

**General Faculties Council
March 28, 2022
3:00 pm to 6:00 pm**

Kule Theatre / Room 9-323

| Open Agenda | | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| # | Agenda Item | Presenter | Action* | Time |
| 1.0 | Call to Order | A. Trimbee | | 5 min |
| 1.1 | Land Acknowledgement | | I | |
| 1.2 | Agenda of March 28, 2022 and Consent Items (MOTION) | | | |
| | 1.2.1 GFC Minutes of February 14, 2022 | | A | |
| | 1.2.2 GFC Executive Minutes of January 31, 2022 | | I | |
| | 1.2.3 GFC Executive Minutes of March 14, 2022 (draft) | | I | |
| 2.0 | Reports | | | |
| 2.1 | President's Report | A. Trimbee | I | 15 min |
| 2.2 | Provost's Report | C. Monk | I | 15 min |
| 2.3 | GFC Executive Committee Report | K. Harcombe | | 20 min |
| | 2.3.1 GFC Schedule 2022-2023 | | I | |
| | 2.3.2 GFC Reapportionment (MOTION) | | A | |
| 2.4 | Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee Report | I. Bica | I | 5 min |
| 2.5 | Academic Standards, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee Report | K. Harcombe | | 20 min |
| | 2.5.1 Memo to Faculty and School Councils on ELA 30-2 in Admissions | | I | |
| | 2.5.2 Delegation of responsibilities related to the Academic Calendar (MOTION) | | A | |



GENERAL FACULTIES COUNCIL

General Faculties Council

March 28, 2022

3:00 pm to 6:00 pm

Kule Theatre / Room 9-323

Open Agenda

| # | Agenda Item | Presenter | Action* | Time |
|-------|---|------------|---------|--------|
| 2.6 | Teaching and Learning Committee Report | C. Zutter | | 25 min |
| 2.6.1 | Teaching Modality Framework and Definitions | | D | |
| 2.7 | Scholarly Activity Committee Report | K. Miller | I | 5 min |
| 2.8 | Council on Student Affairs Report | J. Loh | I | 5 min |
| 3.0 | Adjournment | A. Trimbee | A | |

Next meeting: May 9, 2022, at 3:00 pm

***A = Approval, R = Recommendation, D = Discussion, I = Information**



February 14, 2022
Open Session
 3:00 PM – 6:00 PM
 Remote via Teams

Members Present:

- Chair* Annette Trimbee
- Vice-Chair* Kim Harcombe
- VPs* Maureen Lomas, Myrna Khan, Craig Monk
- Academic AVPs and Deans* Allan Gilliland, Karen Keiller, Craig Kuziemyky, Christy Raymond, David McLaughlin, Heather McRae, Cassie Prochnau, Melike Schalomon, Tim Tang
- Student Members* Ruan Bouwer, Freya Cartujano, Raymarck Unera
- Faculty Members* Fernando Angulo-Ruiz, Calin Anton, Cristina Anton, Mary Asirifi, Ion Bica, Katie Biittner, Brendan Cavanagh, Lucio Gelmini, Bob Graves, Erin Gray, Jim Head, Robert Irwin, Dave Kato, Emily Khalema, Kari Krell, Tiffany Kriz, Eric Legge, Joanne Loh, Lee Makovichuk, Lucille Mazo, Kathy Miller, Peter Myhre, Tory Pino, Eva Revitt, Vahid Rezania, Chandelle Rimmer, Tara Stieglitz, Chris Streimer, Josh Toth, Martin Tucker, Andrea Wagner, William Wei, Rene Wells.
- Faculty Assoc. President* Rafat Alam
- Alumni* Laura Gilmour
- Resource Members:* Sumiko Yip Marco Turlione
 Bronwyn Snefjella (recording)
- Regrets:** Cynthia Zutter, Myles Dykes
- Guests:** Sherif Elbarrad, Jason Fung, Marg Leatham, Stacey Martin, Tony Norrad, Helen Ngan-Pare, Robert Sabulka

MINUTES: OPEN SESSION

| # | Item |
|------------|---|
| 1.0 | Call to Order |
| | The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm |
| | The Chair introduced new GFC members Ruan Bouwer, SAMU representative, and Maureen Lomas, VP Finance & Administration, and new leadership team member, Jason Fung, General Counsel. |

MINUTES: OPEN SESSION

| # | Item |
|--------------------|---|
| 1.1 | <p>Land Acknowledgement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President and Chair A. Trimbee commenced with acknowledgment of traditional Indigenous land. |
| 1.2 | <p>Approval of Agenda and Consent Items (MOTION)</p> <p>MOTION#GFC-01-02-14-2022: Moved by M. Schalomon and seconded that the General Faculties Council approves the February 14, 2022, meeting agenda and consent items.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Motion passed.</p> <p>Consent items:</p> <p>1.2.1 Previous Minutes: December 6, 2021 (for approval)</p> <p>1.2.2 Health and Community Studies Student Advisory Committee Procedures (for information)</p> <p>1.2.3 Procedures for Development of Minors (For information)</p> |
| 2.0 Reports | |
| 2.1 | <p>President's Report</p> <p>A. Trimbee, President, and Chair of GFC, reported on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On Covid-19 response, return to in-person learning as of February, 2022. Recognition that transition may be difficult for students. • Anticipating in-person Spring convocation June 21-23, 2022. • There will be a townhall on February 28, 2022, to celebrate MacEwan's Strategic Vision: Teaching Greatness 2030. • The Provincial Budget is expected on February 24, 2022. It is anticipated MacEwan's budget will stay at same level. MacEwan's 2022-2023 budget will go for Board approval in March. • MacEwan has been advocating for funding for new School of Business building to expand academic space on campus. The building is key to MacEwan's strategy. GFC now needs to be drawn into the process and next layers of decisions (substantive discussion in Provost's Report). |
| 2.2 | <p>Provost's Report</p> <p>C. Monk, Provost, and VP, Academic, reported on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on searches for academic leaders and tenure-track faculty – Getting to market early has helped attract high-quality candidates. The process requires significant faculty service but reflects priority of hiring faculty. • Learning Modalities – GFC Committee on Teaching and Learning is looking at definitions of different modalities to give a consistent base for discussion going forward. |

MINUTES: OPEN SESSION

| # | Item |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion on the School of Business Building – Today an opportunity to begin a discussion from the perspective of the GFC. <p>Discussion occurred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to consider alignment with objectives of the province. Expect employment as measure for performance-based funding. MacEwan already performs very well on this. • GFC engagement in budget process needs to focus on budget approach more than accounting details, i.e., to consider high-level assumptions and where meaningful strategic investment is possible. • <i>On new School of Business building:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From early in process, suggestion that Careers and Experiential Learning, MacEwan International, and Research Services could be co-located in the space. ○ The new space could focus on external facing services that connect to the community. International and work integrated learning connections are critical for a successful School of Business. ○ Should MacEwan International, etc., move into new building, vacated space could be used for one-on-one student services. ○ Increasing classroom space for teaching and learning is critical to support growth of institution. The new building focuses on several 40, 60, and 80 seat capacity classrooms. ○ Light Rail on 104 Avenue likely to impact use of space on campus. ○ Early consultation with faculty in School of Business on design has led to closed-door offices, not open concept. ○ Space not solely for School of Business, though scheduling will lead to spaces primarily used by Business. |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 2.3 | <p>GFC Executive Committee Report</p> <p>K. Harcombe, Vice Chair, reported on the following:</p> <p>GFC Executive Committee approved Health and Community Studies Student Advisory Committee Procedures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFC Executive Committee discussed membership issues, including 1) review of the apportionment of the faculty seats on GFC, and 2) process to staff/reappoint GFC representative on the Board of Governors. • GFC Executive Committee summarized discussions at standing committees on the legal opinion on Board and GFC authorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discussions were led by Craig Monk, Provost, and VP, Academic ○ Committees’ assessment of current GFC authority for academic matters was positive. Some areas for further work include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Address bleed between Committee mandates ▪ Explore enhanced role in Academic Calendar ▪ Consider GFC role related to buildings and facilities. |
|-----|---|

MINUTES: OPEN SESSION

| # | Item |
|---|------|
|---|------|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Look at specific authorities that might be delegated (Board and GFC) ○ Identified issues will be added to relevant committee workplan. <p>Discussion occurred:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a review of committee terms of reference as planned. • In general, institution has been conservative in delegating authorities. Need to find level of comfort with decision-making at subsidiary bodies. • The Board maintains decision-making on finances, but the “how” we use money lies with GFC, and Faculties and Schools, too. |
|--|---|

2.4 Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee

I. Bica, Faculty Co-Chair, reported on the following:

- Process for Development of Minors – The proposed process was approved by GFC Executive and will be communicated to Faculties and Schools. Further work includes 1) alignment with revised policy on Program Approvals and Changes, 2) alignment with prospective quality assurance handbook, and 3) principle-level considerations around minors.
- The Committee struck a Working Group to develop A Quality Assurance Handbook
- Many thanks to the volunteers who are working on these projects

2.5 Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar Committee

K. Harcombe, Faculty Co-Chair, reported on the following:

- Committee approved admission criteria for the Business Management Diploma and Human Resources Management Diploma, as well as Bachelor of Fine Arts Regulations.
- Committee reviewed use of English Language Arts 30-2 in admission requirements. It found students with marks in the 60%-65% range often struggle. However, the importance of maintaining accessibility and flexibility was also emphasized. More discussions to come on next steps.

Discussion occurred:

- Issue largely applies to diplomas and smaller programs, as many programs only accept English Language Arts 30-1 for admission.
- Accessibility can be achieved other ways as well, e.g., higher admission GPAs may signal to students they should upgrade before application.

2.6 Teaching and Learning Committee

C. Monk, Co-Chair, provided the following report:

- Committee provided feedback draft Teaching Awards Policy

MINUTES: OPEN SESSION

| # | Item |
|-----|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee discussed the legal opinion – members noted Committee has a role in recognizing teaching, and tool for assessment of teaching • Working group established to look at results of student / faculty surveys done in 2020-2021 to talk more generally about the learning experiences. |
| 2.7 | <p>Scholarly Activity Committee</p> <p>K. Miller, Faculty Co-Chair, reported on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee decided that for 2021-2022 it would serve as an interim body to adjudicate Distinguished Research Awards and Board of Governors Research Chair while a subcommittee is established for 2022-2023. • Committee reviewed the draft Open Access Policy and provided feedback • Committee received for information, the proposed institutional strategy for data management required by the Tri-Council Agency. |
| 2.8 | <p>Council on Student Affairs</p> <p>J. Loh, Faculty Vice-Chair, reported on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended Faculty of Health and Community Studies Student Advisory Committee procedures to GFC Executive. • Provided feedback on Faculty of Fine Arts and Communications Student Advisory Committee procedures. • Recommended rescission of Participation in Student Life and Student Government Policy to the GFC. • AVP, Students, provided an update on student mental health project. <p>2.8.1 Rescission of Participation in Student Life and Government Policy</p> <p>Motion#GFC-02-14-02-2022: Moved by M. Tucker and seconded that the General Faculties Council approve the rescission of the Participation in Student Life and Government Policy.</p> <p>Motion passed.</p> <p>The item was introduced by J. Loh and presented by T. Tang. It was explained that the policy is outdated and no longer necessary. There are other ways to recognize students developed more recently, such as the provision of a co-curricular record. The recommendation to rescind is part of overall efforts to review policies and ensure their continued relevance.</p> |

3.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:32 pm.

January 31, 2022

Open Session

3:15 – 5:00 p.m.

Meeting by Teams

| | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Faculty Members: | Kim Harcombe, Co-Chair | Cynthia Zutter |
| | Ion Bica | Bob Graves |
| | Joanne Loh | Kathy Miller |
| Dean | Allan Gilliland | |
| Student Member | Ruan Bouwer | |
| Ex-Officio Members: | Annette Trimbee, Co-Chair | Craig Monk, Provost |
| Resource Members: | Sumiko Yip | Marco Turlione Bronwyn Sneffjella (recording) |
| Guests: | Cassie Prochnau | Tim Tang |
| | David McLaughlin | |
| Regrets | Allan Gilliland | |

MINUTES: OPEN SESSION

| # | Item | Presenter | Action* | Time |
|------------|--|--------------------|----------|---------------|
| 1.0 | Call to Order | <i>A. Trimbee</i> | - | <i>2 min</i> |
| | The meeting was called to order at 3:16 pm. | | | |
| <i>1.1</i> | <i>Approval of Agenda (MOTION)</i> | <i>A. Trimbee</i> | <i>A</i> | |
| | Motion#GFC-EC-01-31-01-2022: Moved by R. Bouwer and seconded that the General Faculties Executive Committee approve the agenda. Motion carried. | | | |
| <i>1.2</i> | <i>Minutes of January 31, 2022 (MOTION)</i> | <i>A. Trimbee</i> | <i>A</i> | |
| | Motion#GFC-EC-02-31-01-2022: Moved by I. Bica and seconded that the General Faculties Executive Committee approve the minutes for November 22, 2021, as presented. Motion carried. | | | |
| 2.0 | GFC Executive Approvals and Recommendations | | | |
| <i>2.1</i> | <i>Health and Community Studies Procedure for the Student Advisory Committee Policy</i> | <i>C. Prochnau</i> | <i>I</i> | <i>10 min</i> |
| | Motion#GFC-EC-03-31-01-2021: Moved by J. Loh and seconded that the General Faculties Executive Committee approve the revised Student Advisory Committees Faculty of Health and Community Studies (FHCS) Procedures. Motion carried. | | | |

C. Prochnau presented the item. The procedures have been developed under the revised Policy on Student Advisory Committees.

Discussion occurred:

- Committee members voiced support for the level and depth of engagement laid out in the procedures.

2.2 *Process for Development of Minors* *I. Bica* *A* *10 min*

Motion#GFC-EC-04-31-01-2021: Moved by I. Bica and seconded that the General Faculties Executive Committee approve the proposed process for Development of Minors as amended.

Motion carried.

*Request to record “nay” vote on behalf of C. Zutter.

I. Bica. presented the item. The document lays out the process steps when a minor is first being contemplated in a faculty or school.

Discussion occurred:

- Three primary concerns were raised: 1) whether there is too much administrative vs. academic involvement; 2) where minors fit into MacEwan’s academic strategy; and 3) lack of process for discontinuing minors.
 - Currently individual Deans effectively have a veto based on resource considerations. The proposed process puts this consideration at Deans’ Council for more inclusive conversation on resource and strategy alignment. After initial go ahead, academic governance determines nature of minor, whether to approve it.
 - General agreement that the next step is to consider the strategic rationale for minors within MacEwan’s overall academic planning.
 - I. Bica suggested that the quality assurance program would include review to determine whether a minor should continue or not.
- The process must fit within vision of Policy on Program Approvals and Changes.
- Will need to be aware if process impacts ease of developing interdisciplinary minors.

AMENDMENTS: 1) Remove last two sections pertaining to academic planning and evaluation. 2) Remove reference to specific staff member/make wording generic.

GFC Agenda Items

3.1 *Rescission of Recognition for Participation in Student Life and Student Government Policy* *J. Loh / T. Tang* *D* *10 min*

J. Loh and T. Tang presented the item, which has been recommended for approval by the Council on Student Affairs. The policy outdated and has not been used in years. There are now many other routes to recognize students for their contributions and participation in university life.

4.0 GFC Executive Committee Discussion Items

3.1 *Update on GFC Reapportionment* S. Yip / D. D 10 min
McLaughlin

S. Yip indicated that the Office of University Governance and Registrar have started the process of reviewing the apportionment of elected faculty seats on the GFC. The review is to take place every three years. The current procedures are based on previous governance practices and need to be updated but can largely be relied on to guide calculating the reapportionment.

Discussion occurred:

- The 2019 GFC Bylaws do not specifically address reapportionment. The broad expectations are defined in the *Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA)*.

3.2 *GFC Position on Board of Governors* A. Trimbee A 10 min

A. Trimbee noted that the Ministry of Advanced Education now requires additional notice when a reappointment is required, and the term of the first, and current, GFC representative (Lucio Gelmini) will be finished in a few months. When the position was first elected by the GFC, process to renew was not considered, nor was alignment of Board and GFC terms.

Discussion occurred:

- Technically, GFC representative to the Board need not be a current GFC member but it is important that the representative has context of the GFC.
- GFC Executive needs to consider whether process should be easier for an incumbent to be reappointed, rather than a full election.
- Align Board representative's term automatically to one's term on GFC; or, when *someone is already serving in such a role, that they should continue by default*, providing they remain a GFC member. Preference for second option.

3.3 *Legal Opinion on Division of Authorities Discussion at Committee- Roundtable*

C. Monk introduced the item, noting that he had brought the legal opinion to the standing committees for discussion. He received good feedback from committees and main concerns were bleeding between mandates of committees, and desire for more delegation of authority. Faculty co-chairs of the standing committees provided brief overview of discussion at their committee.

Discussion occurred:

- Broadly, Committee did not find red flags about how the authorities of the GFC are reflected. However, some specific areas where authority could be cultivated such as Academic Standards Committee having more substantive role in Calendar, GFC consideration of tool for assessment of teaching (per Faculty Collective Agreement), and consideration of GFC role in facilities and building plans.
- From perspective of Board of Governors, there could be more discussion over grey areas between Board and GFC and perhaps inviting a conversation on delegations from the Board.

5.0 GFC Agenda Approval

5.1 Approval of Agenda for February 14, 2022 *A. Trimbee* *A* *10 min*

Motion#GFC-EC-05-01-2021: Moved by I. Bica and seconded that GFC Executive Committee approve the GFC agenda for February 14, 2022 as amended.

Motion carried.

- As per legal opinion discussion, remove stand-alone item 3.0 from draft and extend time in Executive Committee report.

Discussion occurred:

- Will comment on new academic building in President's Report but need for a future agenda item on the new academic building to engage GFC and some determination of where GFC ought to have input given recommendatory power.

K. Harcombe took the Chair at 4:56.

5.0 Adjournment of Closed Session *K. Harcombe* *A*

The meeting concluded at 4:59 pm.

March 14, 2022
Open Session
3:02 – 4:31 p.m.

Meeting by Teams

| | | |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Faculty Members: | Kim Harcombe, Co-Chair | Cynthia Zutter |
| | Ion Bica | Bob Graves |
| | Joanne Loh | Kathy Miller |
| Dean | Allan Gilliland | |
| Student Member | Ruan Bouwer | |
| Ex-Officio Members: | Annette Trimbee, Co-Chair | Craig Monk, Provost |
| Office of University Governance: | Sumiko Yip | Bronwyn Sneffjella (recording) |
| | Brian Kurylo | Marco Turlione |
| Guests: | David McLaughlin | Sharon Bratt |
| | Karen Keiller | |

Regrets:**MINUTES: OPEN SESSION**

| # | Item | Presenter | Action* | Time |
|---|------|-----------|---------|------|
|---|------|-----------|---------|------|

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------------|-------------------|---|--------------|
| 1.0 | Call to Order | <i>A. Trimbee</i> | - | <i>2 min</i> |
|------------|----------------------|-------------------|---|--------------|

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 pm.

| | | | | |
|------------|--|-------------------|----------|--|
| <i>1.1</i> | <i>Approval of Agenda and Consent Items (MOTION)</i> | <i>A. Trimbee</i> | <i>A</i> | |
|------------|--|-------------------|----------|--|

Motion#GFC-EC-01-14-03-2022: Moved by K. Harcombe and seconded that the General Faculties Council Executive Committee approve the agenda and consent items.
Motion carried as amended.

- Add item 2.3 update on GFC position on the Board.

2.0 GFC Executive Approvals and Recommendations

| | | | | |
|------------|--|---------------|----------|---------------|
| <i>2.1</i> | <i>2022-2023 General Faculties Council Meeting Schedule (MOTION)</i> | <i>S. Yip</i> | <i>A</i> | <i>10 min</i> |
|------------|--|---------------|----------|---------------|

Motion#GFC-EC-02-14-03-2021: Moved by I. Bica and seconded that the General Faculties Executive Committee approve the 2022-2023 Meeting Schedule.
Motion carried.

S. Yip presented the item and explained the approach including the pathway of items moving from academic governance to the Board.

Discussion occurred:

- Consensus that the presentation of schedule supports effective planning, including items such as the budget, annual report, and changes to tuition and non-instructional fees, and the graduands list.
- Members voiced interest in having some visual examples of pathways for items.
- Each cycle contains a contingency spot if extra meetings required.
- Requested changes: correct length of meetings to 75 minutes each (15-min break between); alternate times for back-to-back meetings each cycle.

2.2 *Apportionment of Faculty Positions on GFC* D. McLaughlin A 20 min
(MOTION)

Motion#GFC-EC-03-14-03-2022: Moved by A. Gilliland and seconded that the General Faculties Executive Committee approve the apportionment of Faculty Positions on GFC as amended:

- Note correction to Arts and Science's representatives as 10 instead of 11.
- Amended to include additional recommendation to the GFC to appoint as S. 23(1)(d) members of the GFC: 1) the new position of General Counsel, 1) additional faculty position for the Faculty of Arts and Science, and 1) additional faculty position for the School of Business

Motion carried as amended.

Discussion occurred:

- Add previous apportionment numbers to table so it is easier to see the change.
- Strong preference amongst some members that decision should go to GFC and note this will be required if recommendations with respect to modifying discretionary membership are made.
- Clarification that additional administrators added like General Counsel do not require two additional faculty, but the discretionary ability to appoint members can be used to top-up faculty membership.
- Before the next reapportionment, GFC Executive should look more comprehensively at the additional members appointed to GFC.

2.3 *Update on GFC Position on Board*

K. Harcombe advised that L. Gelmini would be willing to stand for reappointment as the GFC representative on Board of Governors and will run in the GFC election in spring 2022 to seek to renew his seat on GFC.

2.4 *Recommend levels of approval/responsibility for Academic Calendar Content* K. Harcombe / D. McLaughlin A 15 min
(MOTION)

Motion#GFC-EC-04-14-03-2022: Moved by K. Harcombe and seconded that the General Faculties Council Executive Committee recommend to the General Faculties Council the levels of approval/responsibility for academic calendar content.

Motion carried as amended.

The item was presented by D. McLaughlin. The Calendar Advisory Group is now positioned under the GFC Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar which makes more detailed delineation of responsibilities possible. Most components of the Calendar are approved by Faculty/School Council and put directly into Calendar management software. Therefore, most of the decision-points identified here are all issues arising during of assembling and producing the Calendar, such as edits to approved material. Also, lots of things in the Calendar are not academic in nature. Delineating and clarifying oversight of those issues will make the production process more efficient.

K. Harcombe noted that the recommendation received strong support from the Committee on Academic Standards and the Calendar.

Discussion occurred:

- GFC Executive should consider whether the issues presented were merely procedural, or ought to be approved by the full GFC. The responsibility for the Calendar lies with the GFC however much of the responsibility is already delegated, leaving some grey area with respect to the right level of approval.
- Decision to amend the motion to refer the item to GFC for decision.

3.0 Items for Placement on the GFC Agenda

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|----------|---------------|
| <i>3.1 Teaching Modalities Framework & Definitions</i> | <i>C. Zutter / S. Bratt</i> | <i>R</i> | <i>10 min</i> |
|--|---------------------------------|----------|---------------|

The item was presented by S. Bratt. The intent of the document is to define the features of different teaching modalities and their uses to help clarify approach at MacEwan, for the benefit of faculty, students, and administrators. Some notable elements include a definition of “hybrid” as a minimum of 30-50% in-person and some thinking about the distribution of teaching hours.

Discussion occurred:

- Committee commended Dr. Bratt on the work.
- The approach leaves option to maximize in-person, when space is available.
- The definitions are meant to give clarity and boundaries in some areas, but the overall approach is meant to be flexible and illustrative.
- Some individual faculty may be having issues with being scheduled for unanticipated synchronous online.
- Document should encourage asynchronous hybrid as much as possible and allow people at program/department level can decide to collaborate to share space, etc.
- General consensus that document reflects members’ understanding of hybrid classes; some wanted more focus on the pedagogical assumptions of hybrid learning.
- Structure of consistent days of week in-class vs online can help students. There should be a balance between flexibility and stability.

- In addition to research, item was at Provost's Group and Deans' Council on the administrative side for a touchpoint, but the GFC Committee on Teaching and Learning which recommended the document to GFC for further discussion.
- Item should go to GFC for feedback and then again later for approval.

4.0 Approval of GFC Agenda

A

4.1 Approval of Agenda for March 28, 2022 (MOTION)

Motion#GFC-EC-05-14-03-2022: Moved by A. Gilliland and seconded that the General Faculties Executive Committee approve the agenda for March 28, 2022.

Motion carried as amended.

Note the following changes and corrections to the draft GFC agenda:

- Apportionment to be referred to GFC (under Executive Committee report) with amendment to add a second motion to appoint to S. 23(1)(d) the new General Counsel position and on extra faculty member each for the Faculty of Arts and Science and the School of Business.
- Calendar responsibilities to be referred to GFC for decision (under Academic Standards Committee report)
- Teaching Modalities item (under Teaching and Learning Committee report) to be made a discussion item anticipating it returning as a decision item on a future GFC agenda.
- Minor spelling/typo corrections.

5.0 Adjournment

A. Trimbee

A

The meeting concluded at 4:31 pm.

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Submission to | GFC Executive |
| Meeting Date | Submitted by |
| March 14, 2022 | Sumiko Yip, University Secretary, Office of University Governance |
| Agenda Item | 2022-2023 General Faculties Council Meeting Schedule |
| Resource Staff | Bronwyn Snefjella, Governance Officer, Office of University Governance |
| Action Requested | For Information |
| Recommendation /Motion | That the General Faculties Council Executive Committee approve the 2022-2023 General Faculties Council Meeting Schedule as presented. |
| Context and Background | <p>On March 14, 2022, the GFC Executive Committee recommended that the 2022-2023 meeting schedule be brought forward for General Faculties Council approval. The schedule was developed with the following criteria in mind:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings will be held on Monday afternoons where possible. • Meeting are 75 minutes in length • Start times for committee meetings to alternate for each meeting cycle. • A contingency meeting has been included in each meeting cycle. • The Board of Governors and General Faculties Council meeting schedules have been better aligned to accommodate items that require consideration from both governing bodies. <p>The dates presented have been reviewed by Executive Council to ensure alignment with the reporting needs of the university.</p> <p>A visual representing the meeting cycle alignment between the Board of Governors and General Faculties Council is attached for reference.</p> |
| Summary | The proposed 2022-2023 General Faculties Council Meeting Schedule is presented for approval by GFC Executive Committee. |
| Implications | |
| Review History | Executive Council: February 22, 2022 |
| Next Steps | Pending approval by the GFC Executive Committee, the 2022-2023 schedule will be shared with GFC for information. |
| Policy | N/A |
| FOIP | This item has been assessed relative to the Guidelines and Practices for the application of the FOIP Act, Chapter 4: Exceptions to the Right of Access. This information is in compliance and deemed to be appropriate for Public distribution. |
| Attachment(s) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2022-23 GFC & Committees Schedule 2. 2022-23 Governance Approval Cycles |

| Committee/ Body | Meeting Time | Meeting Date | Material Submission Date | Call for Agenda Items |
|------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Cycle 1 | | | | |
| GFC Executive Council | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, August 29, 2022 | Wednesday, August 17, 2022 | Monday, August 8, 2022 |
| General Faculties Council | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, September 12, 2022 | Wednesday, August 29, 2022 | |
| Cycle 2 | | | | |
| Planning & Quality Assurance | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, September 19, 2022 | Tuesday, September 6, 2022 | Monday, August 29, 2022 |
| Curriculum & Standards | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| Scholarly Activity | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, September 26, 2022 | Monday, September 12, 2022 | Tuesday, September 6, 2022 |
| Teaching & Learning | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| Student Affairs | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, October 3, 2022 | Monday, September 19, 2022 | Monday, September 12, 2022 |
| GFC Committee (Contingency) | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| GFC Executive Council | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, October 11, 2022 | Monday, September 26, 2022 | Monday, September 19, 2022 |
| General Faculties Council | 3:00 – 6:00 p.m. | Monday, October 24, 2022 | Wednesday, October 5, 2022 | |
| Cycle 3 | | | | |
| Curriculum & Standards | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, October 31, 2022 | Monday, October 17, 2022 | Friday, October 7, 2022 |
| Planning & Quality Assurance | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| Teaching & Learning | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, November 7, 2022 | Monday, October 24, 2022 | Monday, October 17, 2022 |
| Scholarly Activity | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| Student Affairs | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, November 14., 2022 | Monday, October 31, 2022 | Monday, October 24, 2022 |
| GFC Committee (Contingency) | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| GFC Executive Council | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, November 22, 2022 | Monday, November 7, 2022 | Monday, October 31, 2022 |
| General Faculties Council | 3:00 – 6:00 p.m. | Monday, December 5, 2022 | Wednesday, November 23, 2022 | |
| Cycle 4 | | | | |
| Planning & Quality Assurance | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, January 16, 2023 | Thursday, January 5, 2023 | Monday, December 19, 2022 |
| Curriculum & Standards | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | Tuesday, January 3, 2023 |
| Scholarly Activity | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, January 23, 2023 | Monday, January 9, 2023 | Monday, December 19, 2022 |
| Teaching & Learning | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | Tuesday, January 3, 2023 |
| Student Affairs | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, January 30, 2023 | Monday, January 16, 2023 | Monday, January 9, 2023 |
| GFC Committee (Contingency) | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| GFC Executive Council | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, February 13, 2023 | Monday, January 30, 2023 | Monday, January 23, 2023 |
| General Faculties Council | 3:00 – 6:00 p.m. | Monday, February 24, 2023 | Wednesday, February 8, 2023 | |

| Committee/ Body | Meeting Time | Meeting Date | Material Submission Date | Call for Agenda Items |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Cycle 5</i> | | | | |
| Curriculum & Standards | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, March 6, 2023 | Friday, February 17, 2023 | Monday, February 13, 2023 |
| Planning & Quality Assurance | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| Teaching & Learning | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, March 13, 2023 | Monday, February 27, 2023 | Friday, February 17, 2023 |
| Scholarly Activity | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| Student Affairs | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, March 20, 2023 | Monday, March 6, 2023 | Monday, February 27, 2023 |
| GFC Committee (Contingency) | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| GFC Executive Council | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, March 27, 2023 | Monday, March 13, 2023 | Monday, March 6, 2023 |
| General Faculties Council | 3:00 – 6:00 p.m. | Monday April 17, 2023 | Monday, April 3, 2023 | |
| <i>Cycle 6</i> | | | | |
| Planning & Quality Assurance | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, April 24, 2023 | Tuesday, April 11, 2023 | Thursday, March 30, 2023 |
| Curriculum & Standards | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| Scholarly Activity | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, May 8, 2023 | Monday, April 24, 2023 | Monday, April 17, 2023 |
| Teaching & Learning | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| Student Affairs | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, May 15, 2023 | Monday, May 1, 2023 | Monday, April 24, 2023 |
| GFC Committee (Contingency) | 4:30 – 5:45 p.m. | | | |
| GFC Executive Council | 3:00 – 4:15 p.m. | Monday, May 23, 2023 | Monday, May 8, 2023 | Monday, May 1, 2023 |
| General Faculties Council | 3:00 – 6:00 p.m. | Monday, June 5, 2023 | Wednesday, May 17, 2023 | |



Governance Approval Cycles
As of February 22, 2022

LEGEND: Board Retreat Board Contingency (not booked) Board Financial Statement Approval



| mSubmission to | GFC Executive | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|----------|----------------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|----------|----|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Meeting Date | Submitted by | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| March 14, 2022 | Kim Harcombe, Co-Chair, GFC Executive Committee David McLaughlin, Registrar and AVP, Planning and Analysis | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agenda Item | Reapportionment Analysis to Determine Electable Positions on GFC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resource Staff | Sumiko Yip, University Secretary Bronwyn Sneffjella, Governance Officer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Action Requested | For Approval | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation /Motion | <p>Motion 1:</p> <p>That the General Faculties Council approve the revised reapportionment ratios, effective for academic year 2022-2023.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Arts and Science</th> <th>Business</th> <th>Health & Community Studies</th> <th>Nursing</th> <th>Fine Arts & Comms</th> <th>Con. Education</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Current:</td> <td>12</td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Revised</td> <td>10</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>If motion 1 is approved...</i></p> <p>Motion 2:</p> <p>That core statutory members of the General Faculties Council defined in sections 23(a), (b), and (c) approve the addition of the following 23(d) positions on the GFC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The General Counsel • One (1) academic staff member allotted to the Faculty of Arts and Science • One (1) academic staff member allotted to the School of Business | | Arts and Science | Business | Health & Community Studies | Nursing | Fine Arts & Comms | Con. Education | Current: | 12 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Revised | 10 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| | Arts and Science | Business | Health & Community Studies | Nursing | Fine Arts & Comms | Con. Education | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Current: | 12 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Revised | 10 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Context and Background | <p><i>Issue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 24 of the <i>Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA)</i> stipulates that, from time to time, institutions review the apportionment (i.e., distribution) of electable faculty positions on GFC to reflect the proportional distribution of academic staff among faculties and schools. (These positions are the “red” category in the attached current GFC membership). • There have been changes in this distribution over time and the elimination of one institutional VP has reduced the overall number of electable positions on GFC from 26 to 24. • To make up for losses of elected statutory positions in Arts and Science and Business, GFC Executive Committee recommends the addition of one faculty member position each to Arts and Science and Business under the discretionary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| | <p>authority of the GFC (These would be added in the “green” category in the attached membership).</p> <p><i>Post-Secondary Learning Act</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PSLA stipulates the number of electable faculty positions should be twice (2x) the number of <i>ex-officio</i> positions (ex., President, VPs, Deans, and the Registrar). Therefore, changes in the senior leadership team can impact the number of electable faculty positions. • Section 24 of the PSLA indicates that the distribution of the positions will be, insofar as possible, proportional based on the complement of full-time academic staff in each Faculty and School. <p><i>Methodology</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic methodology for the calculation of reapportionment is laid out the in the existing procedures and is still applicable, however the overall document is out of date and will need to be updated along with GFC Bylaws. |
| Implications | <p><i>Timing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reapportionment should be completed during February 2022 to ensure that Faculties and Schools have time to elect members to the GFC under their normal election timetables (March-May). • In the longer term, GFC Executive should determine principles for revising or rescinding the reapportionment procedures. |
| Review History | Office of the University Registrar Executive Committee to the General Faculties Council |
| Next Steps | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If approved, Faculty and School Councils will elect membership to GFC for 2022-2023. |
| Policy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Governance Council Faculty Reapportionment Procedure |
| FOIP | This item has been assessed relative to the Guidelines and Practices for the application of the FOIP Act, Chapter 4: Exceptions to the Right of Access. This information complies and deemed to be appropriate for Public distribution. |
| Attachment(s) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of Apportionment based on Faculty complement 2022 2. Current 2021-2022 GFC members 3. Academic Governance Council Faculty Reapportionment Procedure <p>Also see GFC Bylaws, Article 5.0</p> |

Reapportionment Analysis

| Ex-Officio Position* | Ex-Officios |
|---|--|
| President | 1 |
| Vice-Presidents (includes Provost) | 3 (was formerly 4 VPs) |
| Deans (includes heads of Library and Extension) | 7 |
| Registrar | 1 |
| Total | 12 x 2 = 24 electable faculty positions |

| Faculty / School | Full-Time Academic Staff | Formula | Positions to nearest decimal | Net -/+ ** |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Faculty of Health and Community Studies | 47 | $47 \div 405 \times 24 = 2.78$ | 3 | - |
| Faculty of Fine Arts and Comms. | 48 | $48 \div 405 \times 24 = 2.84$ | 3 | +1 |
| Faculty of Nursing | 45 | $45 \div 405 \times 24 = 2.66$ | 3 | - |
| School of Business | 60 | $60 \div 405 \times 24 = 3.55$ | 4 | -1 |
| School of Continuing Education | 17 | $17 \div 405 \times 24 = 1.00$ | 1 | - |
| Faculty of Arts and Science | 188 | $188 \div 405 \times 24 = 11.14$ | 10 | -2 |
| Total | 405 | | 24 | |

Reasons for changes in apportionment and impact on elections

The reapportionment is suggested because a review has not been carried out since the implementation of the GFC in 2019. The current out-of-date reapportionment procedures (attached) stipulate a review every three years, and since 2019 there has been significant hiring of tenure-track faculty. The proportional growth in the smaller faculties has increased their relative size, particularly in Fine Arts and Communications which gained a seat. Another factor likely contributing to the size of faculty complements in the past three years is the shift of faculty (academic) advisors from academic staff under the Faculty Collective Agreement into the MacEwan Staff Association. In addition to these changes, one VP level position which was a formal ex-officio in the PSLA was eliminated, and replaced with a General Counsel, which is not an automatic ex-officio, leading to a reduction of two electable faculty positions (from 26 to 24).

Changes Managed Through Elections

The net loss of positions would not involve removing any GFC member. Rather, they can be achieved by electing less members where relevant.

Discretionary members: academic AVPs and additional faculty representatives

Academic AVPs are not included in the PSLA *ex-officio* definitions and are not counted when using *ex-officio* positions to determine electable faculty. These AVP positions have been added to the GFC membership through discretionary authority with additional discretionary faculty positions added to compensate above the 24 electable positions identified here.

Counting “full-time academic staff” for purposes of GFC

The Secretariat consulted with Human Resources to develop a list of current member tenure-track/tenured faculty. The PSLA refers to “full-time Academic Staff” and it is necessary to dive deeper into this definition to reach a reasonable conclusion about who is counted. “Full-time Academic staff” was interpreted to mean full-time tenure/tenure-track positions covered by the Faculty Collective Agreement whose home unit is a Faculty or School, including the professoriate, lab assistants, instructional assistants, and any faculty advisors who are still covered in the Faculty Collective Agreement in those units. The analysis included faculty in seconded administrative positions. A more detailed breakdown is provided below.

The analysis also ensured that faculty with cross-appointments were only counted once, as a member of their home unit for administrative purposes.

Faculty whose home units are not a faculty or school (ex. librarians and counsellors) are not included in these elected positions, but are allotted positions based on discretionary authority to appoint additional members to section 23(d). If desired by GFC, those members could also be reviewed and modified.

Summary of Included/Excluded in Headcount:

In headcount:

- Full-time tenure/tenure-track positions (includes lab assistants, etc.)
- Department Chairs
- Full-time tenure/tenure-track positions who are seconded to administration (i.e. Associate Deans, Deans, Registrar, Provost, President).
- Full-time tenure/tenure-track positions currently on leave
- Full-Time Limited-Term

Not in headcount:

- Part-time tenured positions.
 - Note, three part-time positions (2022 analysis) have been excluded due to wording of the PSLA, however Executive may wish to examine how this is interpreted in revising the apportionment procedures.
- Sessional faculty
- Sessional-extended faculty
- Nurse Educators

- Academic advisors who are now MSA

Different Scenarios

During analysis several slightly different scenarios were tested, ex. excluding vs. including seconded faculty. In all cases, it yielded the same results in terms of whole numbers and changes within the number of seats +/- among the faculties and schools.

GFC MEMBERSHIP 2020-2021

GFC Membership by Category – February 2022 Update

| Member | Role | Unit | Term |
|--|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Statutory Ex-Officios (12) under PSLA section 23(1)(a) | | | |
| 1 | Annette Trimbee | President | President's Office |
| 2 | Craig Monk | Provost and VP, Academic | Academic Affairs |
| 3 | Maureen Lomas | VP, Finance and Admin, & CFO | Finance |
| 4 | Myrna Khan | VP, External Relations | External Relations |
| 5 | Melike Schalomon | Dean | Arts and Science |
| 6 | Allan Gilliland | Dean | Fine Arts and Communications |
| 7 | Cassie Prochnau | I/Dean | Health and Community Studies |
| 8 | Christy Raymond | Dean | Nursing |
| 9 | Craig Kuziemsky (dual role, count once, one vote) | I/Dean | Business |
| 10 | Heather McCrae | Dean | Continuing Education |
| 11 | Karen Keiller | Dean | Library |
| 12 | David McLaughlin | Registrar and AVP, IAP | Registrar |
| Statutory Student Members (2) under PSLA section 23(1)(b) | | | |
| 14 | Myles Dykes | Student President | SAMU |
| 15 | Ruan Bouwer | Student Academic VP | SAMU |
| Statutory Academic Staff Members (26) under PSLA section 23(1)(c) | | | |
| 16 | Katie Biittner | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 17 | Andrea Wagner | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 18 | Calin Anton | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 19 | Bob Irwin | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 20 | Lucio Gelmini | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 21 | Eric Legge | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 22 | Vahid Rezanian | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 23 | Ion Bica | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 24 | Kimberley Harcombe | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 25 | Chris Streimer | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 26 | Josh Toth | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 27 | Cynthia Zutter | Faculty | Arts and Science |
| 28 | Dave Kato | Faculty | Health and Community Studies |
| 29 | Erin Gray | Faculty | Health and Community Studies |
| 30 | Brendan Cavanagh | Faculty | Health and Community Studies |
| 31 | William Wei | Faculty | Business |
| 32 | Joanne Loh | Faculty | Business |
| 33 | Fernando Angulo | Faculty | Business |
| 34 | Bob Graves | Faculty | Business |
| 35 | Rene Wells | Faculty | Business |
| 36 | Kari Krell | Faculty | Nursing |
| 37 | Emily Khalema | Faculty | Nursing |
| 38 | Kathleen (Kathy) Miller | Faculty | Nursing |
| 39 | Lucille Mazo | Faculty | Fine Arts and Communications |
| 40 | Chandelle Rimmer | Faculty | Fine Arts and Communications |
| 41 | Peter Myhre | Faculty | Continuing Education |
| Additional Appointed Members (14) PSLA section 24(1)(d) | | | |
| 42 | Tim Tang | AVP, Students | Academic Affairs |
| 44 | Craig Kuziemsky | AVP, Research | Academic Affairs |

Last Updated August 2020

GFC MEMBERSHIP 2020-2021

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------|
| 43 | Rafat Alam | President, FA | Faculty Association | - |
| 44 | Cristina Anton | Faculty | Arts and Science | 31/08/22 |
| 45 | Tiffany Kriz | Faculty | Business | 31/08/24 |
| 47 | Jim Head | Faculty | Fine Arts and Communications | 31/08/24 |
| 48 | Lee Makovichuk | Faculty | Health and Community Studies | 31/08/23 |
| 49 | Mary Asirifi | Faculty | Nursing | 31/08/24 |
| 50 | Martin Tucker | Faculty | Continuing Education | 31/08/23 |
| 51 | Eva Revitt | Faculty | Library | 31/08/23 |
| 52 | Tara Stieglitz | Faculty | Library | 31/08/22 |
| 53 | Tory Pino | Faculty | Professional Resource Faculty | 31/08/23 |
| 54 | Raymarck Unera | Student | SAMU | 30/04/22 |
| 55 | Freya Cartujano | Student | SAMU | 30/04/22 |
| 56 | Laura Gilmour | Alumni Representative | Alumni Association | 31/08/22 |

Last Updated August 2020

Memoranda

To Deans as Chairs of Faculty and School Councils: Dr. Allan Gilliland, Dr. Karen Keiller, Dr. Craig Kuziemsy, Dr. Heather McRae, Cassie Prochnau, Dr. Christy Raymond, Dr. Melike Schalomon

From: Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar

Date: March 21, 2022

Re: Analysis of Admissions Standards Using English 30-2

Dear Chairs of Faculty and School Councils,

Over the past several months, the Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar has undertaken a review of the use of ELA 30-2 in admissions requirements at MacEwan. This review grew out of the Committee's observation that there were inconsistencies in how ELA 30-2 was used across the institution, and that we were unsure if ELA 30-2 was serving as an effective standard for admissions. To examine this issue, the Committee was provided, by the Office of the University Registrar and Institutional Analysis and Planning, with extensive data on the outcomes of students admitted to programs that use ELA 30-2 in their admissions criteria. These data allowed us to compare the outcomes of students presenting ELA 30-2 to students presenting ELA 30-1 within the same programs, as well as across programs.

Our analysis was based on the understanding that the purpose of admission requirements is not to keep students out, but rather to ensure that students presenting a certain prerequisite have a realistic chance of completing program requirements. While we do not want to create artificially high entry requirements and thereby restrict access, we also do not want to do students a disservice by admitting them to a program that they do not have the background and skills to complete. Our analysis and discussion of these data identified several important themes:

- In line with our history and vision, it is important to ensure that we maintain accessibility to our programs for a diversity of students.
- Aside from admission standards, it is important that appropriate supports and services are available to maintain access and encourage student success.
- ELA 30-2 is not appropriate for admissions requirements to many programs, for example for baccalaureate programs in the Faculty of Arts and Science. It does, however, serve an important role in the admissions requirements of many smaller programs, particularly those with diploma exit options.
- Students entering programs with ELA 30-2 with grades higher than 65% were generally successful, where success is defined as continuing in the program and receiving credit in university-level English courses.
- Students admitted with ELA 30-1 did tend to have higher average GPAs and perform better in university-level English classes, but this fact alone is not sufficient to exclude students admitted with ELA 30-2.

- The number of students admitted to programs with a grade below 65% in ELA 30-2 was quite small. These students, however, were not as successful, with more than 1/3 of students not returning after their first year of studies. These poor outcomes suggest there might be some justification for minimum standards for admission of students with ELA 30-2, to ensure a realistic chance of success.

Based on these discussions, a minimum grade in ELA 30-2 should be considered as an admission requirement by Faculty and School Councils. The Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum and the Calendar does not wish to impose a standard as a minimum grade could strengthen some programs, but not others. Rather, we request Faculties and Schools, as our partners in academic governance, examine the issue in the context of their own programs and provide a position on the use of ELA 30-2. Some options that could be considered by Faculties and Schools include, but are not limited to:

- A minimum grade of 65% in ELA 30-2 will be used for admission to programs that employ ELA 30-2 in their admission requirements.
- A different minimum grade (other than 65%) more appropriate to the program will be used for admission to programs that employ ELA 30-2.
- No minimum grade in ELA 30-2 beyond the current practice will be used if this is deemed to be appropriate for programs within the Faculty or School. Or,
- ELA 30-2 is not an appropriate admission requirement for the programs within a Faculty or School, and a minimum standard therefore does not need to be considered.

We have enclosed a summary of the data we used to conduct our own analysis to assist in your discussion of this issue. We ask that you examine the issue and respond to the Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum and the Calendar with a position, supported by your Faculty or School Council, on the future use of ELA 30-2 in your admission requirements, as well as a short rationale underlying the chosen position and how it best supports the needs of your programs.

In the upcoming months, the Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar intends to conduct a similar review of admissions requirements which use Math 30-2, and you can expect a similar request for feedback as part of that analysis.

If you or your committees have any questions or feedback, please do not hesitate to contact me at harcombek@macewan.ca.

Sincerely,

Dr. Kimberley Harcombe, Faculty Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar

Cc: Dr. Craig Monk, Robyn Alyes, Dr. Tai Munro, Jenny McGrath, Dr. Brian Parker, Allan Wesley, Dr. Robert Woznura



| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Okay | Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar |
| Meeting Date | Submitted by |
| March 28, 2022 | Kim Harcombe, Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Standards David McLaughlin, AVP, Analysis & Planning, and Registrar |
| Agenda Item | Recommended levels of approval/responsibility for Academic Calendar Content |
| Resource Staff | Chris Harrison, Associate Registrar, Student Information Sessions |
| Action Requested | For Approval |
| Recommendation /Motion | That the General Faculties Council approve the Proposed Levels of Approval and Responsibility for Calendar Content. |
| Context and Background | <p>The Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar recommends the approval of the proposed responsibilities. The intent of the proposal is to clarify responsibility for different aspects of the Calendar development process, which engages both academic and administrative interest.</p> <p>GFC has authority on the preparation and publication of the university calendar through the Post-secondary Learning Act, article 26 (1) (g). With the creation of the Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar Committee (ASCC), GFC delegated aspects of this authority to ASCC. ASCC in turn created a subcommittee, the Calendar Advisory Group (CAG) to coordinate aspects of the calendar process.</p> <p>A discussion paper was created to consider the delineation of responsibilities of these bodies and proposes authority for these responsibilities. Many components of activities of Calendar preparation are administrative and the document outlines some of these activities and notes the appropriate responsibility and authority to implement corresponding changes. The discussion paper proposes an approval structure that allows for decision making at the appropriate level, consistent with GFC delegation and relevant policies while also recognizing that authority for administrative components of calendar preparation is separate from the academic governance process.</p> <p>The university has a comprehensive Curriculum Inventory Management system which acts as the authoritative source of academic decisions related to programs and courses. The software also includes a calendar component interface that directly uploads these decisions into a calendar structure.</p> <p>The second part of the discussion paper outlines some of the implications of the decision to move calendar production to the Fall term, and notes that the approval structure in part one of the document acknowledges and supports these changes. The timelines included here provide the Academy with a clear understanding of the sequencing of approvals and the need to have completed curriculum and admission planning to support the timely creation of the Calendar and so provide applicants and students with up-to-date information.</p> |



| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| <p>Summary</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of the proposed structure will provide clarity of authority and decision making relative to items related to the preparation and publication of the Calendar. This will allow ASCC and CAG to act with confidence on matters referred to them and significantly streamline the development and delivery of the Calendar. |
| <p>Implications</p> | |
| <p>Review History</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 23, 2021- Recommended by Calendar Advisory Group. • February 22, 2022 – Recommended by the Committee on Academic Standards and the Calendar • March 14, 2022 – Referred to GFC by GFC Executive Committee |
| <p>Next Steps</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share with stakeholders |
| <p>Policy</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approval of courses and program information aligns with and references the Curriculum Policy |
| <p>FOIP</p> | <p>This item has been assessed relative to the Guidelines and Practices for the application of the FOIP Act, Chapter 4: Exceptions to the Right of Access. This information is in compliance and deemed to be appropriate for Public distribution.</p> |
| <p>Attachment(s)</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Calendar Discussion Paper with recommendations embedded |

Calendar Discussion Paper & Recommendations

Prepared by: David McLaughlin, AVP, Planning & Analysis, and Registrar

Prepared for: Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar (ASCC)

Date: February 22, 2022

Referred to: General Faculties Council

Background and Framing

When MacEwan had only a hard copy of the Calendar, there were significant constraints on the construction and production of the document. While the delivery of a fully online Calendar (CAT), and a parallel Curriculum Inventory Management process (CIM), eliminated or significantly reduced many of these constraints, the University has not yet ventured to fully update its processes related to the ongoing maintenance of the Calendar content, but has instead concentrated on getting familiar with CIM and understanding the new options that come with having a digital Calendar.

With our acquired experience and understanding of the capabilities, the university is now able to better utilize the capacities of our CAT/CIM system. To best leverage these capabilities, it will be necessary to delineate roles and authorities for the development and the production of the Calendar.

Changes to the Calendar

Note that most of the content of the Calendar is approved in the context of Faculties and Schools developing and approving courses and program changes, and new programs approved by the Board on recommendation of GFC. The issues addressed in this discussion and recommendations largely pertain to changes to the Calendar that fall outside these normal processes.

One important new capability of the current Calendar environment is the option to add or amend information in the Calendar; however, the Calendar constitutes a quasi-legal document, so updates and errata need to be handled carefully. Some changes such as typos, and minor additions should be easy to action, while others, such as material changes to admission regulations, might need to wait for subsequent Calendars, following full academic governance consideration. There is much that will fall into the middle and establishing authority and processes for these considerations is needed.

The proposed levels of approval provide basic direction on those issues where OUR believes we can clarify at this juncture and reflect the types of ongoing questions and decisions that arise in our management of the Calendar. Nothing prevents further modification and clarification. Note, the table includes existing GFC authority and

delegation. These are included for reference to show the overall delegation structure with respect to decisions on the Calendar. Note that there is not a single point of approval of the whole Calendar as various pieces and updates are approved at different levels.

Proposed Levels of Approval and Responsibility for Calendar Content:

| Approval Authority | Decision | Authority & Delegation Details | Notes |
|---|---|--|---|
| Committee on Academic Standards, Curriculum, and the Calendar, typically on recommendation of Faculty or School Council and Calendar Advisory Group | Changes to courses and programs, and admissions standards post-production | Typically, this is not an option. Strong rationale for such a change needs to be provided. | Students affected by the change will receive communication outlining the proposed change and impacts. Students will be advised of options relative to the proposed change. |
| Calendar Advisory Group | General content, production decisions, and layout | | |
| Typically, Faculty or School Council | Course and program changes prior to publication | Further definition in Curriculum Policy | All course and program info in the Calendar must be implemented via Curriculum Inventory Management system (CIM) |
| Registrar | Implementing decisions made by authorized bodies | | E.g., Tuition and Fees approved by the Board of Governors, addition of Professors Emeritus per policy, and new courses approved off-cycle by Faculty |

| | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| | | | and School Councils |
| Registrar | Minor editing and course additions, postproduction | Approved in Curriculum Inventory Management system (CIM) as operational matter | E.g., correcting typos, improving syntax, and updating personnel information |

Calendar Timelines and Standard Curriculum Timelines

Another important aspect of Calendar production is the date at which a new Calendar becomes effective. There is a clear connection between the development of curriculum, including course information, and program information. This means that final approval of these items was a major factor in driving the subsequent timeline of the Calendar. While the manual process of proofing such an extensive document added several months to the venture, the integration of CAT and CIM means that the process is less error prone, and many of the hurdles that previously drove production have disappeared. We now have the capacity to move from approved curriculum in CIM to a published Calendar in a matter of weeks. There is no need to wait until March to get a completed Calendar.

A decision by the Calendar Advisory Group in Spring 2021, and supported by administration in Faculties and Schools, is to have curriculum decisions completed by June at Faculty/School Councils, starting in the upcoming Academic Year. Since Faculty/School Councils are responsible for virtually all curriculum decisions, this means that Calendar production can begin much earlier in the year and there would be great benefit in formalizing the process to require a production date by the end of September.

This new sequencing of approvals and production will have *one very important implication related to admission requirements*. Students start applying to programs in October, almost a full year ahead of classes starting, yet the Calendar in the past was generated in March, only a few months prior to classes starting. This has always meant that we had to commit to admission requirements almost two full years ahead of the commencement of classes. The hard version of the Calendar provided no flexibility in modifying either the content of the requirements or the timing of approvals. The production of a Calendar prior to October 1 would allow for final admission decisions made in June to flow into a Calendar for applicability in the upcoming Academic Year.

Moving the Calendar production substantially earlier will have some adverse implications, primarily the addition of approved tuition and fee costs. These are

typically approved, in late November or December, by the Board of Governors. A March production date allowed us to include the approved amounts in the Calendar, but a September production date that will make that impossible. If we were creating a hard copy, that would be a fatal flaw for a September production, but with a digital copy and the options for errata/addenda, it is only a question of developing a process for updating the Calendar once the Board approves the tuition and fee structures. The proposed approvals listed above outline authority for precisely this scenario.

Timelines, Responsibilities, and Process for Production of the Calendar:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| April | Faculty and Schools ensure that admission requirements decisions are provided to Academic Standard, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee by April, allowing time for potential revisions to be completed and approved by June. These are effective for September of the following year (14 months later). |
| June | Faculty and School Councils finalize curriculum decisions in June, effective for September of the following year (14 months later). |
| July | Faculty and School administration updates and activates approved curriculum in CIM in July to reflect their Council decisions |
| July-August | Office of the University Registrar (OUR) initiates the Calendar production once all Faculties and Schools have completed sign off in CIM |
| September | Calendar is moved to production during September by the OUR. (Generally, this is a 2 to 3-week process). |
| October 1 | Official launch of the new Calendar on October 1. |
| Fall Term | Academic Schedule is approved by General Faculties Council in the Fall term. The OUR updates the Schedule as needed and edits the descriptor from “tentative” to “approved”. Changes logged as an addendum. |
| Typically Fall Term | Tuition and mandatory non-instructional fees are approved by the Board. The OUR updates the tuition information accordingly, then edits the descriptor from “previous year” to “official”. Changes logged as an addendum. |

Final Observations

The ability to now update the Calendar post-production can create issues for ensuring information is accurate and up to date. Since the Calendar is the official expression of academic decisions, all websites that reference this information need to link directly to the site, rather than to replicate the information separately. This provides an authoritative single source of truth and obviates the need for multiple edits of information in multiple locations.

Last, the Academic Calendar Policy last underwent significant review in 2011 and contains a large of amount of defunct content given changes in governance, responsible

offices, and technology. In addition, a regular review of the ASCC terms of reference is anticipated and would consider delegation of authority relevant to decision-making authority. The recommendations presented here go some ways to bridge the policy gaps and clarify responsibilities and it is possible that when ASCC next reviews that policy and terms of reference, there will be further refinements with respect to authorities and delegations as well as consideration of the fate of the Academic Calendar Policy.

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Submission to | GFC Executive |
| Meeting Date | Submitted by |
| March 28, 2022 | Cynthia Zutter, Co-Chair, Committee on Teaching and Learning Sharon Bratt, Associate Dean, Centre for Teaching and Learning |
| Agenda Item | Teaching Modalities Framework Analysis and Definitions |
| Resource Staff | |
| Action Requested | For Discussion |
| Recommendation /Motion | That the General Faculties Council approve the “Hybrid at MacEwan” teaching modalities framework and definitions therein. |
| Context and Background | <p>The documentation provided here addresses an identified need to provide clearer understanding and definition of teaching modalities at MacEwan. There is a need to better define online, hybrid, and face-to-face teaching. Faculty, students, and staff would benefit by a set of standard definitions for teaching modalities which include their synchronous and asynchronous versions where applicable. Draft materials were presented for discussion at the November 2021 and February 2022 meetings of the GFC Committee on Teaching and Learning meeting.</p> <p>Part of the recommended approach, based on Committee discussions, was that definitions should be rewritten for an audience of students and faculty rather than the OUR and the definition of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) align with the province’s definition.</p> <p>The provided framework on forms of hybrid learning includes definitions of hybrid teaching modes, examples of substantive interactions, and distribution of in-person and online instructional hours to support MacEwan’s emerging mixed-modality or mixed delivery mode learning model.</p> |
| Implications | <p>Approving the framework and definitions will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide faculty, students, and staff with the defining features of each modality. • Provide faculty with clear guidelines when designing and implementing these modalities. • Assist students in planning their academic schedule. • Support Scheduling to assign the appropriate codes and classrooms in the future. • Improved communication for all stakeholders <p>Lack approved definitions and framework may result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student confusion about how a course is delivered as evidenced in lead-up to the fall 2021 academic year. |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ambiguity among faculty about the meaning of certain modalities and their key features—hybrid synchronous and hybrid asynchronous. • Lack of clarity when communicating with stakeholders both internal and external. |
| Review History | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 2021 - Teaching and Learning Committee recommended that some of the draft definitions be revised. • December 2021-January 2022 - presented to Provost's Group and Deans' Council in February for discussion. • February 2022 – Recommendation by Teaching and Learning Committee. |
| Next Steps | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GFC approval • Implementation and Communication – ex. to internal stakeholders, website, and/or Calendar |
| Policy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A |
| FOIP | This item has been assessed relative to the Guidelines and Practices for the application of the FOIP Act, Chapter 4: Exceptions to the Right of Access. This information is in compliance and deemed to be appropriate for Public distribution. |
| Attachment(s) | 1. Background and Definitions for Teaching Modalities |

Hybrid at MacEwan

Developed by the Centre for Teaching and Learning
March 7, 2022

Summary

This document presents an evidence-based framework for hybrid teaching modes, including examples of substantive engagement, and distribution of in-person and online instructional hours to support MacEwan's emerging mixed-modality or mixed delivery mode learning model.

At MacEwan University hybrid learning means a range of at least 30 to 50 percent in-person instruction.

The post pandemic return to campus will involve more than simply hitting the reset button for the academy. In the video game world, gameplay is the specific way in which players interact with a game. Gameplay is the pattern defined through the game rules, connection between player and the game, challenges and overcoming them, plot and player's connection with it. (Gameplay, n.d.) One could argue that the game board and even the gameplay have been redesigned as institutions look beyond the pandemic and recognize the need for greater resiliency in the face of future disruptions. When we use this analogy in academia the elements of gameplay are 1) the policies that specify required instructional hours; 2) the definitions that guide instructional modes; and 3) the pedagogical activities that constitute meaningful contact time.

...the game board and even the gameplay have been redesigned as institutions look beyond the pandemic and recognize the need for greater resiliency in the face of future disruptions.

These elements have already begun to shift in support of the new and emerging societal, economic, and technological realities our students experience. (Young et al., 2016) Resetting the board is not a realistic long-term option. These realities create the need for new game play with mixed instructional modes that provide flexible course delivery, andragogic course designs –teaching strategies developed for adult learners, future-ready competencies and build out our digital teaching and learning capabilities. The 2021 EDUCAUSE Horizon Report. Teaching and Learning Edition explores key trends, technologies and practices shaping the future of higher education. One of the trends is the mainstreaming of a mixed-modality model known as hybrid learning in the higher education landscape.

The conventional understanding of *classroom instruction* is a scheduled, formal physical space occupied primarily by an instructor-led activity such as a lecture, practical demonstration, supervised group activity or combination of these activities for the duration of time specified by the course schedule.

The emerging post-secondary landscape is characterized by flexible and adaptive learning modes that facilitate the in-demand asynchronous learning model that has proven successful for high profile for-profit learning platforms like Coursera, Udemy, and edEX.org that exist outside of time- and place-based education.

MacEwan emerges from the pandemic with the capacity to deliver asynchronous hybrid learning. The majority of faculty have had two years of experience teaching in some combination of hybrid mode. Leadership and professional development training, services, resources, and technology support have been available and have adapted to meet the emerging needs of the academy. Today's students have shared a similar digital learning experience. In fact, many previous in-person learning, social and recreational activities were moved online from 2020-2022 –further acclimatizing this influx of learners to a mixed delivery mode. According to a recent higher education report, the features of a hybrid university make it a more **student-centred university** and that such an approach “encourages innovation in teaching and learning”. (Selingo et al., 2021, p.2)

Pragmatic approaches and recommendations for asynchronous activities would give faculty a path forward as they design in this bifurcated mode.

Innovation in teaching and learning may be viewed by an exhausted academy as more *aspirational* than intentional. The shift to more asynchronous hybrid learning requires faculty to reconsider and redesign components of their course to fit with the leading practices that have emerged from the experiences during the pandemic. Pragmatic approaches and recommendations for asynchronous activities would give faculty a path forward as they design in this bifurcated mode.

But what exactly do we mean when we use the term hybrid learning?

Hybrid learning incorporates both an in-person and online component. Students registered in hybrid classes should expect to have at least 30 to 50 percent of their class delivered in person and will need to be able to attend classes on campus during the term.

There are 2 types of hybrid models: synchronous and asynchronous. A **synchronous** hybrid model describes a course where in-person and online sessions occur at a scheduled time. An **asynchronous** hybrid model describes a course where the in-person sessions occur at a scheduled time but the online sessions do not. Questions that arise when designing a hybrid course are “what is the distribution of instructional hours between in-person and online, and what activities are suitable for each?”

Re-thinking Substantive Interaction

A more accurate description would be, “regular and substantive engagement with the instructor, peers, course content and the community either synchronously or asynchronously”.

The US Department of Education’s description of distance education stipulates “regular and substantive interaction between these students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously”. But this narrow description limits the activities that would fit into the asynchronous component of a course. A better description should be broader in scope –such as “regular and substantive **engagement** with the instructor, peers and course content”. MacEwan might further broaden this description to include “community” which reflects the institution’s commitment to community engagement in the centre of amiskwaciwâskahikan. This more inclusive description also reflects high impact teaching: experiential learning, active learning, team-based learning; learner autonomy and open pedagogies. A more accurate description would be, “regular

and substantive engagement with the instructor, peers, course content and the community either synchronously or asynchronously”.

Considerations

Which activities are more suitable for synchronous versus asynchronous modes? A shallow dive into the literature shows general agreement that some activities are better suited to one mode or the other depending on the context. Bloom’s Taxonomy can guide this decision. Learning outcomes that require higher order skills: creativity, critical thinking and reflection, analysis, problem- solving and application are time-intensive therefore more suitable for asynchronous learning.

Learning outcomes that result in declarative knowledge through memorization and recall require less time to develop and internalize. Activities that involve communication of facts and an understanding of concepts are suited to synchronous learning. Therefore, it is best practice to begin with the learning outcomes when deciding on the appropriate mode. (Bates, 2019) Table 1 gives some examples of activities suited for synchronous or asynchronous learning based on a 30 – 50% distribution of instructional hours. It is helpful to think of instructional hours as *learning time* -that is, time students spend in a variety of activities. (Greifner, 2007)

Table 1 Examples of synchronous and asynchronous activities

| Instructional mode | LEARNING TIME | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| | Synchronous activities | Asynchronous activities |
| Hybrid | Lectures Guest speakers Demonstrations Small group breakout sessions Student presentations Q&A Class discussion Labs | Pre-recorded lectures Instructor-mediated discussion forums Peer-mediated discussion forums Team-based activities Research Portfolio development Vlogs, webinars, or podcasts Self-assessment Interactive readings/videos Assignments Journals Projects Product creation OER content creation Pre-class assessments |

Operationalizing contact hour activities

MacEwan uses the term Instructional hour (IH) as a unit of measure that quantifies the amount of time scheduled for the purposes of classroom instruction. IH is also referred to as contact hours. Contact hours are the regular and substantive interaction between students and their instructor and

are traditionally associated with the number of hours that a class meets on campus. The pandemic necessitated in-person instructional modes to adapt contact hours and activities to suit hybrid models.

There is no Canadian federal agency equivalent that defines or gives guidance on distance education (online learning). The Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC) – the arms-length quality assurance agency that reviews and recommends Alberta degree programs to the Minister of Advanced Education for approval does not address delivery modes as part of their role in building and maintaining effective quality assurance processes and practices. The provision of definitions and operationalizing of instructional modes remains the purview of degree granting institutions as part of institutional autonomy.

Institutions must decide the proportion of in-person contact hours to online contact hours (both synchronous and asynchronous). There is no one-size fits all formula nor will one solution work across disciplines, programs and courses (Young, 2002). The amount of in-person ‘seat time’ replaced by online varies greatly by institution, class, discipline, and learning objectives.

A common approach uses a 50/50 split where the class meets approximately half online and half in-person (Bernand et al., 2014; California State University, Northridge, n.d.). Classes may be scheduled using an alternating pattern of days, or weeks. This pattern works well for classes that meet twice weekly. Classes that meet 3 times per week may choose a different split based on thirds. The class might meet in-person for 2 days and the remaining class is online synchronous or asynchronous. The split would be a 2:1 ratio. Conversely, the split might be 1:2 where for each in-person class 2 classes are online.

The screenshot displays a scheduling interface with two main sections: 'Class Sections' and 'Meeting Pattern'.

Class Sections:

- Session 1, Regular Academic Session, Class Nbr 22010, Class APDB Mapping Values
- Class Section 1, Component Lecture, Event ID
- Associated Class 1, Units 3.00

Meeting Pattern:

| Facility ID | Capacity | Pat | Mtg Start | Mtg End | M | T | W | T | F | S | S | *Start/End Date |
|-------------|----------|-----|-----------|---------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| FH_106 | 9 | W | 9:00AM | 10:20AM | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 01/19/2021 - 05/07/2021 |

Below the table, there are fields for 'FH 106', 'Topic ID', and 'Free Format Topic'. At the bottom, there are options for 'Print Topic On Transcript', 'Contact Hours', and 'Meeting APDB Mapping Values'.

Figure 1 Sample screenshot for scheduling instructional hours

Benefits of Hybrid Learning

A full review of the benefits of hybrid learning is beyond the scope of this document. Instead, a summary of the most commonly cited benefits is presented.

One administrative benefit of the hybrid model is the ability to flex the physical footprint of a campus and increase capacity by ‘sharing the space’ (California State University, Northridge, n.d.). Two classes can be scheduled in the same classroom location if their split between in-person and online are complementary. An important logistical requirement of this shared space model is that the pattern of in-person and online cannot be delivered impromptu or incidentally. Teaching faculty who

opt for a shared space model should commit to a schedule of in-person/online to facilitate the creation of the academic course calendar through the Office of the University Registrar.

The results of a 2020 systematic review of synchronous hybrid learning identified both institutional and pedagogical benefits. (Raes, 2020) Hybrid learning affords equitable access to educational opportunities required by an older, more diverse student population. The author cites increased recruitment rates by students seeking more flexible academic schedules to fit with their work and family commitments as one institutional benefit of hybrid learning for institutions challenged by decreasing enrolments.

The online format also affords access to expertise outside of the institution thereby broadening perspectives and strengthening connections with the community. Several studies included in the review identified strengthened social relations among students and teachers which is a factor in student retention.

However, the author concludes that empirical evidence on the impact of hybrid learning on student learning outcomes is still emerging and more research is needed.

A recent meta analysis of blended learning in higher education –used interchangeably with hybrid and mixed mode– found that overall differences between blended and conventional classroom learning are small. Furthermore, around half the studies reported positive and half negative results which suggests that replacing classroom time with online learning does not always lead to a neutral or positive outcome. (Miller & Mildemberger, 2021) The authors conclude that factors such as clear criteria, challenging coursework, feedback and quality of peer and instructor interactions are more important factors than the delivery mode. The efficacy of any delivery mode depends on the quality of its implementation. (p. 12) The research shows that while neither fully in-person or fully online results in *better* academic achievement a mixed or hybrid mode does improve other outcomes such as enrolment and retention, EDI, and self-reported increases in student satisfaction.

Next Steps

UNESCO's Global Education Coalition, formed in response to the pandemic, suggests a 4-step iterative approach to create an effective hybrid learning strategy: understand and envision, decide and design, enable and execute, and monitor and adjust. (UNESCO & McKinsey & Company, 2020) MacEwan spans steps 1 and 2. Step 1 involves setting the parameters of the hybrid learning strategy. Step 2 is to determine the allocation of instructional hours.



Figure 2 UNESCO's iterative process for implementing hybrid learning

The type of hybrid model, distribution of IHs, and types of instructional activities that constitute substantive engagement are the basic components for hybrid learning. The creation of new, or revisions to current policies and processes guide stakeholders in this new era of 'hybrid first' pedagogies as MacEwan develops the required capabilities to sustain and mature new mixed modes of instructional delivery.

Appendix

Instruction modes

MacEwan's 2021/22 definitions of in-person, online and hybrid learning instruction modes are available on our website.

In-person: Taught face-to-face during regularly scheduled class times and in a setting that accommodates physical distancing requirements as per AHS guidelines at the time of the class. This will need to be updated when restrictions are lifted.

Online – Asynchronous: Asynchronous online learning does not require real-time interaction; instead, content is available online for students to access when it best suits their schedules. Assignments are completed to deadlines.

Online – Synchronous: Synchronous online learning happens in real time during a scheduled class time. Online activities vary depending on the course and the instructor. Examples of synchronous activities might include online lectures, class discussions (optional or mandatory), office hours and exam reviews.

Hybrid: Hybrid learning incorporates both an in-person and online component. Students registered in hybrid classes should expect to have at least 30 to 50 percent of their class delivered in person and will need to be able to attend classes on campus during the term.

Independent Learning: Instructional activities that allow students to pursue a specific topic of interest. Students work independently with a professor who acts as a research, field-specific, or performance supervisor. There are no formal class meetings, lectures, or readings other than what is agreed to with the supervisor. (This can include research courses, private lessons, or other one-on-one instructors).

HyFlex: HyFlex combines the terms "hybrid" and "flexible." Each scheduled class is offered in-person, and synchronously online. HyFlex represents a small proportion of the classes offered.

References

- Bates, A. W. (2019). *Teaching in a Digital Age – Second Edition: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning*. Tony Bates Associates Ltd.
- Bernand, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Tamim, R. M., & Abrami, P. C. (2014). A Meta-Analysis of Blended Learning and Technology Use in Higher Education: From the General to the Applied. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 26(1), 87-122. 10.1007/s12528-013-9077-3
- California State University, Northridge. (n.d.). *Schedule Hybrid Classes | California State University, Northridge*. CSUN. Retrieved December 26, 2021, from <https://www.csun.edu/admissions-records/schedule-hybrid-classes>
- Department of Education. (2006, August 9). *Federal Register, Volume 71 Issue 153 (Wednesday, August 9, 2006)*. GovInfo.gov. Retrieved December 18, 2021, from <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2006-08-09/html/06-6696.htm>
- Gameplay. (n.d.). Wikipedia. Retrieved December 8, 2021, from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gameplay>
- Greifner, L. (2007). *Learning Time*. *Education Week*, Vol. 26, p. 9. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tfh&AN=24097331&site=ehost-live>
- Means, B., Yukie, T., Murphy, R. F., & Baki, M. (2013). The Effectiveness of Online and Blended Learning: A Meta-Analysis of the Empirical Literature. *Teachers College Record*, 115(3), 1-47.
- Miller, C., & Mildenerger, T. (2021). Facilitating flexible learning by replacing classroom time with an online learning environment: A systematic review of blended learning in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, 34.
- Poulin, R. (2016, September 30). Interpreting what is Required for “Regular and Substantive Interaction”. *WCET Frontiers*. Retrieved December 18, 2021, from <https://wcetfrontiers.org/2016/09/30/interpreting-regular-and-substantive-interaction/>
- Raes, A. (2020). A systematic literature review on synchronous hybrid learning: gaps identified. *Learning Environ Res*, 23, 269-290. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-019-09303-z>
- UNESCO & McKinsey & Company. (2020, December). *COVID-19 response – hybrid learning Hybrid learning as a key element in ensuring continued learning (2)*. UNESCO.org. Retrieved December 30, 2021, from <https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/unesco-covid-19-response-toolkit-hybrid-learning.pdf>
- USC Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism. (n.d.). *Calculating contact hours in online and hybrid classes*. USC Annenberg. Retrieved December 18, 2021, from <https://annenberg.usc.edu/faculty-and-staff-resources/calculating-contact-hours-online-and-hybrid-classes>
- US Department of Education. (2020, September 2). *Distance Education and Innovation*. Federal Register. Retrieved December 18, 2021, from <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/09/02/2020-18636/distance-education-and-innovation>

Young, J. R. (2002). Hybrid Teaching Seeks To End the Divide between Traditional and Online Instruction. *Chronicle Of Higher Education*, 48(28), A33-A34.

Young, W., Allen, L., & Warfield, K. (2016). Developing Online/Hybrid Learning Models for Higher Education Programs. *Alabama Journal of Educational Leadership*, 3, 47-56.