



MEETING OF THE SENATE

Monday, April 27, 2026
3.30pm to 5.30pm

Brown Family House of Learning, C71stkten (Winter House, Room HL190)

AGENDA

The public Senate meetings are live streamed, and at the meeting time, non-Senators may [click here to join the meeting](#). The live-stream of the meeting is recorded and is used to assist with preparing the minutes. Once the minutes of a meeting are approved, the recording is deleted.

1. **Call to Order** — Dr. Airini
 - a. Remarks from the Chair
 - i. Territorial Acknowledgment
 - ii. Passing of Kye7e Cecilia Dick DeRose
2. **Adoption of Agenda**
3. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**
 - a. Minutes of Senate meeting of March 23, 2026 (For Decision)
4. **Reports of Officers**
 - a. President and Vice-Chancellor — Dr. Airini
 - b. Provost and Vice-President Academic — Dr. Gordon Binsted

[Page 3](#)

5. Reports of Committees

[Page 7](#)

a. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (Items for Decision) — Dr. Gordon Binsted

[Page 12](#)

b. Budget Committee of Senate (Information) — Dr. Gordon Binsted

[Page 13](#)

c. University Tenure and Promotion Committee (Items for Decision) — Dr. Gordon Binsted

[Page 14](#)

d. Ad Hoc Committee on Advice to the Board on TRU Planning Goals 2025-2030 (Information) – Dr. Monica Sanchez – Florez

[Page 31](#)

e. Steering Committee (Items for Decision) — Dr. James Sudhoff

[Page 33](#)

f. Educational Programs Committee (Information) — Devon Graham

[Page 34](#)

g. Graduate Studies Committee (Information) - Dr. Alana Hoare

6. Business

[Page 36](#)

a. 2028/29 Academic Schedule of Dates (Information) — Michael Bluhm

[Page 39](#)

b. Fall 2026 Election results (Information) - Michael Bluhm

c. Reimagining post-secondary education in the Williams Lake region (Information) – Dr. Airini

7. Question Period

8. Next Senate meeting

The next regular meeting of Senate is on Monday, May 25, 2026 from 3:30pm-5:30pm in the Brown Family House of Learning, C71stkten (Winter House), Room HL190.

9. Adjournment of Meeting



MEETING OF THE SENATE

Monday, March 23, 2026
3.30pm to 5.30pm

Brown Family House of Learning, C7ístkteń (Winter House, Room HL190)

MINUTES

Present:

President Airini (Chair), Inderpreet Bains, Mike Bluhm, David Carter, Tracy Christianson, John Church, Melba D'Souza, Yasmin Dean, DeDe DeRose, Katia Dilkina, Seán Donlan, Sarah Gibson, Jenna Goddard, Tania Gottschalk, Oleksandr Kondrashov, Brad Kozubski, Krish Maharaj, Laura Lamb, Ehsan Latif, Rita Leone, Daleen Millard, John Patterson, Baldev Pooni, Gordon Rudolph, Mónica Sánchez-Flores, Anne St. John-Stark, Anne Terwiel, Joanna Urban, Shannon Wagner, Mark Wallin, Juliana West, Joel Wood (Vice-Chair)

Regrets: Greg Anderson, David Cormier, Aleece Laird, James Lomen, Ryan Munden

Absent:, Ikenna Ezeka, Ishan Kapoor, Derek Knox, Mishal Nizar

Executive and Others Present:

Matt Milovick (Vice-President, Administration and Finance), Shannon Wagner (Interim Provost and Vice-President, Academic), Michael Henry (Chief of Staff), Scott Blackford (General Counsel), Andrew Guerra (General Counsel), Gordon Binsted (Provost and Vice-President, Academic, Designate), Lily Copeland (Office of the President)

1. **Call to Order** — Dr. Airini
President Airini, Chair of Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm.
2. **Adoption of Agenda**
The chair of senate asked senators if there were any objections or changes to the agenda and, as there were none, the agenda was adopted as circulated.
3. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**
 - a. Minutes of Senate meeting of February 23, 2026
President Airini invited senators to identify any corrections required to the minutes of the senate meeting of March 23, 2026 and, hearing none, the minutes were approved as circulated.

4. Reports of Officers

a. President and Vice-Chancellor

President and Vice-Chancellor Dr. Airini reported on progress advancing TRU's identity as BC's first dual-sector, research-mandated university, highlighting momentum in applied research, student-centred education, and growing strengths in wildfire research, human rights scholarship, and responsible AI.

Dr. Airini noted recent and upcoming government engagement, including meetings with the Minister of Forests, the Minister of State for AI and New Technologies, and Canada's High Commissioner to New Zealand.

Campus highlights included the WolfPack women's volleyball team's historic national championship appearance and the opening of Wolfie's Campus Store.

Dr. Airini also TRU's proactive engagement in the post-secondary sector review and welcomed new senior leaders: Provost, Dr. Gordon Binsted, General Counsel, Andrew Guerra, and Executive Director of Marketing, Megan Wilson.

b. Provost and Vice-President Academic

In his first report to Senate, Provost Dr. Gordon Binsted outlined interim arrangements for student learning supports in the FSD following retirements and sabbaticals, noted interim staffing for key centres, ongoing planning for remaining roles, and advised that broader consultations are underway with a firmer service model expected by spring.

6. Reports of Committees

a. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

Dr. Gordon Binsted, BCOS chair, presented the committee's report to the Senate and proposed a change to Category III, Bachelor of Arts, Major in Philosophy, related to an update to admissions requirements.

*On motion duly made and adopted, it was **RESOLVED** that Senate approve the changes to the the Bachelor of Arts, Major in Philosophy as presented.*

Dr. Gordon Binsted has also presented three EPC Category II course approvals that were noted for information. No Senate approval is required.

i. Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework

Vice-Provost Dr. Liesel Knaack presented the proposed Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework.

The motion was proposed that Senate approve the Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework, as presented in the associated four core documents, including the overview of the initiative, commitments, and foundational principles; the definitions and details of flexible delivery and learning modes; the curriculum processes for approving and modifying program and course modes; and the decision chart and guiding questions.

Senators sought clarification regarding the absence of a model allowing in-person, synchronous online, and asynchronous participation within the same course.

Dr. Knaack advised that such a model was not included due to technology and collective agreement considerations and noted it would be examined during the trial period. Senators also raised questions regarding resourcing, trial outcome measures, and readiness for approval.

An initial amendment proposing that the listed examples of delivery modes be considered non-exhaustive, and that other modes could be included, was moved and seconded. Following a voice vote, the amendment was defeated.

A subsequent amendment proposing that TRUflex 7 be changed to support a HyFlex model was moved, seconded, and stated by the Chair. This amendment was remained attached to the main motion.

Following consideration of the proposed amendments and discussion of the framework, a motion was introduced:

That the motion and the associated amendment be referred back to the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC) for further consideration.

b. Budget Committee of Senate

Vice-President Administration and Finance Matt Milovick reported that TRU is trending toward a small surplus for 2025/26, with no anticipated draw on reserves. He advised that the proposed 2026/27 budget is balanced on presentation, with approximately \$11–12 million in deficit mitigation strategies to be addressed during the fiscal year, and noted that the Budget Committee of Senate has recommended the President bring the budget forward to the Board of Governors for approval.

c. Educational Programs Committee

EPC Committee reported to Senate for Information only 13 Category I course modifications for information across five programs, primarily involving updates to course descriptions and learning outcomes.

d. Steering Committee

The report from the Steering Committee was presented by the committee chair, Dr. James Sudhoff. The report contained two items for decision by Senate.

*On motion duly made and adopted, it was **RESOLVED** that Senate approve the volunteer appointments to the standing and ad hoc Senate Committees as mentioned:*

Chancellor Nomination Committee: student senator Ikenna Ezeka;
Teaching and Learning Committee: and Rhonda McCreight (Faculty of Nursing);

7. Question Period

In response to a written question from Senator Goddard, Dr. Airini and Dr. Binsted advised that no final decisions have been made regarding the future configuration of student learning supports in the FSD, that interim staffing supports the planning process, and that a clearer model is anticipated by June 2026.

At the invitation of Senator Church, President Airini provided an overview of the TRU horizon initiative, describing it as TRU's approach to responsible applied AI.

Senator Sánchez-Flores outlined the process for Senate advice on the Planning Goals (2025–2030), noting that senators are asked to submit a one-page written submission to the Secretariat by March 31, 2026.

8. Next Senate meeting

- a. The next regular meeting of Senate is on Monday, April 27, 2026 from 3:30pm-5:30pm in the Brown Family House of Learning, C7istkteń (Winter House), Room HL190.

10. Adjournment of Meeting

As there were no additional agenda items for the public meeting, the meeting has been adjourned at 5:09 PM.

**ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE
APRIL 2026 REPORT TO SENATE**

The April 9, 2026, meeting of APPC was chaired by Dr. Gordon Binsted, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee. The following items come forward from APPC to Senate:

FOR APPROVAL

1. Category III, Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies

[Comparison](#) [All Fields](#)

Approved Motion

On motion duly made and adopted, APPC recommends to Senate the changes in the Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies as presented.

Category III: Program admission updates

2. Category III, Master of Science in Data Science

[Comparison](#) [All Fields](#)

Approved Motion

On motion duly made and adopted, APPC recommends to Senate changes to the Master of Data Science as presented.

Category III: Update to program architecture and graduation requirements

3. Category III, Master in Environmental Economics and Management

[Comparison](#) [All Fields](#)

Approved Motion

On motion duly made and adopted, APPC recommends to Senate changes to the Master in Environmental Economics and Management as presented.

Category III: Update to admissions

4. Category III, Master of Science in Environmental Economics and Management

[Comparison](#) [All Fields](#)

Approved Motion

On motion duly made and adopted, APPC recommends to Senate changes to Master of Science in Environmental Economics and Management as presented.

Category III: Update to admissions

5. Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework

Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework **Briefing Note**

Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework [Supporting Documents](#)

Approved Motion

On motion duly made and adopted, APPC recommends that Senate approve the proposed Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework, as presented in the associated four core documents: a) Overview of the initiative, commitments and foundational principles; b) Definitions and details of flexible delivery and learning modes; c) Curriculum processes for approving and modifying program and course modes; and d) Decision chart and guiding questions given that faculty can continue to provide accommodations and flexible supports for students for successful learning.

FOR INFORMATION

- 1. Program Review Response to Recommendations and Action Plan, Automotive Service Technician**
- 2. Abeyance of Communication and Visual Arts Courses**

APPC approved the abeyance of the four CMNS, two JOUR, two FILM, and nineteen VISA courses.

EPC Category II Approvals, Devon Graham, EPC Chair

1. LAWF 3270 Air and Space Law
2. LAWF 4090 Sports Law Arbitration Moot

Respectfully submitted on April 10, 2026 by



Gordon Binsted,
Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

To: APPC

From: Liesel Knaack, Vice-Provost, Learning and Teaching

Re: Motion from March 23 Senate for APPC to Review Once More the Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework

Context

Some concerns about the proposed Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework were raised at the March 23 2026 Senate. A motion was passed to take the proposed framework back to APPC to review the proposal in context of the concerns. This memo provides clarification details to inform the April 9th APPC discussion. Documents: [Senate - Flexible Delivery Learning Modes Docs](#)

Senate

Concerns raised fell under two key headings:

1. Faculty member autonomy to accommodate students in the context of the proposed delivery and learning modes and suggestion to add “hyflex” as a mode.
2. Institutional resourcing to support expanded delivery and learning modes.

In addition to the four key documents and multiple faculty engagements and learning sessions held across TRU, this briefing note provides some additional clarification. The concerns were most likely grounded in not fully understanding the specifics of the delivery and learning modes. The concerns may also have been a misunderstanding that the framework doesn't prevent faculty from continuing to support students in flexible and inclusive ways.

1. Faculty Member Teaching Autonomy to Accommodate Learners

Concern was expressed about a perceived limitation on faculty to deliver courses providing appropriate student accommodations and flexible supports – when students are unable to attend in-person classes.

The proposed framework is grounded in a guarantee that students will experience consistent and quality delivery and learning standards across all modes of delivery in any course and subject area, ensuring that students know what they can expect from all learning experiences.

The proposed Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework **doesn't prevent** faculty members from continuing to provide accommodations and flexible supports for students who are sick, can't travel or have days or weeks they can't fully participate in the in-person classroom experience.

At any time, faculty members can adjust their in-person classes to allow students to join virtually, watch a recording of the class at another time, or offer ways for students to catch up on provided materials etc. should they be unable to attend in person for whatever reason.

Inclusive, flexible and supportive actions and activities employed by faculty members are hallmarks of good teaching for successful learning experiences and are supported throughout any of the new and existing delivery and learning modes.

Another concern was why “hyflex learning” was missing on the framework thereby not providing inclusive and flexible learning options for students. The term *hyflex* was raised to describe the desire of faculty to be able to apply accommodations (record a class, attend a class virtually, review recordings after a class) to support learners who can’t always make it to in-person learning experiences due to sickness, caregiving, travel challenges etc.

As noted above, at any time for any TRUFlex mode 1 through 7 (those with in-person portions), faculty can continue to accommodate learners, as needed, to support their success.

The word "HyFlex" (meaning Hybrid-Flexible as a delivery format) typically means a **tri-modal** learning experience where one mode is in-person, one mode is virtual and one mode is *asynchronous* (never attending the class, taking the whole course online at their own pace).

Instructors often build three versions of their course (or one version with often up to three variations for assignments, receiving content, engagement, etc.) so that all students have an equitable experience in each of the modes. Students may move between all three modes during a course or as most often happens they pick a mode and generally stick with it.

But a key feature of many HyFlex courses is the **asynchronous component** that a student could take the whole course and never show up to any scheduled or live classes (either in-person or online). TRU is unable to enable this key feature, thereby not using the term “HyFlex” as it would presume the use of three modes.

TRUOLFA (Modes TRUFlex 9 and 10) is the only collective bargaining unit that can offer *asynchronous* learning experiences through self-paced and paced independent learning courses. To respect this distinction in the work TRUOLFA does, TRUFA members are not able to offer an asynchronous course or course mode that would allow for independent, self-paced learning components - as is often part of a “HyFlex” tri-modal definition.

However, a version of "HyFlex" is also **bi-modal** - whereby students can choose to attend the course in person or without physically attending class (aka virtually) – with no asynchronous third mode. This mode is already represented by **TRUFlex 7 (Bi-Modal)** in TRU's Delivery and Learning Modes Framework. The details are found in the documents.

To fully support bi-modal (TRUFlex 7) and make the accommodations faculty are doing to support learners who can’t come to in-person classes due to travel, health, commitments etc., TRU is working to build more classrooms to be “flexible” as a standard when applying upgrades. This means classrooms would have dedicated audio/microphones in the ceiling that pick up all student voices with clarity and volume. There would be two (pan/tilt/zoom) cameras to cover the room for good visibility of students and instructors - and with seating that is flexible to accommodate group work and working digitally with their online peers. There would be multiple screens for displaying student video images and content to both

online and in-class learners. The instructor technology screen/panel would be easy to operate and set up. While several instructors have found creative ways to use their laptops, webcams and other devices to connect students in a virtual mode when they can't make it to class, these new 'flexible' standard of room designs will make learning and teaching more streamlined and with higher quality audio and video for learners.

TRUFlex 7 (in pilot phase) will be offered for registration with two sections (one online and one in-person) so a faculty member has a good idea how many students may be joining in person most of the time vs. online. **A student can be accommodated by switching delivery modes at any time to provide flexible access for their learning.** Alternatively, an instructor may allow students to flip between the online and in-person modes if they feel the learning experience remains suitable for all students (e.g., you won't have a class of 1 joining in-person and everyone else online). The piloting of TRUFlex 7 will be done in one of four rooms at TRU that already have the technology enhanced for bi-modal learning.

In sum, **the current version of the Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes framework does provide accommodations applied for individual students for accessible and supportive learning experiences regardless of their situation. TRUFlex 7 is a variation of "HyFlex" with two modes for learning (in -person or online) and thus provides choice for learners who want to join in person or online. The tri-modal variant of HyFlex cannot be employed at TRU because the asynchronous online portion of work belongs to TRUFOLFA.**

2. Resourcing of the Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes

Concern was expressed that the Framework was being proposed with out any associated budget. Like other strategic initiatives, the Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes framework provides the institutional principles, priorities, commitments and procedures to guide implementation.

The proposed package includes detailed procedural information that outlines the priorities for decision-making about delivery and learning mode at the course and program level, including where responsibility for resourcing sits. A key principle of the framework is that individual decisions about delivery modality are made in the context of adequate institutional resourcing, including technology, facilities, student literacy and faculty literacy. As such, approvals for expanded delivery modality will be dependent on demonstrating feasibility, along with the other principles.

Revised Motion

That Senate approve the proposed Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes Framework, as presented in the associated four core documents: a) Overview of the initiative, commitments and foundational principles; b) Definitions and details of flexible delivery and learning modes; c) Curriculum processes for approving and modifying program and course modes; and d) Decision chart and guiding questions given that faculty can continue to provide accommodations and flexible supports for students for successful learning.



BUDGET COMMITTEE OF SENATE (BCOS)

APRIL 2026 REPORT TO SENATE

The April 14, 2026 meeting of the Budget Committee of Senate was chaired by Gordon Binsted, Provost and Vice-President Academic. The following item is presented to Senate for information:

Baker Apprenticeship Program

The proposed Baker Apprenticeship Program addresses a regional training gap outside the Lower Mainland and has demonstrated strong early demand. The program is scheduled to launch on July 6 and will improve summer facility utilization while being delivered within existing staffing resources. It has received Skills Trades approval, with Level 1 planned for July, Level 2 anticipated in late summer or early fall, and early industry interest noted for a Level 3 offering.

A financial review determined that the program is projected to generate an annual surplus beginning in Year 1 (2026/27). While enrolment below eight domestic students per level per year would result in an annual deficit, available grant funding mitigates this financial risk.

BCOS reviewed the proposal and advised APPC that there are no budget-related concerns.

Motion passed:

On motion duly made and adopted, it was resolved that BCOS will recommend the President recommend to the Board of Governors the approval of the budget for the proposed Baker Apprenticeship Program.

The next BCOS meeting is scheduled for May 12, 2026.

Respectfully submitted on April 17, 2026 by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'G. Binsted', written over a horizontal line.

Gordon Binsted
Provost & Vice-President Academic



MEMORANDUM

TO: President Airini, Chair of Senate

FROM: Gordon Binsted, Chair, University Tenure and Promotion Committee

DATE: April 9, 2026

RE: Revised UEPRep, Literatures, Languages and Performing Arts, and Learning Design and Innovation Departmental Standards Documents

On behalf of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee (UTPC), I respectfully submit the following TRU Revised Departmental Standards to Senate for approval as recommended by the UTPC at meetings held on March 12, 2026 and March 26, 2026 respectively.

1. The Faculty of Education and Social Work's revised University and Employment Preparation Department Standards
2. The Faculty of Arts Languages and Performing Arts Departmental Standards (correction/minor revisions)
 - a. Please note: prior to the English and Modern Languages and the Performing Arts departments merging into the LLPA department, their respective standards had been approved separately by Senate in 2021
 - b. As such, the revisions are being submitted in separate documents
3. The Learning Design and Innovation Revised Departmental Standards

The votes to recommend these Departmental Standards to Senate were unanimous.

The departmental standards for your review can be found at [Senate materials-O365 - Standards - All Documents](#)

Senate Ad hoc Committee on TRU’s Planning Goals Senators’ Feedback Analysis

The Secretariat received eight submissions; this is a table of feedback at a glance:

Goal	Measure - KPI	Number of points		Senator points made specifically about planning goals:
		In support	Critical	
Excellence for Interior BC, the province and Canada.	By 2028 TRU leads as Canada’s ranked dual sector research university.	1	3	1) KPI lacks contextual framing: no peer institution comparison provided (Maharaj). 2) KPI viewed as unrealistic given program strength, faculty reductions, and declining international enrolment (St. John-Stark, Christianson). 3) Financial and resource implications of rankings participation not addressed, there is tension between regional excellence framing and national rankings aspiration (Christianson).
Long-term financial strength.	TRU has a balanced budget by 2027/2028, and growing surplus to FY 2030/31	1	3	Balanced budget goal broadly supported as necessary (Wood, Christianson). 1) "Growing surplus" framing raises concern about institutionalizing structural austerity (Wood). 2) Financial accumulation over academic mission is problematic (Lamb, Wood). 3) Priority should be reinvesting in academic programs, student services and academic priorities (Lamb).
New-era student enrolment growth and success.	Universities for students in the labour force or further education in a field related to their studies two years after graduation.	0	2	1) Enrolment targets still contain placeholder text "XXXX", goal cannot be meaningfully evaluated (Maharaj). 2) Regional focus on Interior BC and underserved students appears to conflict with national rankings ambitions in PG1 (Christianson).
Impactful student outcomes.	By 2028 TRU is in the top three BC universities for students in the labour force or further education in a field related to their studies two years after graduation.	0	2	1) KPI language is ambiguous, what is "top 3"? (Maharaj). 2) Student outcomes must be defined more broadly than labour force participation or completion rates; retention, quality of campus life, extracurricular opportunities, and services are critical outcome factors not reflected in the current KPI (Christianson).
Use-inspired research.	By 2030 TRU is consistently in the top 40-50 Research universities in Canada, elevating use-inspired research.	0	4	1) Terminology is unclear and restrictive; risks privileging applied research over fundamental, theoretical, humanities, and creative scholarship (Lamb, Sánchez-Flores, St. John-Stark). 2) External funding KPI is misaligned with goal (Wood). 3) TRU may already be in the top 40–50 Canadian research universities, reducing value as a stretch target (Maharaj). 4) Academic freedom implications of directing research priorities through planning language which should affirm support for diverse research, scholarly, and creative work (Lamb).
Dynamic internationalisation.	By 2030 TRU is recognized as a top university in Canada in global engagement and internationalization.	0	3	1) Caution urged about re-expanding international enrolment without structural protections, given recent negative experience with enrolment dependency (Christianson). 2) Priority should be domestic enrolment stability and student support before pursuing aggressive internationalization targets (Christianson). 3) Cannot be achieved without naming EDI and A-R (Sanchez-Flores, St. John-Stark).

Leading sustainability	By 2027 Thompson Rivers University is a world class university in sustainability.	0	2	1) Potential conflict between sustainability goal and balanced budget imperative (Maharaj). 2) Deep tension between sustainability commitments and AI data centre investment (St. John-Stark, Sánchez-Flores, Faculty of Student Development).
Transformative applied AI	TRU is a national leader by 2030 in applied and responsible AI.	0	5	This goal received the most substantial critical feedback (see analysis below): 1) Goal seen as overly vague (Wood). 2) AI infrastructure investment must be accompanied by corresponding human resources and training support for faculty and students (Christianson). 3) Acceptance of funding for AI data centre without prior campus-wide consultation is problematic (Faculty of Student Development). 4) KPI measuring "comfort" with AI is not fit for purpose and may produce perverse incentives (Wood). 5) Embracing AI for efficiencies without explicitly addressing EDI and A-R is a major problem ((St. John-Stark, Sánchez-Flores).
Meaningful reconciliation and partnerships	By 2030 TRU closes education achievement gaps experienced by Indigenous students.	0	0	Limited commentary was provided on this goal. No senator raised concerns about its direction or KPI. Its importance is implicitly affirmed.
Thriving workplace wellness.	Thompson Rivers University is recognised amongst the best places to work in BC and Canada by 2030.	0	4	1) Goal is described as unrealizable without genuine faculty engagement in the development and operationalization of planning goals (St. John-Stark). 2) Assignment of the Vice President Administration and Finance as champion for this goal is viewed as inappropriate given the recent workplace investigation (FSD). 3) The goal would benefit from a more holistic "Health Promoting University" framework rather than employer rankings alone (Christianson). 4) Whitewashing the planning process with this goal without explicit reference to EDI & A-R (Sanchez-Flores).
Red: 5-4 negative points		Orange: 3 negative points		Yellow: 1-2 negative points
Green: No negative points.				

Further Analysis

Feasibility and Resource Alignment

The most pervasive concern is the tension between ambitious planning goals and the current fiscal and human resource reality and that most measures (KPIs) require investment for success. There is a problematic focus on achieving financial health and surplus and not on the consequences of engaging in financial "efficiencies" that are dismantling student services and jobs. Additionally, senators expressed significant skepticism about whether the goals are achievable given simultaneous budget constraints, faculty reductions, and program cuts.

- Senator St. John-Stark observed the goals are "exciting" but "unrealistic, overly ambitious and impractical," noting the incompatibility of expecting whole-of-university buy-in while cutting faculty and staff.
- Senator Christianson questioned whether targeting a Maclean's top 10 ranking by 2028 is realistic, noting the cost implications of rankings participation.
- Senator Wood raised a structural concern: a planned "growing surplus" signals a shift from temporary to structural austerity, with long-term implications for educational quality.

Faculty, Staff, and Consultation Adequacy

Multiple senators raised concerns about whether the consultation process was genuinely substantive and inclusive.

- Senator St. John-Stark reported that faculty consultations in September and October 2025, described as opportunities to discuss change goals, instead covered other matters with change goals receiving little attention. This undermines the legitimacy of the consultation record cited in the planning document.
- Senator Sánchez-Flores echoed that the earlier Envisioning process consistently emphasized EDI, and that this commitment is not reflected in either the process or priorities as currently articulated.
- Senator St. John-Stark asked what impact the goals will have on faculty and staff "actually holding courses, doing the actual research... interacting with and engaging students," a perspective not addressed in the planning document.
- Without genuine faculty and staff buy-in, the whole-of-university commitment required for implementation is not achievable.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) and Anti-Racism

The removal of explicit EDI and anti-racism language was identified as a significant omission by multiple senators.

- Senator Sánchez-Flores described the omission as the "most glaring" problem, arguing that subsuming EDI under terms like "wellness" or "internationalization" renders processes of power and harm invisible and forecloses targeted accountability.
- Senator St. John-Stark asked directly: "What happened to these EDI commitments?" noting that the commitment is reflected neither in the development process nor in the articulated priorities.
- Both senators pointed to the defunding of TRU's EDI and Anti-Racism office and the Interculturalization program as concrete evidence that financial efficiencies are marginalizing these values.
- Senator Sánchez-Flores emphasized that social justice frameworks require explicit language, disaggregated data, and race-conscious goals to identify barriers, track progress, and hold leaders accountable.

Transformative Applied AI: Environmental, Ethical, and Process Concerns

The AI planning goal generated the highest volume and intensity of concern across all submissions, spanning four distinct dimensions.

Environmental Impact

- The Faculty of Student Development raised detailed technical concerns about the AI data centre, including energy and water consumption (up to 500 million litres per year), carbon footprint, GHG reduction targets, STARS rating impacts, and infrastructure upgrade costs estimated at \$8–\$10 million.
- Robert Sanford (UN Senior Government Relations Liaison, Global Climate Emergency Response) was cited regarding anticipated temperature increases to 50°C in Interior BC within five years, raising serious questions about data centre viability in a semi-arid environment.

- Senators St. John-Stark and Sánchez-Flores noted that the sustainability goal and the AI leadership goal are fundamentally at odds as currently framed.

Process and Transparency

- The Faculty of Student Development raised concerns that TRU accepted funding to build an AI data centre before engaging in broad, open, and transparent campus-wide consultation.
- The planning document records TRUSU's environmental concerns as merely "noted", with no specification of what action was taken. This is insufficient.

Bias, Inequality, and Epistemic Justice

- Senators St. John-Stark and Sánchez-Flores, drawing on Ruha Benjamin (Race After Technology) and Safiya Noble (Algorithms of Oppression), argued that AI systems reproduce and amplify inequalities affecting racialized and marginalized groups, and that this is masked as technical efficiency.
- Senator St. John-Stark asked how TRU intends to actively address the biases inherent in AI, a question the planning document does not answer.

KPI Quality

- Senator Wood criticized the AI goal's KPI as unmeasurable and argued that the emphasis on "comfort" with AI is misplaced: higher comfort is often correlated with increased unethical or irresponsible use by students and faculty.

Research Terminology and Academic Breadth

- Senator Lamb argued "use-inspired research" is unclear and potentially restrictive, risking the privileging of applied work over fundamental, theoretical, humanities, and creative scholarship.
- Senator Lamb cautioned this framing may raise concerns regarding academic freedom and called on Senate to safeguard the full breadth of scholarly activity at TRU.
- Senator Wood identified a misalignment: external research funding, the chosen KPI, can be obtained for any research type, and does not specifically indicate growth in use-inspired work.
- Senators Sánchez-Flores and St. John-Stark called for recognition of creative activity as research in Arts and Humanities, and for more inclusive vocabulary in goals addressing student learning and research.

KPI Measurability and Data Gaps

- "Excellence for Interior BC": No context is provided for what "Canada's leading dual-sector research university" means, peer institutions and current positioning are unstated (Maharaj).
- "New-era student enrolment growth": The preliminary target still contains placeholder text "XXXX", meaningful assessment is impossible (Maharaj).
- "Impactful student outcomes": The KPI language is ambiguous, it is unclear what TRU is supposed to become "top three" for (Maharaj).
- "Use-inspired research": TRU may already be within the top 40–50 Canadian research universities, calling into question its value as a stretch target (Maharaj).

Respectfully presented by the Ad hoc Senate Committee:

Daleen Millard (dmillard@tru.ca)

Oleksandr Kondrashov (okondrashov@tru.ca)

Inderpreet Kaur Bains (bainsi14@mytru.ca)

Monica Sanchez-Flores (Msanchez@tru.ca)

Feedback received from Senators on TRU Planning Goals (2025-2030)

Joel Wood

The planning goal of excellence for Interior BC, the province, and Canada is exactly what we should be aiming for. The KPI and preliminary target align well with this goal, and it is laudable that TRU plans to join the Maclean's rankings.

The planning goal related to long-term financial strength signals a KPI of a balanced budget by 2027/28, but also identifies a KPI of a "growing surplus" through 2030/31. Achieving a balanced budget is necessary and a worthwhile institutional goal, and I understand why this requires a period of temporary austerity for faculty, staff, and students. However, this period of austerity will have consequences for the quality of education offered at TRU.

More concerning is that a planned "growing surplus" suggests a shift from temporary to structural austerity. Since budget surpluses are restricted to reserves or capital projects and cannot be used for operational costs that directly improve educational quality, this goal risks making current reductions permanent. For example, faculty retirements not replaced during the austerity period may not be restored once balance is achieved. As currently framed, the financial strength goal may unintentionally entrench long-term declines in educational quality.

The planning goal of use-inspired research is not well aligned with its KPI and preliminary target. Both the KPI and target are measured by external research funding, which can be obtained for either use-inspired or non-use-inspired research. While increasing external funding reflects improved research capacity overall, it does not necessarily indicate growth in use-inspired research specifically. The goal and its measures would benefit from clearer alignment.

The Transformative Applied AI goal is overly vague, and its KPI is not measurable. The preliminary target emphasizes "comfort" with AI, but this seems misplaced. Ethical and responsible use should be the primary focus, especially given that higher comfort with generative AI is often associated with increased instances of unethical or irresponsible use by both faculty and students.

Feedback on Senate Advice Process

I see potential value in using ad hoc committees to help Senate articulate its advice to the Board in written form. An ad hoc committee could solicit written submissions from Senators and prepare a summarized report reflecting the range of views expressed. That report could then be brought to Senate for discussion and a vote, with a motion required to transmit it to the Board as formal Senate advice. However, I believe this written process should complement, not replace, verbal discussion in Senate, particularly when advice involves specific or actionable recommendations. For example, a Senator might still move that Senate advise the Board that cancelling the BFA would have negative educational consequences for TRU students, informed by the committee's summary. I remain concerned

about the potential use of procedural delay to avoid providing advice, though I do not yet have a clear solution to this issue.

Faculty of Student Development

Towards Planning Goals (2025-2030): Feedback from Faculty of Student Development

Feedback collected during March 26 Faculty Council, emailed statements, and anonymous Mentimeter feedback tool

1. Feedback on Transformative Applied AI

- A. Concerns that TRU **accepted money to build an AI Data Centre before having broad, open, and transparent conversations with the campus community**
- B. Concerns with **environmental impact** of TRU's data centre:
 - What's the increased energy use? Carbon footprint?
 - How does this impact our GHG reduction targets and our STARS rating?
 - Where is the energy coming from?
 - Does TRU have the electrical infrastructure to provide this increased demand?
 - If not, has TRU priced out the potential cost for any improvements needed to the infrastructure? (Potential costs from 8-10 mil)
 - Onsite data centres require water to cool them: does TRU have the water infrastructure (large enough water main at TRU) to support the increased flow?
 - Large data centres can consume almost 500 million litres of water a year, the equivalent of 6500 households, which TRU pays the City for by the litre
 - Has there been a preliminary feasibility study conducted? What is the potential water cost? Does the city have the infrastructure to get that volume of water up the hill to the university?
 - How much of an impact will this be on a semi-arid desert environment that, according to Robert Sanford—the UN Senior Government Relations Liaison, Global Climate Emergency Response—has noted will regularly see temperature increases to 50 degrees Celsius in the summer *within 5 years*?

- C. Concerns with **lack of opportunities for a balanced dialogue that includes the harmful impacts of AI and concerns AI poses to the social, emotional, mental, physical, cultural, spiritual, and environmental health of people, communities, or the land.**
 - D. Table of “Samples of suggested amendments as of February 10 2026”, p. 2
 - **Question** about how the feedback from TRUSU around “Applied, responsible AI” was addressed. Under “Changes”, it says, “Concerns noted about environmental impact of AI.
 - **Could you specify the action taken?**
2. Appendix 5, p. 13: Planning Goals “Champions”
- Concerns that the **Planning Goal Champion** (Vice President Administration and Finance) of “Thriving workplace wellness” seems inappropriate given the recent investigation.

Laura Lamb

Part A: Comments on 2025–2030 Planning Goals

Long-term financial strength:

I am concerned about framing “long-term financial strength” as including a goal of growing a surplus. As a public institution, TRU’s financial planning should prioritize reinvestment in academic quality and the student experience rather than surplus accumulation. While prudent contingency planning is appropriate, positioning surplus growth as a strategic objective risks signaling that financial accumulation is being prioritized over core academic and educational functions.

The sharp decline in international student enrolment has revealed the extent to which domestic students benefitted from services funded by international tuition. Domestic students are now experiencing reductions in services, with further cuts anticipated. These reductions affect advising, library access, course availability, and other academic supports that directly influence student success. This approach risks weakening TRU’s academic environment and undermining its reputation, making it more difficult to attract and retain students. From a Senate perspective, financial planning should explicitly prioritize maintaining and enhancing academic programs, instructional capacity, and student supports. Financial resilience should serve academic priorities, not compete with them.

Use-inspired research:

The term “use-inspired research” is unclear and potentially restrictive. All scholarly research contributes to knowledge, informs future inquiry, and generates impact in diverse ways, with quality determined through peer review and disciplinary standards. This terminology may be perceived as privileging certain types of research, particularly applied

or immediately practical work, over fundamental, theoretical, humanities, and creative scholarship.

Such framing risks implicitly directing research priorities and may raise concerns regarding academic freedom. Senate has a responsibility to safeguard the full breadth of scholarly activity at TRU. Planning language should affirm support for diverse research, scholarly, and creative work, without administrative categorization that may unintentionally constrain academic priorities or suggest hierarchy among research approaches.

PART B: Format

I am in favour of a written submission to the Board of Governors composed by the ad hoc committee receiving these comments. I am not in favour of a visual or audio recording shared with the Board of Governors.

Mónica Sánchez-Flores

Feedback on Planning Goals (2025-2030). Submitted by Senator Mónica Sánchez-Flores (Faculty of Arts), March 31, 2026.

As I review the document “Towards planning goals (2025-2030): February 2026 briefing” the most glaring omission throughout the document is naming equity, diversity, inclusion (EDI), and anti-racism (A-R) as part of the goals or of their measurable outcomes in key performance indicators. I worry that not mentioning EDI and A-R specifically as goals, subsumes them under generic ones such as “wellness” or “internationalization,” which whitewashes the planning process, makes processes of power and harm invisible, and this is doomed to fail at identifying barriers, targeting remedies, tracking progress, and holding leaders accountable for outcomes adversely affecting students, faculty, and staff who are women, living with disabilities, LGBTQ2S+, and/or racialized (BIPOC). Social justice frameworks emphasize explicit language, disaggregated data, race-conscious and minority-conscious goals, strategies, plans, and actions to address systemic discrimination and inequities. I worry that the financial efficiencies mentioned by senior leadership to balance budgets have marginalized these central aspects of TRU’s values and mission, as can be seen in defunding and non-renewal of staff and faculty in various offices in TRU, such as the office of EDI and A-R as well as the Interculturalization program (and defunding and shrinking other student services on campus is also cause for concern). To cite feedback from one of my colleagues in Arts: “the earlier Envisioning process consistently emphasized Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. That commitment is not clearly reflected either in the process through which these new priorities were developed or in the priorities themselves.”

Other areas of concern that colleagues in Arts have expressed are also related to the above, for instance, embracing Artificial Intelligence (AI) also for efficiencies without explicitly addressing EDI and A-R, an Arts colleague presented sources¹ and expanded on this: “AI and

digital technologies are not neutral tools but systems that reproduce, amplify, and exacerbate existing inequalities, particularly racism, sexism, and economic inequity ... Algorithms trained on biased data misrepresent, exclude, and harm marginalized groups ... ways of knowing are systematically ignored, devalued, or distorted, and dominant narratives are reinforced [they] often mask bias as technical efficiency, making discrimination harder to see and challenge.” Additionally, similar to TRUSU, Arts colleagues expressed concerns with the environmental impact of AI and TRU has responded in calling use of AI “responsible” and “transformative” as well as “sustainable,” but specifics on how this is to be achieved are lacking.

Additionally, while the document espouses an over-reliance on AI that creates much anxiety and confusion, especially when using “politician speak” in consultations and communications, there is no mention to embrace applied humanities. Too much emphasis on “use-based research” but no recognition of disciplines in the Arts and Humanities whose contributions to knowledge are crucial but whose impact is often indirect, critical, and interpretive (paraphrasing a colleague). There is also concern about the insistence on research on its own without even acknowledging or recognizing creative activity as research in many of the disciplines of the Arts and Humanities whose outputs contribute to the cultural environment of the university campus and community, so Arts strongly suggests that anything regarding student focused learning and "research" should use more inclusive vocabulary (paraphrasing a colleague again).

¹ Among others, Ruha Benjamin: *Race After Technology* (2019, Polity) and Safiya Noble: *Algorithms of Oppression* (2018, NYU Press).

Anne St. John-Stark

March 31, 2026

Secretariat, Thompson University Faculty Senate

As a Senator representing the Faculty of Arts at Thompson Rivers University I respond here, in the points below, to the request for input compiled from a combination of my own perspectives as well as those articulated by colleagues within the Faculty of Arts.

- The ambition of a “whole-of-university” passionate support and engagement is unrealistic. This is the case because – as the changes and strategies of the past decade have shown – many within the faculties and staff at TRU have had negative consequences to previous and ongoing changes and the rationale articulated behind them. As the change goals as provided from the Board do not address or incorporate some essential realities concerning faculty, staff and students now and in the future they are very unlikely to receive complete “buy in” or support from all or

the “whole” of TRU. The change goals proposed are themselves largely overly ambitious and impractical, not cognizant or aware of the lack of university buy-in for changes. The proposed change goals cannot occur at the ideological and philosophical levels without attentiveness and action at the level of faculty hires, actual monetary investment in programs already in existence, and similar and permanent investment in student success and support entities at TRU. The Board works hard to create a forward path for this university, and this is laudable. However, basic needs of faculty and staff, and students, at TRU are typically not incorporated into the large initiatives envisioned at the Administrative and Board levels. For example, cuts to faculty are persistent at exactly the time when faculty point to the existence of programs which must continue to be supported so that TRU can be one of the top universities in BC, and indeed in Canada in dual-sector programs, in research, and in leading and offering innovative education for international and Indigenous students.

- The goal of being a leader in AI technology does not refer in any way – in its signal language - to the significant and pointed concerns raised regarding AI’s impact on the environment. The concerns raised are legitimate, non-catastrophizing and in fact realistic. To move forward in advancing infrastructural and financial investment in this goal at this time, with the timeline goal indicated in the plan, is to ignore these real concerns. Revise this goal in light of the current and ongoing research into environmental impacts of AI and its already proven environmental costs.
- The sustainability goal of TRU, articulated in recent years, is clearly at odds with this one-track focus on this university becoming a leader in AI technology. The goal of sustainability is negated/ cancelled out by the goal of AI tech leadership.
- The goals articulated – along with the timeline of achievement of said goals – are exciting. They are also unrealistic, overly ambitious and impractical for several reasons. One of the main reasons is that the faculty “buy-in” requires (to literally be the “whole-of-university” envisioned) faculty already present to fully accept that despite funding cuts, loss of faculty, loss of programs, staff cuts (all, admittedly based on real economic shortfalls) this university will somehow see a surplus of funds, growth of reputation and national and international standing. These are incompatible. Faculty, particularly, will not organically buy-in when they continue to be strained by the weakening of programs consequent to loss of faculty and non-replacement of faculty and staff. While budgetary revisions have been necessary with the diminishing of revenues from various areas and government entities, it seems that such tightening has not been acknowledged in plans which are clearly based on having a much more robust reserve of funds and demonstrable and obvious increases in revenues.

- Representation of faculty at “consultation” has been negated by administrators swayed by ambitious and wondrous goals, and by a confidence in these goals which exists only within the Board. The goals are laudable, but not achievable without further destruction of existing programs. Programs themselves have been changing with faculty work (performed by faculty strained often to the breaking point, and on their own time) to address real current and future evolution, matching current changes in educational and employment sectors nationally and internationally. Students encountering cancellation of courses, weakening of programs despite the best efforts of strained but courageous and forward-thinking and acting faculty and staff, and indeed loss of programs WILL go elsewhere.
- Currently (2026) Thompson Rivers University is not among the top-ranked undergraduate universities in Canada, according to Macleans magazine. To achieve placement in the top-ten of such universities in Canada by 2028 is not realistic, given the strain in program offerings, the lack of breadth of growing programs (because of insufficient funding and faculty/staff cuts), the decline in numbers of International students, and the very weak buy-in of faculty.
- More direct consultation and actual integration of diverse faculty perspectives into goal articulation is required. The consultation alluded to in the articulation of the history of these change goals has been and is insufficient. Faculty present at a recent consultation, labelled as one in which these change goals were to be discussed and consultation specifically engaged regarding these goals (September, October 2025) did not, in fact, happen. Instead, other matters were discussed, and change goals received little attention, much less the solicitation of and recording of actual faculty perspectives. This points to faulty justification for moving forward along the anticipated timeline for the Board to move forward on these goals.
- What will these goals mean, literally, for faculty and staff actually holding courses, doing the actual research necessary at a research-based institution, interacting with and engaging students and advancing forward-conscious programs? There is no indication in the document that the literal impact on faculty already here at TRU or the impact on staff has been considered. Are they not part of the equation for any movement toward actual, real achievement of any portion of these goals?
- The above statement points to another comment: The following “Thompson Rivers University is recognised amongst the best places to work in BC and Canada by 2030.” Is unrealizable given the absence of literal and majority active engagement of faculty in the creation of these goals, and their actual and daily operationalizing.
- The change goals no longer address significant elements of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, despite these appearing in an earlier vision of the goals. What happened to these? The commitment to EDI is not reflected either in the development process

for these goals or in the articulated priorities. As well, how will teaching and scholarship in disciplines in the Arts be recognized and evaluated as use-based contributions?

- There has been insufficient attention to the proven harms of AI, and no substantive acknowledgment of and action on these harms. One faculty member in the Faculty of Arts eloquently points out “As Ruha Benjamin in *Race After Technology* and Safiya Noble in *Algorithms of Oppression* (among others) outline, applied AI and digital technologies are not neutral tools but systems that reproduce, amplify, and exacerbate existing inequalities, particularly racism, sexism, and economic inequity. They do this all under the guise of objectivity. Algorithms trained on biased data misrepresent, exclude, and harm marginalized groups (e.g., search results, facial recognition, hiring tools). Moreover, corporate control over AI and Social Media platforms is increasingly shaping what counts as credible knowledge. This amplifies epistemic injustice, where some voices and ways of knowing are systematically ignored, devalued, or distorted, and dominant narratives are reinforced. Crucially, these systems often mask bias as technical efficiency, making discrimination harder to see and challenge.” AI is definitely NOT a “neutral tool”. How does TRU intend to – literally and actively – address the biases inherent in it? There is no articulation of this in the description or information regarding the AI future as a goal for TRU.

Do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Warm regards,

**Annie St. John-Stark
Arts Senator
Assistant Professor
Department of Philosophy, History and Politics
Thompson Rivers University**

Krish Maharaj
Faculty Senator for Law

Ad hoc Committee for Provision of Advice to the BOG

Thompson Rivers University Senate

March 31, 2026

Dear Committee,

Re: Comments on TRU Change Goals

I wish to submit the following comments on TRU's proposed change goals:

Part A – Comments on Proposed Change Goals

The following comments are directed to the change goals as set out in Appendix 1 of the Board of Governors' letter to Senate dated February 20, 2026, requesting our advice.

“Excellence for Interior BC, the province, and Canada” – The KPI listed for this goal is that “By 2028 TRU is Canada’s leading dual-sector research university”; however, there is no context for understanding what this goal means. **We are not told how many institutions fall into this category, who they are, or how we rank against them at present. Attainment of the goal cannot be measured without this context.**

“New-era student enrolment growth” – The preliminary target has placeholder text “XXXX” rather than actual numbers. I have already brought this error to the attention of the Senate Secretariat, but I must stress that **without actual numbers this goal cannot be meaningfully assessed.**

“Impactful student outcomes” – The KPI for this goal states, “By 2028 TRU is in the top three BC universities for undergraduate and graduate students in the labour force or further education in a field related...” **I cannot tell what TRU is supposed to become “top three” for.**

“Use-inspired research” – The KPI calls for TRU to be in the top 40–50 research universities in

Canada; however, it appears this may already be the case:
<https://inside.tru.ca/2023/12/12/tru-makes-top-50-research-rankings/>

“Leading sustainability” – This goal may conflict with TRU’s balanced budget imperative and

will likely do nothing to improve enrolment numbers. 805 TRU Way, Kamloops BC V2C 0C8
 Canada | tru.ca

Part B – Presentation of Advice

I have no input to offer in this regard.

Yours sincerely,

Krish Maharaj, PhD

Tracy Christianson

In preparing your submission, please structure your comments in the following two sections:

Part A: An articulation of your comments on the proposed change goals

Part B: Recommendations regarding the appropriate format for Senate’s advice to the Board of Governors.

Planning goal (2025-2030)	Key Performance Indicator	Preliminary Target
Excellence for Interior BC, the province, and Canada	By 2028 TRU is Canada’s leading dual sector research university. ²	Ranked top 10 in Macleans primarily undergraduate university rankings by 2028, at 900-1000 in QS world ranking (initially as a contributor) by 2030/31; and we are champions in all TRU Wolfpack sports by 2030/31.
Long-term financial strength	TRU has a balanced budget by 2027/2028, and growing surplus to FY 2030/31.	\$20M-\$25M projected deficit removed from operating by 2027/28 FY; surplus growth by at least 4% annually from 2027/28-2030/31. ³
New-era student enrolment growth and success among domestic and international learners, enables more skilled people to stay in Interior BC and contribute to building the province.	By 2030 TRU’s enrolment growth ensures access and success by traditional and under-served students of Interior BC and the province. <small>[see “Dynamic Internationalisation” for International enrolment actions and Meaningful reconciliation and partnerships for Indigenous enrolment and success target]</small>	Undergraduate enrolment to XXXX by 2028 and XXXX by 2031, graduate enrolments to XXXX by 2028 and XXXX by 2031; with attention to participation, retention and successful completion, and traditional and under-served students of Interior BC and the province.
Impactful student outcomes	By 2028 TRU is in the top three BC universities for undergraduate and graduate students in the labour force or further education in a field related to their studies two years after graduation	>90% by 2028, with performance benchmarked against other BC post-secondary institutions.
Use-inspired research	By 2030 TRU is consistently in the top 40-50 research universities in Canada, elevating use-inspired research.	Increase total annual sponsored research revenue from all sources to \$10M-\$15M by 2030.
Dynamic internationalisation	By 2030 TRU is recognized as a top university in Canada in global engagement and internationalization.	TRU achieves 5-star QS rating for global engagement by 2030
Leading sustainability	By 2027 Thompson Rivers University is a world class university in sustainability.	Top 600 globally in THE Sustainability Impact Ranking/Rating, retain Platinum STARS rating by 2030

Transformative applied AI	TRU is a national leader by 2030 in applied and responsible AI.	AI 'comfort' +20% to baseline (see measurement: survey) by end of 25/26 academic year. ⁴
Meaningful reconciliation and partnership	By 2030 TRU closes education achievement gaps experienced by Indigenous students	Indigenous students achieve on par, at least, with non-Indigenous students / close education gaps (TRC #10), by 2030; and Indigenous student enrolment will be on par, at least, with regional demographics.
Thriving workplace wellness	Thompson Rivers University is recognised amongst the best places to work in BC and Canada by 2030.	Winner in the <i>BC's Top 100 Employers</i> competition (2027, 2028) Winner in <i>Canada's Top 100 Employers</i> competition (2029)

Part A:

Planning Goal (PG) 1 – Why is being a top 10 ranked school by McLean’s important? There are financial implications (I think) to trying to be rank in that magazine. Also, I don’t know if having all sports teams be national champions is realistic unless more incentives for recruiting the best players.

PG 2 – this is an important goal and target

PG 3 – If the focus on the traditional & under-served Interior of BC students, then again why the need for PG 1? Let’s focus on being that dual sector university to supports/embraces what we do best and who TRU engages with...our regional communities

PG4 – student outcomes NEED to be more than completion rates; it’s more than just the quantifiable data). TRU needs to create a truly engaging experience for students who come here. What is going to keep them here? It is their experience in the classroom, extracurricular activities/opportunities, services on campus especially in the evening. It is about the impactful student experience; if they have a good experience, then more likely to come to TRU and stay.

PG 5 – really no comment

PG 6 – Why? Have we not learned anything in last few years about relying on International students? As long as TRU focuses on domestic student enrolment, services, and supports and limits the number of international students so as not to be “caught” in situations that are beyond its control as it has recently experienced.

PG 7 - no comment

PG 8 – Be prepared to provide the necessary/essential infrastructure and human resources to support Transformative applied AI for faculty and students

PG 9 – no comment

PG 10 – I would like to see this goal changed to reflect more of a holistic approach where TRU is a Health Promoting University as was suggested many years ago. Using such a framework would encompass the idea of TRU as an ideal place to work

Part B:

Recommend that these change goals come back to Senate for its discussion and voting before going to the BOG for their approval.

**Steering Committee
Report to Senate**

April 8, 2026

1. APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES

The Steering Committee recommends the following volunteers for appointment by Senate:

a. Educational Programs Committee (“EPC”)

Faculty Member

- **Notice Ringa**, EDSW

b. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (“APPC”)

Staff Member

- **Kaleena Carriere**, Office of VP Research

c. Research Committee

Faculty or OLFM member

- **Bruce Martin**, Human Enterprise and Innovation, SOBE

d. Budget Committee

Faculty or OLFM member

- **Christine Miller**, EDSW, (April 1st start)
- **Mark Woloszyon**, Arts, 3rd Term, (June 1st start)
- **Michael Purcell**, Library, (June 1st start)

e. Teaching and Learning Committee

Dean

- **Baldev Pooni**, School of Trades & Technology

- *Motion: That Senate approve the volunteer appointments to the Senate Standing Committees as mentioned.*

2. BUSINESS

Academic Integrity Committee (“AIC”) revisions to the Terms of Reference (“ToR”)

The AIC has re-written its ToR to bring itself in alignment with current student-centric practice, voted for approval by the AIC on March 13th 2026th. The steering committee has voted in favor of the amendments and recommends the approval of Senate for the AIC ToR as presented.

Please see the [attached file](#) for: the memorandum explaining the reasons for the changes and the original, redlined, and clean versions of the document.

➤ *Motion: That Senate approves the revised AIC ToR changes as presented.*

Respectfully submitted,
Kukwstsétsemc (Thank you)

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James Sudhoff". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "J" and "S".

James Sudhoff, DVM
Chair, Steering Committee of Senate



EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS COMMITTEE (EPC)
REPORT TO SENATE FOR APRIL 2026

The following approvals from the April 1, 2026 meeting of the Educational Programs Committee (EPC) are reported to Senate for information purposes:

Provisional Approval, Bachelor of Engineering in Software Engineering

Category I Modifications

1. BIOL 1692 Human Anatomy and Physiology II
2. BIOL 3010 Bioinformatics
3. HLTH 4011 Issues in Health Care
4. LAWF 3080 Criminal Law
5. LAWF 3130 Mergers & Acquisitions
6. MATH 0520 Advanced Foundations of Mathematics
7. MATH 1091 Business Mathematics
8. MATH 2111 Calculus 3

Respectfully submitted on April 10, 2026 by

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Devon Graham".

Devon Graham, Chair, Educational Programs Committee

**GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE
OF SENATE**

**2025-26
REPORT TO SENATE**



**Graduate Studies Committee Team Photo
(April 2026)**

Summary of Activities

Over the past 12 months (April 1, 2025 – March 31, 2026) the Graduate Studies Committee of Senate met nine times and accomplished the following:

- Reviewed **55** new and/or changes of graduate courses for existing programs, including minor changes
- Added “Student Business” as a standing item on the agenda
- Established several ad-hoc subcommittees, including:
 - Terms of Reference and Membership
 - Faculty Participation in Graduate Studies

- Graduate Program Committee Terms of Reference
- Reviewed and recommended **33** faculty applications for graduate associate or full supervisor status
- Established sub-committees to adjudicate awards, including:
 - Governor General's Gold Medal for Graduate Studies
 - Ken Lepin Award
 - Sherman Jen Award
- Received several presentations on topical items, including:
 - Curricular Governance and Process for Cultural Advising and Engagement with Tk'emlúps te Secwépemc by Shannon Smyrl
 - Graduate Leaders and Graduate Mentors
 - Flexible Delivery and Learning Modes by Shannon Smyrl for Liesel Knaack

Respectfully submitted,



Dr. Alana Hoare

Chair, Graduate Studies Committee



Date: January 21, 2026

To: Senate and Board

From: Michael Bluhm, AVP Enrolment Services & University Registrar

Re: **2028/29 Academic Schedule of Dates**

FOR INFORMATION

The dates for the 2028/2029 Academic Schedule have been established in accordance with Board policy BRD 26-0, Annual Academic Schedule, and ED 03-9 Examinations. These dates, along with all other operational dates, deadlines, and recognized holidays are included for information.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Michael Bluhm', written in a cursive style.

Michael Bluhm
AVP Enrolment Services & University Registrar

FOR INFORMATION

2028 – 2029 Academic Schedule [BRD 26-0 – ED 03-9]

Term/Intersession	Fall Term 2028 (Sep-Dec)	Winter Term 2029 (Jan-Apr)	Two-term courses (Sep-Apr)		Summer Term 2029 (May-Aug)	Summer Intersession 1 (May-June)	Summer Intersession 2 (June-Aug)
Class Dates							
Orientation day	September 5, 2028						
Start of classes	September 6, 2028	January 8, 2029	September 6, 2028		May 7, 2029	May 7, 2029	June 25, 2029
Mid-term break	November 9-10, 2028	February 20-23, 2029	Nov. 9-10, 2028	Feb. 20-23, 2029			
End of classes	December 5, 2028	April 13, 2029	April 13, 2029		August 10, 2029	June 22, 2029	August 10, 2029
Last day to withdraw from a course with no academic penalty	October 27, 2028	March 9, 2029	January 26, 2029		June 29, 2029	May 25, 2029	July 13, 2029
Exams & Grades							
Start of examinations	December 7, 2028	April 16, 2029	April 16, 2029		The exam period for summer courses is included in the term.		
End of examinations	December 20, 2028	April 28, 2029	April 28, 2029				
Final day for faculty to submit semester grades (as per Policy ED 3-11)	January 4, 2029	May 4, 2029	May 4, 2029		August 17, 2029	June 29, 2029	August 17, 2029

2028 – 2029 Operational Dates and Deadlines

Term/Intersession	Fall Term 2028 (Sep-Dec)	Winter Term 2028 (Jan-Apr)	Two-term courses (Sep-Apr)	Summer Term 2029 (May-Aug)	Summer Intersession 1 (May-June)	Summer Intersession 2 (June-Aug)
Registration Dates						
Registration Opens	June 2028	June 2028	June 2028	March 2029	March 2029	March 2029
Registration Deadline	September 1, 2028	January 5, 2029	September 1, 2028	May 4, 2029	May 4, 2029	June 23, 2028
End of course change period (add/drop/audit, late registration deadline)	September 19, 2028	January 19, 2029	September 19, 2028	May 18, 2029	May 11, 2029	June 29, 2029
Tuition & Refund Dates						
Due date for tuition and fee payment (Domestic and International)	September 1, 2028	January 5, 2029	September 3, 2027	June 22, 2029	June 22, 2029	June 22, 2029
End of 100% refund period (minus tuition deposit) (Domestic students only)	September 19, 2028	January 19, 2029	September 19, 2028	May 18, 2029	May 11, 2029	June 29, 2029

2028 – 2029 Other Important Dates

Deadline to apply to graduate for Fall Convocation	July 31, 2028
Deadline for program advisors to submit lists of eligible graduates for Fall Convocation	Four weeks prior to Convocation
Fall Convocation – Kamloops	October 2028 TBA
Fall Mid-term Break (no classes, campus open)	November 9-10, 2028
Winter Mid-term Break	February 20-23, 2029
Campus Wide Professional Development Day	February 21, 2029
Deadline to apply to graduate for Spring Convocation	March 31, 2029
Deadline for program advisors to submit lists of eligible graduates for Spring Convocation	Four weeks prior to Convocation
Spring Convocation - Kamloops	June 2029 TBA

2028 – 2029 Recognized Statutory Holidays (University Closed)

Labour Day	September 4, 2028
National Day for Truth and Reconciliation	September 30, 2028 (Observed Monday, Oct. 2, 2028)
Thanksgiving Day	October 9, 2028
Remembrance Day	November 11, 2028 (Observed Monday, Nov. 13, 2028)
Winter Break	December 25, 2028 - January 1, 2029
BC Family Day	February 19, 2029
Good Friday	March 30, 2029
Easter Monday	April 2, 2029
Victoria Day	May 21, 2029
Canada Day	July 1, 2029
British Columbia Day	August 6, 2029

To: Senate
From: Michael Bluhm, AVP Enrolment Services and University Registrar
Date: March 19, 2026
Subject: **Thompson Rivers University Winter 2026 Election Results**

Winter 2026 election results for positions on the Board of Governors, Senate, the Planning Council for Open Learning, and the TRU Community Trust Board of Directors.

Board of Governors

Two (2) Student representatives for the appointment term September 1, 2026, to August 31, 2027.

Levi Escobar	elected	207 votes
Amisha Patel	elected	99 votes
Onyinye Anya		90 votes
Inderpreet Kaur Bains		77 votes
Mehtaab Singh Gill	<i>(candidate withdrawn)</i>	

Senate

Four (4) Student representatives for the appointment term September 1, 2026, to August 31, 2027.

Myah Jones	elected	127 votes
Ayobola Alalade	elected	125 votes
Jonathan Sholty	elected	119 votes
Amisha Patel	elected	108 votes
Inderpreet Kaur Bains		101 votes
Alishah Khaki		90 votes
Krishna Malladi		63 votes
Bora Muliri		49 votes
Anantha Krishnan Anil Kumar		41 votes

Planning Council for Open Learning (PCOL)

One (1) TRU Open Learning Student representative for the appointment term September 1, 2026, to August 31, 2027.

Mitchell Lane	elected	69 votes
Shawna Sutherland		67 votes
Angelo Fuenzalida		50 votes
Bert Holden		37 votes

TRU Community Trust Board of Directors

One (1) TRU Student representative for the appointment term September 1, 2026, to August 31, 2027.

Inderpreet Kaur Bains	elected	102 votes
Johnathan Anguish		89 votes
Elton Buruvuru		61 votes