After consulting with the Dean, the Chair shall inform the candidate of the pool of potential referees. The candidate may challenge, in writing to the DTPPC, a potential referee for bias, apprehension of bias, perceived conflict of interest or unsuitability. If the DTPPC and the candidate do not agree on the pool of potential referees, at least half of the referees contacted must be from those approved by the candidate.

In the cases of Assistant Professors, Teaching Stream or Associate Professors, Teaching Stream with a non-zero Scholarship weighting, a total of at least four referee letters must be obtained, at least two of which are from qualified external referees who provide an assessment of the candidate's contributions to Scholarship. If they are qualified and well-placed to do so, these referees may also be asked to assess the candidate's teaching.

Letters soliciting comments from referees shall be sent by the Dean. Referees shall be sent copies of this Policy and links to the University's Framework for Teaching Effectiveness and Addendum. Since a scholarship weighting greater than zero is unusual, in such cases the Dean will explain the size, duration, and reason for the scholarship weighting to facilitate fair assessment of the candidate's scholarly contribution by the referee. Informal contacts with potential external referees by the department Chair, DTPPC or FTPPC members, or the candidate are inappropriate.

Tenure, permanence or promotion file

The tenure, permanence, or promotion file for a candidate consists of: all evidence considered by the DTPPC, the FTPPC or the President; the DTPPC assessment of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship (where relevant) and service; the outcome of deliberations by the DTPPC, the FTPPC and the President. The file shall also include the numerical record of votes taken, plus any written statements, including reasons, by DTPPC or FTPPC members who do not agree with the majority recommendation. If the file is provided to the candidate, it shall include all internal or external letters of assessment with the names of the authors and other identifying references deleted, unless the authors have expressly consented to being identified.

Conflict of interest

A member of a tenure, permanence and promotion committee who has a conflict of interest in a particular case shall declare the conflict and shall be absent from the portion of committee meetings dealing with that case. In particular, no DTPPC or FTPPC member may attend those portions of meetings at which their own case is being considered (except when appearing as a candidate). If the Committee Chair has a conflict of interest, the committee

shall elect another of its members to serve as Chair pro tem during the absence of the Chair.

Challenges

Prior to consideration of a case, a candidate may challenge in writing any member or members of a DTPPC or FTTPC for bias, apprehension of bias or perceived conflict of interest. The committee, excluding the member challenged, shall decide whether the challenge is well-founded. If so, the challenged member shall not attend those portions of committee meetings dealing with the specific case. If the committee decides that a challenge is not well-founded, the challenged member shall participate, but the challenge becomes part of the record for any subsequent consideration or appeal.

Procedures at the Department Level

The DTPPC shall meet to consider all applications from the department for tenure/permanence or promotion. It shall prepare an assessment of each candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service for Tenure Stream candidates. It shall prepare an assessment of each candidate's teaching and service (and, exceptional cases, scholarship) for Teaching Stream candidates. It shall decide whether to recommend tenure/permanence or promotion. The assessment should state clearly, and in detail, the evidence considered, the criteria applied to the evidence, the evaluation of the candidate in each of the relevant areas, and the emphasis placed on each area.

If a candidate's work intersects significantly with work in another academic unit, the Chair will normally ask an appropriate member or members of that unit for comment. The Chair shall forward to the DTPPC any written submissions assessing the candidate's qualifications for tenure/permanence or promotion.

If members of the DTPPC express significant reservations that could result in a negative recommendation, the Chair shall provide the candidate with a complete, suitably anonymized, copy of the tenure, permanence or promotion file, together with a written explanation of the nature of the reservations in sufficient detail to allow the candidate to respond. Within ten working days the candidate shall provide their written response (including any relevant new evidence) to the Chair for distribution to the DTPPC. The candidate may also choose to appear before the DTPPC and may choose to be accompanied by a UW academic colleague. The DTPPC shall not finalize its recommendation until the candidate has been given the opportunity to respond, as described above.

When the DTPPC has completed its deliberations, the Chair shall inform the candidate in writing of the outcome (including the basis for it, if negative), and shall forward the tenure, permanence or promotion file to the Dean for consideration by the FTTPC. When a negative recommendation has gone forward, the Chair shall inform the candidate that the FTTPC will review the case unless the candidate chooses to withdraw it.

Procedures at the Faculty Level

The FTTPC shall consider all positive tenure, permanence and promotion recommendations from a DTPPC to ensure that the DTPPC has acted carefully and appropriately in its deliberations, that its recommendations are sound and that comparable standards are being applied from department to department. Negative DTPPC recommendations will also be reviewed unless the candidate has chosen to withdraw their case.

The FTTPC shall base its deliberations primarily on the report forwarded by the DTPPC. The DTPPC Chair (or delegate) normally will present the DTPPC recommendations to the FTTPC and will be available to answer questions, but shall not otherwise participate in the proceedings. In exceptional circumstances, the FTTPC may decide to contact additional referees; if such additional referees were not in the original pool of potential referees

developed by the DTPPC, the candidate's right to challenge must be respected, as specified above.

If members of the FTTPC express significant reservations that could result in a negative recommendation, the Dean shall provide the candidate with a complete, suitably anonymized copy of the tenure, permanence or promotion file, together with a written explanation of the nature of the reservations in sufficient detail to allow the candidate to respond. Within ten working days the candidate shall provide their written response (including any relevant new evidence) to the Dean for distribution to the FTTPC. The candidate may also choose to appear before the FTTPC and may choose to be accompanied by a UW academic colleague. The FTTPC shall not finalize its recommendation until the candidate has been given the opportunity to respond, as described above.

When the FTTPC has completed its deliberations, the Dean shall inform the candidate in writing of the outcome (including the basis for it, if negative). For positive recommendations, the Dean shall forward the tenure, permanence or promotion file to the President. Negative promotion recommendations by both the DTPPC and FTTPC shall result in the promotion file being closed for that particular year. Otherwise, negative FTTPC recommendations will be forwarded to the President unless the candidate chooses to withdraw the case.

The President

The President shall consider all tenure, permanence, or promotion recommendations forwarded by the FTTPC, together with the advice of the UTPPC.

If the President decides in favour of promotion, they shall inform the candidate and report the promotion to Senate and the Board of Governors for information. If the President supports the granting of tenure or permanence, they shall inform the candidate, recommend approval to the Board of Governors, and subsequently report the granting of tenure or permanence to Senate for information.

If the President decides against tenure, permanence or promotion, they shall inform the candidate in writing with reasons. In the event of a negative tenure, permanence or promotion decision, the candidate's appointment shall be extended as necessary to provide 12 months' notice from the date the candidate is informed.

7. TENURE, PERMANENCE AND PROMOTION APPEALS

A negative tenure, permanence or promotion decision by the President may be appealed. Within ten working days of being informed of the negative decision, the candidate must submit written notice of intent to appeal to the UTPPAC Chair, who shall establish a three-person Tribunal to hear the appeal.

Members of the Tribunal normally shall be or shall have been Associate Professors or Professors at the University of Waterloo in the candidate's discipline or a related discipline. For cases involving Teaching Stream faculty members, Associate Professors, Teaching Stream or Professors, Teaching Stream in the candidate's discipline or a related discipline are also appropriate. They shall not have had any prior connection with the particular tenure, permanence or promotion consideration nor have had a close professional or personal relationship with the candidate.

The candidate and the President shall each propose at least three possible Tribunal members in accordance with the above criteria, and shall be given the opportunity to challenge in writing the names proposed by the other party with respect to the criteria or for bias, apprehension of bias or perceived conflict of interest. The UTPPAC Chair normally shall appoint the three Tribunal members from the names proposed, including at least one

member proposed by each of the parties, and shall name one of the members as the Tribunal Chair.

If the UTPPAC Chair judges that it is not possible to establish an internal Tribunal meeting with the above requirements, one or more of the three Tribunal members may be external to the University of Waterloo. External members shall be or shall have been tenured Associate Professors or Professors at another Canadian university in the candidate's discipline or a closely related discipline. In cases involving Teaching Stream faculty members, Associate Professors Teaching Stream, Professors, Teaching Stream, or those holding equivalent ranks at another Canadian University may also be appropriate candidates. They shall not have had any prior connection with the particular tenure, permanence or promotion consideration nor have had a close professional or personal relationship with the candidate. The candidate and the President shall be given the opportunity to propose external Tribunal members and to challenge in writing external members proposed by the other party or by the UTPPAC Chair.

The Tribunal shall conduct its proceedings in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The Tribunal shall be provided with the complete tenure, permanence or promotion file, and shall schedule a hearing at which the parties may present arguments and submissions, and may call, examine and question witnesses. The candidate is entitled to be accompanied by a UW colleague. The burden of proof shall be on the candidate to demonstrate that the criteria for tenure, permanence, or promotion have been met.

The Tribunal shall decide by majority vote on the basis of the evidence submitted to it whether the criteria for tenure, permanence or promotion have been met. The Tribunal Chair shall forward a written decision, with reasons, to the candidate and the President, with copies to the UTPPAC Chair and the FAUW President. The decision of the Tribunal is final and binding on the candidate and the University, except that an alleged failure of the Tribunal to comply with the above procedures may be grieved under the grievance and arbitration provisions of the Memorandum of Agreement between the Faculty Association and the University.

For Information**Open Session - Consent**

To: Senate

From: Senate Academic Quality Enhancement Committee

Presenter(s): David DeVidi
Associate Vice-President, Academic

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **11.5** **Report: Senate Academic Quality Enhancement Committee**

Summary

Senate Academic Quality Enhancement Committee (AQuE) conducted an e-vote concluding on April 27, 2026 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 received approved:

- a. Update Report and Action Plan: Catholic Studies Minor

Approved final assessment reports and cyclical program review progress reports can be viewed on the [AQuE Committee Reporting page](#). There were no issues noted in the reports or concerns raised by the committee.

Jurisdictional Information

As outlined in the committee's [Terms and Reference](#), Senate Academic Quality Enhancement Committee is empowered to make approvals on behalf of Senate for a variety of operational matters:

2. On behalf of Senate, consider and approve all Final Assessment Reports and Progress Reports within the University's IQAP, and provide Senate with a summary of the committee's deliberations in this regard. Any matter of controversy that might arise may be referred to Senate.

Governance Path

Senate Academic Quality Enhancement Committee approval date: April 27, 2026

For Information**Open Session - Consent**

To: Senate

From: Senate Graduate Council

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

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **11.6 Report of the Senate Graduate Council**

Summary

[Senate Graduate Council](#) met on [April 16, 2026](#) and [May 25, 2026](#) 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. Curricular Submissions

Council approved the following proposed minor changes to existing programs and regulations at its meeting on [April 16, 2026](#):

- a. [Faculty of Arts](#)
- b. [Faculty of Engineering](#)
- c. [Faculty of Environment](#)
- d. [Faculty of Health](#)
- e. [Faculty of Mathematics](#)

Council approved the following proposed minor changes to existing programs and regulations at its meeting on [May 25, 2026](#):

- a. [Faculty of Arts](#)
- b. [Faculty of Engineering](#)
- c. [Faculty of Mathematics](#)
- d. [Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs](#)

2. New Scholarships and Awards

Council approved the following awards at its meeting on [April 16, 2026](#): WiCS Graduate Student Scholarship; Gerhild Unny Memorial Graduate Award.

Council approved the following awards at its meeting on [May 25, 2026](#): Bonnie Ho Entrance Award in Masters of Accounting; Bahar and Ali Graduate Scholarship for International Women in Computer Science.

3. Graduate Studies Academic Calendar Updates

Council received for information an update for the Graduate Studies Academic Calendar.

4. EdTech Project and Fee Proposal

Council received for information and discussed the proposed EdTech fee.

5. Relationship between Supervisors and Graduate Students

Council received for information and discussed a report provided by the Office of the Ombudsperson.

6. Transnational Education Programs

Council received for information and discussed the Transnational Education Programs.

7. TA/RA Unionization Updates

Council received for information and discussed updates about the TA/RA unionization.

Jurisdictional Information

As outlined in the council's [Terms and Reference](#), Senate Graduate Council is empowered to make recommendation and 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, polices, 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: April 16, 2026

Senate Graduate Council: May 25, 2026

For Information**Open Session - Consent**

To: Senate
From: Senate Research & Innovation Council
Presenter(s): Charmaine Dean
Vice President, Research and International

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **11.7 Report of the Senate Research & Innovation Council**

Summary

[Senate Research and Innovation Council](#) met on [May 14, 2026](#) and discussed the following items at the meeting:

1. [Water Institute](#)

Council approved the renewal application for the [Water Institute](#).

2. [CREATE Grants](#)

Council received for information and discussed the CREATE grants program.

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.
- On behalf of Senate, consider and approve renewals for centres and institutes, and report such renewals to Senate for information. Any matter of controversy that might arise may be referred to Senate.

Governance Path

Senate Research and Innovation Council: [May 14, 2026](#)

For Information**Open Session - Consent**

To: Senate

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

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **11.8.1 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-june-2026.pdf>

Teaching Assessment: Current State of the Holistic Model

Update to Senate, June 2026

Sonya Buffone, Director, Teaching Assessment Processes

Kathy Becker, Specialist, Teaching Assessment Processes

Key Messages

- **Annual institutional analyses of Student Course Perceptions (SCP) survey ratings have produced stable findings over time.** Ratings remain clustered toward the higher end of the response scale across contexts, and analyses have found no statistically significant differences in SCP survey ratings by sex when controlling for multiple variables, including instructor rank, class size, and Faculty.
- **The institutional Peer Review of Teaching (PRT) model is generating consistently positive feedback during its soft-launch phase.** Feedback gathered to date from faculty member reviewers and reviewees indicates a uniformly positive response to the process, with participants describing it as credible, fair, and useful. These positive experiences are most strongly associated with the presence of core design elements of the model, including trained reviewers, structured review processes, use of the Framework for Teaching Effectiveness, and reviewers external to the home department. As Faculties continue to implement the model in different ways, information is being gathered on these approaches, with comparative analysis planned to inform future direction.
- **SCP survey response rates remain an important institutional consideration.** Response rates remain lower than ideal, and their interpretation requires attention to enrolment size and the differing evidentiary value of a given response rate across course contexts. Work to better understand student participation and support informed engagement with SCP surveys continues in collaboration with students and other institutional partners.
- **Large-scale analysis of SCP survey comments shows that these comments contain meaningful and often actionable insight into student learning experiences.** Current work is focused on establishing the technical, methodological, privacy, and governance foundations required for responsible aggregate analysis at the course, program, and Faculty levels, beginning with institutional-level summaries that can inform curriculum planning and support academic leadership in understanding patterns in student learning experiences. As this work matures, it is expected to support more granular applications, informed by ongoing consultation between University leaders and the Faculty Association.

Contents

Purpose and Scope of Update	3
1. Institutional Context.....	3
2. Current State of the Holistic Model of Teaching Assessment	4
Student Course Perceptions (SCP) Surveys	4
Peer Review of Teaching (PRT)	4
Key Facts on the Institutional PRT Soft Launch	5
Teaching Dossiers	5
Student Supervision	5
3. Institutional Observations and Emerging Considerations	6
Student Course Perceptions (SCP) Surveys	6
Annual Quantitative Analyses	6
Qualitative Analysis	7
Aggregate Analysis of SCP Survey Comments	7
SCP Survey Response Rates	8
Peer Review of Teaching (PRT)	8
Teaching Dossiers	9
Student Supervision	9
Distinct Nature of Graduate Supervision	9
Foundational Considerations from Institutional Experience	9
Key Areas for Ongoing Consideration in Student Supervision	10
Considerations Across the Holistic Model	10
4. Conclusion	11

Purpose and Scope of Update

The University is moving toward a more holistic model of teaching assessment. This model is grounded in the Framework for Teaching Effectiveness and in the use of multiple sources of evidence, consistent with prior institutional and Senate-endorsed directions.

The Teaching Assessment Processes (TAP) unit was established in 2021 to support this work through the development and implementation of teaching assessment processes, ongoing analysis of how those processes function in practice, and guidance related to the appropriate interpretation and use of the evidence they produce. Decisions related to performance review and tenure and promotion remain the responsibility of Faculty- and University-level review processes and are beyond the scope of this report. The sections that follow provide an overview of the institutional context for this work, the current state of key components of the holistic model, and emerging considerations arising through implementation.

1. Institutional Context

The University's holistic model of teaching assessment has emerged through sustained institutional work to strengthen how teaching is understood and assessed. This work has been shaped by research; consultation with faculty members, students, and academic leaders; and the development of institutional policy and governance direction. Its aim has been to support more robust, equitable, and context-sensitive approaches to the assessment of teaching.

Senate has played a central role in establishing this direction. In 2020, Senate supported the adoption of a renewed Student Course Perceptions (SCP) survey and supported the continued development of complementary approaches to teaching assessment. Through its endorsement of the recommendations of the Complementary Teaching Assessment Project Team (CTAPT), Senate also affirmed the importance of incorporating multiple sources of evidence into the assessment of teaching, including SCP surveys, Peer Review of Teaching (PRT), teaching dossiers, and student supervision.

This direction reflects a deliberate shift away from reliance on any single source of evidence. As noted in earlier updates to Senate, no one source can adequately capture the full complexity of effective teaching. The holistic model is intended to support more meaningful interpretation by drawing on multiple forms of evidence, each of which offers a distinct perspective on teaching practice.

The University has also developed an institutional Framework for Teaching Effectiveness, endorsed by Senate and reflected in the University's policy context, including Policy 76 (Faculty Appointments) and Policy 77 (Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members). The Framework identifies key dimensions of effective teaching, provides a shared foundation for interpreting evidence from different sources, and allows for flexibility across contexts. The holistic model continues to evolve within this framework, including through consideration of student supervision as a part of university teaching.

Together, this work established the institutional basis for Waterloo's holistic model of teaching assessment. The next section describes the current state of the model as it is reflected in the implementation and development of its main components.

2. Current State of the Holistic Model of Teaching Assessment

As outlined in the previous section, Waterloo's holistic model of teaching assessment is intended to draw on multiple complementary sources of evidence that are grounded in the Framework for Teaching Effectiveness and supported by prior Senate-endorsed directions. The current state of this model is reflected in the implementation and development of four main components: Student Course Perceptions (SCP) surveys, Peer Review of Teaching (PRT), teaching dossiers, and emerging approaches to assessing student supervision. Together, these components contribute distinct perspectives on teaching effectiveness.

Student Course Perceptions (SCP) Surveys

SCP surveys are implemented across all Faculties and are in regular institutional use as one source of evidence within the holistic model of teaching assessment. They provide information about student learning experiences and are intended to contribute one perspective among several within a broader, multi-source approach to the assessment of teaching.

In addition to quantitative results, SCP surveys generate qualitative feedback through written comments. SCP survey comments are available only to individual instructors and may be used at their discretion to support reflection and improvement in teaching. Institutional work is also underway to develop appropriate pathways for understanding aggregate patterns in this feedback, with attention to methodological, governance, and privacy considerations and to support the development of institutional summaries that can inform program, curriculum planning and academic leadership decision-making.

The cascaded model remains the institutional framework for ongoing SCP survey development. With core questions fully implemented across courses, Faculty-level consultation and piloting related to additional question tiers have helped clarify priorities related to the survey, and course-level question development has been identified as a priority.

Peer Review of Teaching (PRT)

PRT has been introduced across a range of Faculties as a complementary source of evidence within the holistic model of teaching assessment. Informed by the recommendations of the Complementary Teaching Assessment Project Team (CTAPT), it contributes peer-based evidence grounded in direct observation of teaching and aligned with the Framework for Teaching Effectiveness.

Implementation of the institutional PRT model began in January 2025 and continues in a soft-launch phase through 2026. This phased approach supports ongoing refinement as the University learns from how the process operates in practice across participating Faculties, including the evidence it produces, how reviews are carried out, and how the process is experienced by faculty members.

To support implementation, a PRT system has been developed in collaboration with institutional partners and is now operational. The PRT system manages core administrative functions, including reviewer-reviewee matching, conflict of interest management, communications and reminders, and the secure storage of PRT reports and reviewee responses.

Reviewer capacity is also being supported through training, developed and delivered in collaboration with institutional teaching support partners. These offerings prepare faculty members to serve as reviewers, with emphasis on the Framework for Teaching Effectiveness as a shared institutional reference point, the role of PRT within the holistic model, and explicit attention to power dynamics and potential sources of bias in the PRT process.

Implementation continues to vary in structure, frequency, and degree of formalization across Faculties, reflecting differences in available resources and local approaches. At the same time, core elements of the institutional model, namely common reviewer training, structured review processes, and alignment with the Framework for Teaching Effectiveness, provide a common foundation for implementation across contexts. As implementation continues across Faculties, institutional learning is also emerging about how different approaches operate in practice and how this experience may inform future direction for the model.

Key Facts on the Institutional PRT Soft Launch

- 6 PRT Reviewer Training sessions have been delivered, with a 7th scheduled for May 2026
- 75 faculty members have completed PRT Reviewer Training, with an additional 15 expected to complete through the May 2026 offering
- 28 faculty members have completed a PRT review through the institutional model since January 2025

Teaching Dossiers

Teaching dossiers are recognized as a complementary source of evidence within the holistic model of teaching assessment. They provide a structured, narrative form of evidence through which instructors can document, contextualize, and reflect on their teaching practice over time, complementing survey-based and peer-based sources of evidence.

Current institutional work related to teaching dossiers has focused on the development of shared principles and guidance for their use within a holistic, multi-source approach to teaching assessment. In collaboration with institutional teaching support partners, this work has included aligning dossier-related resources and practices with the Framework for Teaching Effectiveness and clarifying the role of dossiers alongside other sources of evidence, including SCP surveys and PRT. At present, this work is centered on supporting more coherent and consistent use of teaching dossiers across contexts rather than on the implementation of an institutional process.

Student Supervision

Student supervision has been identified as an important component of teaching assessment, reflecting the broader scope of teaching practice recognized within Policy 77 and the institutional Framework for Teaching Effectiveness. Within the holistic model, it represents an area of teaching for which appropriate sources of evidence and approaches to assessment are still being developed.

Current work in this area builds on earlier institutional discussion and exploratory work related to the assessment of graduate supervision. It is now being led through a working group convened by the Associate Vice-President, Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs, with the TAP unit

providing consultative support. This work remains in an earlier phase of conceptual and process development compared to other components of the model and is focused on ensuring that proposed approaches are methodologically informed and attentive to student safety, confidentiality, and the distinctive relational context of supervision.

Together, these components reflect how Waterloo's holistic model of teaching assessment is taking shape across the University. While they are at different stages of implementation and development, each contributes a distinct form of evidence within a shared institutional framework. Experience with these components is also beginning to generate institutional observations and emerging considerations, discussed in the next section.

3. Institutional Observations and Emerging Considerations

The current phase of implementation of Waterloo's holistic model of teaching assessment highlights the value of drawing on multiple sources of evidence to support meaningful interpretation of teaching. Ongoing analysis by the TAP unit is also helping to surface broader questions related to interpretation, design, and use as the model continues to take shape across the University.

Student Course Perceptions (SCP) Surveys

Institutional experience with SCP surveys is beginning to generate broader insight into how this source of evidence functions within the holistic model of teaching assessment. Quantitative and qualitative analyses are helping to clarify the role of SCP surveys in supporting understanding of student learning experiences, while also surfacing broader considerations related to written feedback, institutional use, and student participation.

Annual Quantitative Analyses

Annual analysis of SCP survey ratings has focused on building an institutional evidence base to support their appropriate interpretation within a multi-source model of teaching assessment.

Annual institutional analyses have identified several consistent findings:

- SCP survey ratings distributions remain stable across successive years of data.
- Ratings consistently cluster toward the higher end of the response scale across Faculties, course types, and delivery contexts.
- Analyses find no statistically significant differences in SCP survey ratings by sex, controlling for multiple variables including instructor rank, class size, and Faculty.
- Earlier analyses found no statistically significant difference in SCP survey ratings based on self-reported racial identity.
- Subsequent equity-related analyses have been limited by high levels of missing self-reported racial identity data.

These findings support SCP survey ratings as a meaningful source of information about student learning experiences when considered alongside other sources of evidence within the holistic model. These findings also underscore the importance of interpreting SCP survey ratings in context and alongside other sources of evidence. While numerical ratings provide high-level patterns,

survey comments can offer more detailed insight into the experiences that inform those patterns, underscoring the value of considering quantitative and qualitative evidence together.

Qualitative Analysis

A large-scale qualitative analysis of more than 82,000 SCP survey comments from students enrolled in Winter 2023 was undertaken, representing the first institution-wide analysis of SCP survey comments at Waterloo. The following key findings emerged:

- Student feedback is generally constructive, specific, and actionable.
- Themes are highly consistent across courses and align closely with the Framework for Teaching Effectiveness.
- Comments frequently address broader aspects of the learning experience, including course design and structure, workload and curriculum alignment, and student engagement in the learning environment.
- A notable proportion of comments are written with a broader audience in mind, including program and Faculty-level administrators.
- Abusive comments were extremely rare in the dataset.

These findings suggest that SCP survey comments are a rich source of information that extends beyond individual instructor feedback and has value at the course, program, and curricular level.

Aggregate Analysis of SCP Survey Comments

SCP survey comments are available only at the individual instructor level, and no institutional mechanism exists to systematically identify patterns across courses, programs, or Faculties. As a result, these comments cannot currently be used to generate aggregate institutional insight.

To address this gap, infrastructure is under development with institutional partners to support secure, anonymized, aggregated analysis of SCP survey comments. This work arises from the institutional observation that SCP survey comments contain meaningful qualitative information extending beyond individual instructor feedback and may help support institutional understanding of recurring themes in student learning experiences across contexts.

Phase 1 of this work focuses on establishing the methodological and technical foundations required for responsible analysis of SCP survey comments at scale, including

- AI-assisted classification of SCP survey comments,
- generation of aggregate thematic outputs at the course, program, Faculty, and institutional levels, and
- development of appropriate governance, privacy, and methodological safeguards.

The current project phase is focused on establishing the technical, methodological, privacy, and governance foundations required for the responsible use of aggregate analyses at the course, program, and Faculty levels. Phase one is focused on institutional-level summaries that can inform program and curriculum planning and support academic leadership in understanding patterns in student learning experiences. Phase two is expected to support more granular applications, informed by ongoing consultation with University leaders and the Faculty Association.

SCP Survey Response Rates

Ongoing analysis of SCP survey response rates is important to informing the interpretation of SCP survey results, as response rates affect the representativeness of the data and confidence in its use. In addition to analyzing response patterns across contexts, the TAP unit regularly engages with students to better understand factors that shape participation in SCP surveys. This engagement has suggested that awareness of SCP surveys and understanding of how results are used is uneven; some students have indicated that they were not previously aware of SCP surveys, while others have expressed uncertainty about how survey feedback is used.

SCP survey comment analysis also shows that students often write to someone other than the instructor, suggesting a misunderstanding about who has access to the feedback they offer and how this feedback is used. This highlights an opportunity to better align student understanding with institutional practice and to support more informed participation, particularly as institutional work continues to develop appropriate pathways for aggregate analysis of SCP survey comments.

Peer Review of Teaching (PRT)

Early implementation of PRT is providing insight into how peer-based evidence functions within the holistic model of teaching assessment. Thematic analysis of interviews with faculty members participating in the soft launch indicates that the institutional PRT model is experienced as credible and meaningful, and that it supports structured reflection on teaching practice. Participants consistently describe the feedback generated through PRT as specific, actionable, and closely connected to pedagogical decision-making, particularly in relation to improving course design, aligning activities with intended learning outcomes, and supporting improved student learning experiences. Notably, these findings hold whether faculty members are participating as reviewees or as reviewers.

Participants also provided insight into how the core design elements of the institutional PRT model, as recommended by CTAPT, function in practice. Participants consistently linked the credibility, fairness, and usefulness of PRT to the presence of key design features, including a shared Framework for Teaching Effectiveness, trained reviewers, structured review processes, and reviewers external to the home department. Where these features were in place, participants reported confidence in the integrity of the process, openness to feedback, and connections between evidence and teaching practice.

This feedback highlights the importance of ensuring that these core design elements are retained as PRT continues to be implemented across Faculties. Evidence to date suggests that variation in implementation affects how the process is experienced, particularly in relation to perceived fairness, credibility, and usefulness. In this context, the relationship between model design and faculty member experiences emerges as an important institutional consideration, as early implementation suggests that stronger alignment with the core design elements of the institutional PRT model supports more credible, fair, and useful experiences of the process.

Participant experiences also suggest that concerns raised in earlier consultations, particularly those related to workload and the use of reviewers external to the home department, did not emerge in practice when core design elements were in place. Participants described the process as manageable within existing academic workloads and cited being matched with reviewers external

to their unit as contributing positively to fairness and trust, reducing the influence of departmental dynamics, and supporting more candid engagement with feedback. Taken together, these observations reinforce the importance of retaining the core design elements of the institutional PRT model as implementation continues.

Teaching Dossiers

Discussions related to teaching dossiers have highlighted the importance of clear guidance and consistent expectations regarding their purpose, preparation, and use within the holistic model of teaching assessment. Variation in how teaching dossiers are understood across contexts can create uncertainty for faculty members and contribute to uneven expectations. These observations suggest the value of greater clarity and transparency in this area.

Student Supervision

Student supervision requires distinctive considerations within the holistic model. As approaches to assessing graduate supervision are explored, the importance of careful attention to student safety, confidentiality, power dynamics, and the relational context of supervision is becoming increasingly apparent.

Distinct Nature of Graduate Supervision

Graduate supervision differs from classroom teaching in ways that have implications for how evidence can be generated, interpreted, and used within the holistic model of teaching assessment:

- Supervisory relationships are long-term, individualized, and highly contextual
- Supervisory relationships involve significant academic, financial, and professional power asymmetries
- Supervisory outcomes can carry high stakes for both student success and faculty career progression

These characteristics suggest that approaches used to assess classroom teaching may not directly translate to supervision contexts and that any proposed approaches will require careful design.

Foundational Considerations from Institutional Experience

Insights drawn from the implementation of other teaching assessment processes highlight several important considerations for the development of approaches to assessing student supervision:

- Clarity of purpose is essential: approaches designed for formative feedback and those intended for summative assessment involve different design choices and safeguards
- Separation of functions is important: combining developmental feedback, oversight, and accountability within a single mechanism can introduce complexity
- Power dynamics introduce additional considerations: in contexts where participating individuals are not positioned equally, even well-intentioned feedback mechanisms must be carefully scoped to avoid unintended risks

Key Areas for Ongoing Consideration in Student Supervision

Early discussions related to student supervision have identified several areas that will require careful attention as this work progresses:

- The relationship between formative support and summative assessment
- The balance between early indicators of concern and evidentiary standards for decision-making
- The role of student input, alongside the need to ensure appropriate protections
- The relationship between disciplinary context and institutional consistency

Increased visibility into supervisory relationships may also change what becomes detectable, reinforcing the importance of clear boundaries, governance structures, and appropriate safeguards.

These considerations underscore why approaches to assessing student supervision require especially careful design within the broader holistic model.

Considerations Across the Holistic Model

Taken together, these observations reflect broader considerations across the holistic model of teaching assessment. As no single form of evidence provides a complete account of teaching, the value of the model lies in the interpretation and integration of multiple sources of evidence. Supporting meaningful interpretation therefore requires attention to context, clarity of purpose, and a shared understanding of key dimensions of effective teaching.

Experience to date also underscores the importance of approach and context in shaping how evidence is generated and engaged with. Across different components of the model, factors such as transparency of process, clarity of expectations, and attention to context contribute to the perceived credibility and usefulness of evidence while supporting trust and engagement among members of the University community.

These broader considerations are particularly relevant as the University continues its work on the interpretation and integration of multiple sources of teaching assessment evidence, including through a cross-Faculty working group currently exploring related approaches. The TAP unit will continue to contribute expertise related to methodological considerations, interpretation, and appropriate use of multiple sources of evidence within the holistic model.

The incorporation of multiple sources of evidence also raises considerations related to sustainability. Processes such as PRT require time, coordination, and participation, and their ongoing use depends on approaches that are proportionate, manageable, and responsive to context. More broadly, the model highlights the need to balance the benefits of multiple sources of evidence with the practical implications of their implementation.

These observations point to an ongoing process of institutional learning. The holistic model of teaching assessment provides a shared approach to drawing on multiple sources of evidence, while continued implementation is deepening institutional understanding of how teaching can be meaningfully assessed across diverse contexts.

4. Conclusion

The University's transition toward a holistic model of teaching assessment reflects a sustained institutional commitment to strengthening teaching assessment through the use of multiple sources of evidence and a shared Framework for Teaching Effectiveness.

This work remains ongoing and will continue to evolve as the model is adapted to diverse institutional contexts. The TAP unit supports this work through the development and implementation of processes that generate evidence for teaching assessment, ongoing analysis of how those sources of evidence function in practice, and guidance related to their appropriate interpretation and use across the institution.

Together, these efforts contribute to the continued development of a more robust, equitable, and evidence-informed approach to the assessment of teaching at the University, consistent with the institutional direction Senate has helped to establish over time.

Further information, including reports and analyses related to teaching assessment, is available at <https://uwaterloo.ca/associate-vice-president-academic/reports-uw-community>

For Information**Open Session - Consent**

To: Senate

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

Date of Meeting: June 8, 2026

Agenda Item: **11.9 Awards, Distinctions, Grants, Commercialization Activity**

Recommendation/Motion

This item is for information purposes.

Summary

This report summarizes successful research and commercialization outputs and outcomes for April 2026.

Proposal/Rationale

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

Jurisdictional Information

N/A

Governance Path

N/A

Documentation Provided

Attached – Vice-President, Research and International: Report to Senate, June 2026.

**Vice-President, Research & International
Report to Senate
June 2026**

Introduction

This report highlights successful research and commercialization outputs and outcomes for the period April 2026.

Funded Research Awards

Mitacs

Mitacs is “Canada’s leading innovation organization” that supports research and training through effective partnerships. Through matched funding programs, Mitacs connects researchers, government, and public and private sectors, to promote innovation, complex problem solving, economic growth and productivity across a diverse range of sectors including advanced manufacturing, AI, cleantech, cybersecurity, health and life sciences, IT, quantum, and beyond. The following project was successful in April:

Dr. Ricardo Fukasawa (Combinatorics and Optimization) and Dr. Luis Ricardez-Sandoval (Chemical Engineering)

Title: Scheduling Analytical services: General personnel and shipping decisions

Partner: Activation Laboratories Ltd

Amount: \$ 200,000

National Research Council - Challenge Program - Applied Quantum Computing

The Challenge program supports commercial and government innovations in quantum algorithms and applied quantum computing. During April, the following two grants were successful:

Dr. Jun Liu (Applied Mathematics)

Title: Efficient Quantum Algorithms for Long-Term Qualitative Analysis of Dynamical Systems

Amount: \$337,315.00

Dr. Samuel E. Jaques (Combinatorics & Optimization)

Title: Computing on quantum codes with low overhead

Amount: \$227,631.00

NSERC Alliance - Quantum Core Funding

QuantumCore, a start-up spun out of research at the Institute for Quantum Computing (IQC), is accelerating its push toward commercialization with significant dilutive and non-dilutive funding and a public listing after launching just more than six months ago. QuantumCore, was co-founded by Dr. Christopher Wilson (*Electrical and Computer Engineering and IQC faculty who also serves as the Chief Technology Officer*) and is developing an amplifier that boosts superconducting quantum chip read-out signals produced at near absolute zero temperatures and gets the signal into room temperature. This technology addresses one of the key engineering challenges in quantum computing.

Amount: QuantumCore NSERC Alliance partner funding = \$1.7M + Private Investment Funding = \$9M

Faculty Awards

University Professor Appointments

The University of Waterloo's reputation and standing are deeply rooted in the excellence of its faculty members. To recognize exceptional scholarly achievement and global academic distinction, the University confers the title of 'University Professor'. Once awarded, a faculty member retains the designation until retirement. During April, three Professors were honored with this designation.

- *Dr. John McPhee (Systems Design Engineering)*
- *Dr. N. Asokan (Cheriton School of Computer Science)*
- *Dr. Randy Harris (English Language and Literature)*

Vevox - Top 50 Voices to follow in Higher Education

Burcu Karabina (Pure Mathematics)

Every year, the Top 50 Voices in Higher Education highlights leaders, innovators, and changemakers whose ideas are shaping the future of teaching, learning, and student engagement. Karabina won the award for her focus on innovative mathematics education, and designing courses that are flexible, accessible, and evidence based. She explores inclusive learning strategies, student engagement, growth mindset, mental performance coaching, and the integration of educational technologies across synchronous, asynchronous, flipped, and blended formats.

Commercialization and Entrepreneurship Highlights

Below are April highlights showcasing University of Waterloo students, startups, and events supported by Velocity.

National Health-Tech Innovation Conference

On April 21-22, Velocity co-chaired the third edition of the Ottawa-based Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario's (CHEO) National Health-Tech Innovation Conference event at the Tannery Event Centre in Kitchener. Multiple Velocity health-tech founders reported making connections with new investors and industry experts at the conference, which had approximately 340 participants. A few key outcomes included 1) A clear focus on moving beyond pilots to scalable adoption; 2) National collaboration and alignment across regions; and 3) stronger connections between innovators and health-system decision-makers.

iCapstone Symposium

Three University of Waterloo student teams that participated in Velocity's iCapstone SCI 300 are moving onto the 2026 Velocity Summer Accelerator. The Faculty of Science, in collaboration with Velocity, launched (SCI 300) using the theme of Future Cities. Over eight months, teams of students from every faculty worked together to explore the complex challenges affecting cities and communities. Using Global Futures lenses, students worked with external partners and clients to develop a deep understanding of problem areas, and contribute to solution-oriented projects that demonstrate mastery of problem-solving, critical thinking and communication. The three student teams are:

- Amir Hamadache (BSc '26 and Co-founder) – [Orbit](#)
Orbit is a tracker for your personal and network connections.

- Malik Dahel (BASc '26 and Co-founder) - [KikReach](#)
KikReach is a brand platform that finds the perfect influencers to market their products.
- Mikaela Moyer (BKI '26 and Co-founder), Mohammad Qureshi (BASc '26 and Co-founder), Rida Sayed (BASc '26 and Co-founder), Zizi Fahlefi (BSc '26 and Co-founder), Ibraheem Azhar (BSc '26 and Co-founder) and Dante Maggiotto (BSc '26 and Co-founder) - [CNL Research Group](#) - the Canadian Nuclear Laboratories research group stemmed from an MOU signed by the University, the Canadian Nuclear Laboratories (CNL) and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) and has the potential to create a first-of-its-kind device that turns a multi-day lab workflow to detect double-strand DNA breakage into a minutes long process performed onsite during emergency events.

People, Planet and Prosperity Innovation Competition

Velocity partnered with Cooperathon powered by Desjardins in its inaugural year of the People, Planet and Prosperity Innovation Competition. Over 65 participants registered for the Cooperathon challenge.