

**Meeting of School of Business Council**  
**Wednesday, October 3, 2018**  
**4:00 – 6:00 p.m.**  
**Room 9-102, City Centre Campus**  
**MINUTES**

**1.0 Call to Order**

The Chair, Dr. Wanda M. Costen, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m., as quorum of 22 was met and exceeded.

**2.0 Indigenous Ceremony**

As is always done at these meetings, the Dean read the official land recognition statement: We acknowledge that the land on which we gather in Treaty Six Territory is the traditional gathering place for many Indigenous people. We honour and respect the history, languages, ceremonies and culture of the First Nations, Metis and Inuit who call this territory home. The first people's connection to the land teaches us about our inherent responsibility to protect and respect Mother Earth. With this land acknowledgement, we honour the ancestors and children who have been buried here, the missing and murdered Indigenous women and men and the ongoing collective healing for all human beings. We are reminded we are all treaty people and the responsibility we have to one another.

The Dean made a presentation of protocol to C. McAdam, MacEwan University Indigenous Knowledge Keeper. In response to the Dean's request, C. McAdam opened the meeting with an indigenous ceremony.

**3.0 Approval of Agendas****3.1 Meeting Agenda****SOBC-01-2018-10-03****Carried**

**MOTION:** It was moved by C. Hancock and seconded by T. Costouros that School of Business Council (School Council) approve the Motion to approve the Agenda as presented.

**SOBC-02-2018-10-03****Failed**

**MOTION:** It was moved by F. Angulo and seconded by M. Roberts to move items 5.0 and 6.0 before item 4.0 due to classes scheduled for 6 p.m. for some faculty.

F. Angulo advised his reason for this change was because 5.0 and 6.0 were items that would need to be voted on by the majority of faculty and some people may need to leave for classes.

The Dean shared her concern that there were three guest presenters and adjusting the time would mean they would need to sit through most of the meeting which may not work for their schedules.

A count was done of how many people would have to leave and the result was that the change would not impact quorum.

The Dean introduced Gina DeVeaux, the new Director of University Governance. At AGC, the Consent Agenda has now approved s separately from the main meeting agenda. The Dean requested a motion to the consent agenda to add the minutes from the September 5<sup>th</sup> Council meeting.

**3.2 Consent Agenda which included the following items:****3.2.1 SoBC Executive Committee** (W. Costen, Chair)**3.2.1.1 Minutes** – September 25**3.2.1.2 Motion** –Ratification of the Dean's Selection of Common Members for Tenure and Promotion Committees (A&F, OB, HR & Mgmt.)**3.2.2 Business Programs and Curriculum Committee****3.2.2.1 Motion** - Annual Report, 2017-18 and Focus Statement, 2018-19**3.2.2.2 BPCC Motions:****3.2.2.2.1 Decision Sciences****3.2.2.2.1.1 Programs of Study**

- Supply Chain Major and Minor

**3.2.2.2.2 International Business, Marketing, Strategy & Law****3.2.2.2.2.1 Major Course Changes**

- LEGL 312 Legal Issues in the Workplace

**3.2.2.2.2.2 Programs of Study**

- Asia Pacific Management and Regulations

- BCom, Marketing Major, Minor & Honours

- Public Relations

- Paralegal Studies

- BCom, International Business Major, Minor & Honours

- BCom, Legal Studies in Business Major & Minor

- Travel

**3.2.2.2.3 Organizational Behaviour, Human Resources & Management**

#### 3.2.2.2.3.1 Programs of Study

- |                                       |                                       |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| - BCom – HR Major & Minor             | - Bus. Mgmt. – Diploma                |
| - BCom – Property Management Minor    | - Bus. Mgmt. Diploma – Aviation Major |
| - BCom – Mgmt. Major, Minor & Honours | - Human Resources Management Diploma  |
| - Bus. Mgmt. – Certificate            | - Library & Information Technology    |

#### 3.2.2.2.4 Programs of Study: BCom & Arts and Science Minors

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| - BCom – Core and Degree Regulations     | - BCom – Political Science Minor for Business |
| - BCom – Cooperative Education           | - BCom – Psychology Minor for Business        |
| - BCom – Anthropology Minor for Business | - BCom – Sociology Minor for Business         |
| - BCom – Economics Minor for Business    | - BCom – Spanish Minor for Business           |
| - BCom – French Minor for Business       | - BCom – Statistics Minor for Business        |
| - BCom – History Minor for Business      |   |

#### SOBC-03-2018-10-03

**Carried**

**MOTION:** It was moved by R. Jindal and seconded by M. Shadnam to amend the consent agenda by adding a motion to approve the minutes from the last council meeting.

#### SOBC-04-2018-10-03

**Carried**

**MOTION:** It was moved by P. Callaghan and seconded by H. Qadri to approve the consent agenda as amended.

### 4.0 Presentations

#### 4.1 Dianna Dempsey & Rohit Jindal – MU Grants Adjudication Committee

The Dean advised they had received information from Office of Research Services that suggested the School was under-served because faculty were not applying for grants and they hope the information shared today will encourage faculty to apply.

D. Dempsey advised that MacEwan has a university-level pot of money that it uses internally to fund different types of grant applications. The Office of Research Services' website lays out detail about the different funding opportunities.

D. Dempsey shared that R. Jindal and she sit on the MU Grants Adjudication Committee with representatives from each faculty/school. This committee adjudicates internal grants administered by the Office of Research Services. The committee meets five or six times a year to talk about these grants and the grants are usually anywhere from 20 – 150 pages long depending on the application. On average, there are 80 or 100 applications a year that are read through. It is a competitive process.

R. Jindal and D. Dempsey provided advice on best practices to follow when applying such as making sure it is clear what you are wanting to do and ensuring you do not go over the word limit. It was advised to make sure your spelling and grammar is correct. When looking at the grants, the committees look at how feasible they are in terms of what the research cushion is, how you are going to pursue it, whether it is feasible for you to address that cushion, and how well it is grounded in literature. Student involvement is not mandatory, but it does help the proposals. The committee is looking for involvement of students in research and projects where students are integrated are the ones that tend to score higher. R. Jindal and D. Dempsey advised not to use jargon as not everyone may be subject matter experts in your field, so the committee needs to understand why this is important from your perspective and how this is grounded in a gap in the literature, and why people are not already doing this.

If people need assistance with the process, there are resources available from the Office of Research Services that are more than happy to help you with your proposals as you are working on them. Faculty were advised to not be discouraged, as it is a competitive bucket of money. Historically, there have not received as many applications from the School of Business as there has been from other faculties. However, especially if more people from the School of Business start applying, it will become even more competitive. Not all applications are funded and typically, you will receive feedback either in verbal or written form from the committee.

The Dean encouraged faculty to apply for this funding. The newly created seed grant fund can be used for pilot research and then faculty can apply for a university grant and eventually an external grant. The Dean encouraged faculty to be competitive and get their work out there so people can see what the School is doing.

#### Questions and Comments from Members of Council:

- *M. Annett inquired if there were guidelines or templates to be used when applying.* D. Dempsey advised that each application has a form you would fill out specifically for what you are applying for with all applicable questions included. Each form asks for a budget. Up to this year, these have been Word Documents, but Office of Research Services is in the process of moving forward with fillable online forms which will be available

Winter 2019. All forms can be found online. R. Jindal advised that applications coming from the School of Business have a high success rate possibly because people are used to writing and explaining what they want to do. If you need assistance with formatting your application, Office of Research Services has resources to assist you with this process. The new online forms will not allow you to go over the word limit.

- *The question was raised if there were deadlines for these applications.* There are deadlines for these applications. D. Dempsey advised that the most recent dissemination deadline was October 1<sup>st</sup>, so the committee will be meeting in the next week or two to go over those. The next big deadline is for strategic grants. These are larger three-year opportunities that go up to about \$22,000 and the next major group of them is in February or March. It is for both the dissemination opportunities (conference types of money) and project grants which are basically for conducting some type of research project. It is a maximum of about \$7,000. The deadlines are all listed on the Research Services website.
- *W. Wei inquired if there is a research consultant that could provide a sample budget.* W. Wei advised that a lot of junior faculty are interested in how they should propose their budget in terms of hiring a Research Assistant or travel related research as it can be very different across faculties. R. Jindal said that they can take that suggestion to the committee to have Research Services put together different budget models. R. Jindal advised that in general, budget is not a deciding factor when the committee is reviewing applications. The committee looks to make sure it is reasonable, but it is not adjudicated in the scoring.
- *Dean Gilliland advised there are set research fees and you can get that information from Office of Research Services.*
- *F. Angulo inquired about projects done by honours students and if it was feasible for Honour students to apply for it? Fernando inquired if he had a project and one of the honour students is going to be the research assistant, if that student can use the money from the funding he received from that project to fund that thesis?* R. Jindal and D. Dempsey advised that the proposals that come to the committee must come from faculty, so students cannot use the money. If it is a student-led project, then they must go to the Undergraduate Student Research Initiative and they could be funded through that. The Dean advised that in the presentation from G. Law, students cannot be compensated for doing their research because they are getting a distinction for honours which means they are not being paid to do that research. If they are not receiving credit for it as a Research Assistant, it is fine.

#### **4.2 Karen Boros –Access to Learning Account**

K. Boros shared that the purpose of the Employee Access to Learning Activities Policy is to provide support for the development of all employees by providing MacEwan educational opportunities and funding. It is essentially intended to waive the fees for a course, but individuals are intended to pay for all special, material and book fees. K. Boros advised that what the policy says and how it is applied may not be the same due to changes in the organization and therefore, will be updated this year.

The policy states that Executive Committee will establish a maximum fee value and that amount is \$1,100 over the fiscal year which allows for a couple of academic courses, a lot of Continuing Education courses, and music and fitness classes. Eligible courses must have a course number. K. Boros shared that if you do courses that are considered personal benefit such as music and fitness classes, it is a taxable benefit. Therefore, the cost is added to your pay at the end of the month that your course is completed.

About 60-65 percent of the fund is used for Sport and Wellness activities. Sessional faculty are eligible after they have done five consecutive terms at the university and need to be active at the time of applying. All tenure and tenure-track employees are eligible upon hire.

The application form is available under the Forms Cabinet on the MacEwan portal – Application for Access to University Learning Activities. The form is completed and submitted online with no approvals required. You will receive confirmation of funds available and instructions to proceed. Human Resources will route the form to the appropriate area. You are responsible for confirming your registration when notified and applicants for credit courses must confirm registration through the student portal. Funds cannot be carried over and it is from July 1<sup>st</sup> – June 30. The course must begin within 6 months of the application or by June 30 annually, whichever is sooner. More information can be found on the MacEwan portal under the Professional Development tab.

*N. Ouedraogo inquired if the five consecutive terms requirement for sessional included the spring/summer terms as well.* K. Boros advised that it is flexible.

The Dean shared that she thought this would be beneficial for faculty that may want to enhance or update their skills

as it relates to research and that this \$1,100 can be used however faculty chooses.

#### 4.3 Gillian Kemp – Experiential Learning at Career Services

G. Kemp explained the types of two main types of experiential learning as “for credit Placement”, where students are an employee within an organization possibly being paid and gaining work experience versus “for credit Project”, where students through their course are working more as consultants with supervision from their instructor with context and direction from community partner. The characteristics of “for credit Placements” are they should have a WIL agreement, be covered by WCB, and have supervision from primarily the community partner. The characteristics of “for credit Project” are it tends to be the professors providing the primary supervision and students going in acting like consultants.

A list was shown of the placement style courses within the School of Business and faculty were asked to share any other placement courses with them that they do not currently have. There are two types of support from their available from their office. The Career development support team often do workshops or presentations around skills like job search, career planning, resume/cover letters, LinkedIn, and interview skills. They also occasionally help with mock interviews. The Experiential Learning support team around placements deals with the paperwork such as employee relations, WIL Agreements and WCB/insurance support. They also direct employers to partner with a COOP program and offer support to those looking for placements.

Community Engaged Learning is a new support this year. G. Kemp shared she is the first tangible support to these project-based course-based types of experiential learning and she shared the list of courses that she is working with this semester. Ten of the 15 courses are business courses because it is easy to see how students can apply what they are learning in their courses to support a community partner. G. Kemp shared that she and L. Wong put on an event this summer. It was a speed dating type of event where professors looking for community partners and community partners looking for help come together.

G. Kemp shared the support that she provides and explained she primarily consults on project design and integration into the course. G. Kemp advised she asks questions such as how we are going to effectively engage with a community partner, how we are going to take that course material and work it in to project format that is achievable in one semester that students are going to learn from, how do we manage it, how do we make sure it does not go off course in the consultation. G. Kemp advised she assists with community partner recruitment because professors want recruiters that are already vetted. G. Kemp explained she runs interference in the classroom and explains to students about their project because then she becomes the point of contact if there is a breakdown of communication between the Community Partner and student. G. Kemp advised she explains to the students why we are teaching in this way to help them understand the connection to competencies and career exploration. This support allows the professor to direct the academic portion. G. Kemp shared she also supports with the logistics when community partners come on campus which can include parking passes and getting them to the right classroom. G. Kemp advised that it is brand new to have support in this.

The nature of this type of experiential learning, provides an opportunity to scaffold through an entire program so when students are in their fourth year, with all this experience, they have built up their skills. It will start simple and keep building their skills and will have great experiences in their fourth year when they are working on large projects.

University Learning Outcomes are coming so programs will be tied to those outcomes. We can then weave in the language of competencies into the course outlines and projects so that the students leave knowing what those competencies are. Research shows that even though students have placements and learning experiences, they cannot articulate what their skills are because they have not been labeled. G. Kemp advised that at Community Engaged Learning, she works hard to provide students those labels, so they know what kind of skills they are using. The Community Engaged Learning becomes the stories students will tell in their interviews when they out to get jobs. This is how they illustrate what they have learned in school.

G. Kemp shared ways to collaborate with CDEL. Number one is structuring community engaged learning at a program level and thinking about how to scaffold up, what makes sense, and what could be feasibly done in each program. The competency maps must be developed to link back to ensure we are using the right language when we are giving students these opportunities. If you would like to request presentations or workshops in your courses, you can request for next semester, but they are currently full for this semester. A request for someone from the Career Development team to present or conduct mock interviews would be made through MacEwanWorks.

G. Kemp shared that there needs to be a conversation planning resources for growth of experiential learning as it will probably continue to keep growing and you might want to think about how to support that. MacEwanWorks is being upgraded which includes student experience record and experience catalogue. There is a great opportunity for the School of Business to really engage with the new tool and utilize the experiential learning and the co-curricular

record because you have club activity and case competitions. This is going to be a wonderful tool for your students to track and record and then print a record of all their experiences which is linked to competencies, so they can speak to it in their job interviews. G. Kemp provided her contact information as follows: [kempg3@macewan.ca](mailto:kempg3@macewan.ca) or 780-633-3046.

#### **Questions and Comments from Members of Council:**

- *Faculty inquired if there was a timeline for when faculty can approach you to design a project for next fall.* G. Kemp advised that she has an email drafted to go out to only the faculty that she has talked to on some level to invite them to let her know over the next week or two if they are interested in a winter course. Anyone that wants to reach out for winter course support, must let her know this month. G. Kemp shared that they will have to nail down what the project perimeters are by the end of October, so she has November to recruit and everything is ready to go for January. G. Kemp shared that in the spring, it is easier, but she would need to know in March what your project perimeters are because she will recruit in March. In the fall, she asks faculty to let her know before they leave for the summer, because she does her recruitment in July.
- *W. Jaciuk inquired if it was the intention to build an inventory of community partners with ready opportunities and ready problems to hold on to, to make matches or to hunt and seek each time a new proposal comes in.* G. Kemp advised it is a combo of both. They create a request for partnership based around a course and its specific requirements because very often there are specific dates they require a community partner to come in. G. Kemp advised that there are projects where there is a surplus, so she does not have to recruit and can slot in community members that were left or did not fit in a previous semester. Therefore, there is a stable of community members that is being developed. The basis is the MacEwanWorks database with over 3,600 contacts so they have a lot to draw from and can usually find what is needed promptly, but they are collecting community partners as they go.

#### **4.4 Paul Sopcak – Academic Integrity Update**

In the new policy that came into place on July 1<sup>st</sup>, procedure was separated from policy, for clarity and to enable timely response to new developments in the field. This change provides more flexibility. There was also a change in terminology as follows: Academic Misconduct no longer referred to as “Academic Dishonesty,” to minimize confusion around unintentional misconduct. There were lots of unintentional violations. They are still violations, but they are not necessarily dishonesty and that opens the space for the students to accept it as a learning opportunity.

There is an added penalty now that faculty members can give now and that is an educational opportunity that you did not have before. It is requiring the student to complete training on academic integrity whether online or otherwise. Faculty members can assign this educational activity such as a APA tutorial now after the first offense. Faculty members can assign training the library put together or contact P. Sopcak. There is also an academic integrity tutorial that is going to be rolled out in January to assign and there is a certificate of completion attached to that.

Students can no longer appeal the penalty on that first level as students would appeal even if they did plagiarize to try to get a lesser penalty and this is no longer an option. This is a bit of a time saver as students can no longer challenge the decision of misconduct at the first level. Time is always a concern with faculty members around academic integrity.

Another important change is the change in appeal structure: the last level of appeal is now a panel presided over by the Dean, rather than the Provost & VP Academic. Previously, if an adjudicator's decision was appealed, it went straight to the Provost's Office and now it goes to the Dean's Office at the last level. Another change is that the repeat misconduct hearings no longer involve the faculty, so faculty submit their reports and if it turns out it is repeat, it no longer involves them. Repeat Misconduct Hearing now discusses all reported incidents for a given student and focuses on the appropriate summative penalty during the hearing and instructing faculty members are no longer required to attend. Students have ten days to appeal. Either it is unsuccessful, or they do not appeal and there is no longer a question of whether misconduct occurred in that hearing so then it is a question what an appropriate penalty is.

There is also a restorative resolution option added. The first group of IIRP certified facilitators have been trained and there will be more training and online resources to follow. More training and online resources to follow. There is another training session coming up November 13 and 14. It is a two-day training session where you will become a certified restorative conference facilitator and the exception would be to facilitate 1 – 3. As faculty member, you can choose and are encouraged to engage in a restorative approach when you think it is appropriate. P. Sopcak advised that the resources and materials are going up in the next few weeks on the website and encouraged faculty to contact him if they had any questions. A restorative approach does not mean there are no consequences. It means it is not strictly disciplinary and is a conversation with a student. It is cooperation on what is appropriate to move forward in

terms of what they need to do it does not happen again and what they need to do to repair any harm that was done.

P. Sopcak encouraged faculty to check the website for updates and to encourage students to visit it. P. Sopcak pulled up the website and suggested including the link to the website in the course outlines, because it is more accessible for students and can be used to talk to students about academic integrity.

P. Sopcak explained that it is a values-based approach. The values come first before we talk about academic integrity or misconduct. The values listed are what students would expect to be upheld in their learning institution. There are definitions of academic misconduct on the website and scenarios around grey areas. Contract cheating has been added as it is a problem right now all over the world. There have been some cases of contract cheating in School of Business. There is a real market for purchased papers and contract cheating is considered severe misconduct and goes straight to a hearing. If you encounter something that you think is contract cheating, you can notify the Academic Integrity Office and it goes to a hearing with possibility more severe consequences. There is always an option for a restorative approach even when it is severe misconduct, but it can only work if the student takes responsibility. It does not mean there are no consequences.

P. Sopcak advised that if faculty go over the rights and responsibilities with their students, it is much more effective than to just tell them to read it. For example, before an assignment, faculty could share with their students how they might run into academic integrity problems on the assignment, so they take it seriously. Roughly half of plagiarism cases are unintentional and seventy percent of cases at MacEwan are plagiarism cases. The next is improper collaboration. Faculty must make their assignment instructions very clear on how much collaboration is allowed as it can help students.

The website also talks about faculty responsibilities and has a lot of information for faculty. There are tools and resources as well. As faculty, if you suspect a violation, there are step by step instructions on what to do on the website. The important part is to not to decide before the student has an opportunity to be heard. There is a template for inviting the student to meet with you as well as decision letters located on the website. Consequences and support for students are also listed.

P. Sopcak advised they are still looking for faculty adjudicators and they have upcoming training sessions. E. Iskra volunteered and P. Sopcak asked her to send him an email and copy the Dean.

#### **Questions and Comments from Members of Council:**

- *T. Huckell inquired if the restorative approach can occur at the initial meeting between the faculty member and the student. T. Huckell further inquired that if the faculty member was satisfied that the criteria for a restorative approach was met at the first meeting if it must go any further. T. Huckell inquired that for multiple offenses of misconduct for a student if the faculty member still must submit the report and if faculty would only be required to attend a hearing if it is a first offence.* P. Sopcak advised that it can and encouraged faculty to look on the website as it provides information on how to structure that conversation restoratively. P. Sopcak advised faculty might not cooperate with the student on what the appropriate consequence is, but the conversation can be structured in a way that is restorative. It helps the student to not feel pushed out of the community and at the same time turn it into a learning opportunity. The only thing that must go to the academic integrity office is a record that the conversation took place. From the faculty perspective, every violation should be a first violation unless it is the same student twice in the same class. The faculty member submits their report and if it turns out, it is not the first time for the student, the faculty member will not be notified that it is not the first time because it would be a FOIP problem. Faculty were encouraged to treat everything as a first offense and the adjudicators take care of it from there. P. Sopcak advised that a faculty member would only be required to attend a hearing if it is a first offense and the student appeals their decision. However, if a student appeals an adjudicator's decision, the Dean could decide to pull in the instructor as well. For a repeat offender, the faculty member would not be involved because it has already been established. P. Sopcak advised faculty to not talk about academic integrity cases using names to your colleagues and if faculty want to debrief without names, that is fine. The Dean advised that we want to give students the opportunity to start fresh in each course and we do not want to be biasing our colleagues because we had a situation. Students can bounce back from an offence and we do not want that incident following them their entire academic career in this school.
- *M. Roberts inquired if there was support for how to work through contract cheating and how to prove it.* P. Sopcak advised the easiest way is to have an in-class writing assignment that you keep until the end of term and if there is something very different from what you received from the student, then you could base your decision on the discrepancy after you meet with the student and ask them to explain the discrepancy. If there is no good explanation for the difference in quality, then you move forward on this academic misconduct. In terms of determining if it is contract cheating, it is a little more difficult.
- *B. Panganiban advised that she had been involved in a case where she had brought in a student to talk about*

*academic integrity and the student had recorded her without her knowledge and used it in her appeal. Has anything gone forward on the fact if faculty can have any way of knowing if it is going to be used against them in any way and how faculty can be protected.* P. Sopcak advised that in a discussion at an AGC meeting talking about the policy less than a year ago, previous Provost advised that nothing could be done in that situation. P. Sopcak advised his understanding in Canadian law around recording is that we are representing the institution, so we cannot record without getting consent, but a private person can.

- *The Dean inquired if anyone knows if MacEwan has SafeAssign as part of Blackboard.* P. Sopcak advised there were two attempts to get it going and IT would have to turn on the option. However, there is an extensive report by the U of A and there are some serious considerations around intellectual property, FOIP and whether it is used as a pedagogical tool or not. SafeAssign is a U.S. company and the servers are held in the U.S. P. Sopcak advised that he had spoken with the people at SafeAssign and they are not willing to bring the server to Canada. The Dean advised that in the U.S., she had her students submit their paper through SafeAssign before submitting their final paper. Dean advised she found SafeAssign helpful and somewhat restorative in the fact that students catch and fix it themselves and then submit their paper for a grade. P. Sopcak advised that Business faculty member R. Jenne is looking at it again because of the contract cheating problem. It was discussed that although not easy, there are ways to trick the system as well for SafeAssign. As a policing tool, it does affect the culture. It does have to have that pedagogical value added to it as well otherwise it does not align with our approach.
- *M. King advised that her understanding was that if you have two writing samples from a student and they do not match, that is enough to start the process.* P. Sopcak said that is correct and that is why it is good to have one in-class assignment to compare to.

#### **4.5 Randy Jenne - Academic Integrity Text in Course Outlines, and IT Security Awareness Training**

R. Jenne explained that in the past, faculty included language about academic integrity in their course outlines, but the language was taken out and replaced with links to the policies instead. R. Jenne shared that he serves as an Academic Integrity Adjudicator and explained that when they must evaluate a situation, having a course outline that has some very specific language is a very strong foundation for the discussion. R. Jenne explained that after discussion with P. Sopcak, he has put together the essential language that he believes should be including in faculty course outlines. Faculty were advised it is included in the meeting materials, so it can be used in their course outlines. It has updated language consistent with the new policy.

#### **Questions and Comments from Members of Council:**

- *P. Callaghan inquired if there is one repository of information for students such as through the student handbook or the library where this kind of information is available and suggested placing it on Blackboard.* R. Jenne advised it is available through the academic integrity website.
- *T. Costouros and P. Callaghan advised that their course outlines were regulated by their department. It was further discussed that there is a School of Business template to ensure that all links to the policy are included.* R. Jenne agreed that the School of Business template has a list of policies, but the academic integrity policy used to be included and should be put back in.
- *The Dean shared that the reason she asked R. Jenne to present this is because she assumed this was already included. The Dean shared she would not want to mandate this as it is up to faculty to do what works best for them, but she is a strong advocate for including this language in all course outlines. The Dean shared that it is important enough from an academic and a learning standpoint that we want students to know and be aware of it and understand the importance of it.*
- *D. Braun from the Centre for Teaching and Learning inquired if there is any reason that this would not be applicable to courses outside of Business.* R. Jenne advised that this is not particular to Business and is generic and consistent with the policy and ready to go for whomever.
- *D. McLaughlin inquired if it was coming straight from the policy and advised that if it was the policy then should change because when he reads the following sentence “a mark reduction up to zero on a piece of academic work”, he understands it as the maximum mark reduction is zero which is problematic under the penalties for academic misconduct.*
- *R. Rudko advised she likes including just the links to the policies because it slimmed down the course outlines. However, if it is important for the adjudicators, she shared she is fine with including it. R. Rudko stated that it is already included in many different spots.* R. Jenne advised that he argue the likelihood of students clicking on or searching for a link to the academic policy, if it is not for marks, is very low.

- *M. Roberts advised that the links made sense previously because you could click on each policy and it would pull it up. However, the links now land on the policy main page and one must search for it in the directory, so he agreed that it would be best to include it in the course outlines.* R. Jenne advised that the likelihood that a student would click on that policy link and read it in the course outline would also be unlikely.

R. Jenne shared that there was a decision made at the ITM committee, a university level committee, to have IT security training for all faculty and staff and that it would be mandatory. Most people completed the training via the link in the email. However, there were a few people that did not so that list was sent to R. Jenne who forwarded it to the Department Chairs and most of those people have now completed the training.

IT received two lists of sessional faculty from the Human Resources department to generate the same emails for sessional faculty so they would also could do the training. The lists were somewhat different, and it is difficult to get a definitive list of sessional faculty teaching for us. In general, if the sessional faculty received the email and clicked on the link, they are good to go or if they visit the portal and click on the link and can login, they are good to go. If they do not know if they received the email, it is possible that their name slipped through the cracks and when they go to the portal and try to log in, they will receive an error message in which case they receive a free pass until the next term when we try to catch them again. Faculty were encouraged to do the training if they had not already done so.

## **5.0 Motion – approval of revised Terms of Reference of School Council Standing Committees – Executive, Business Programs and Curriculum and Faculty Development**

**SOBC-05-2018-10-03**

**Failed**

**MOTION:** It was moved by T. Costouros and seconded by N. Ouedraogo that School of Business Council approve the revised Terms of Reference for its Standing Committees – Executive Committee, Business Programs and Curriculum Committee, and Faculty Development Committee.

The Dean advised that she would like to step out of the Chair role to speak to this item and share F. Angulo's feedback and Vice Chair, B. Graves agreed to step in as Chair. The Dean shared that none of the substantive content related to the Terms of Reference was changed. The Dean shared that she wanted to ensure that these committees have representation from every department and while some of these committees exist that way, it was by chance so that was changed. The Dean advised that she is not going to dictate how departments want to do that and it is up to each department to figure out how they want to do that. The idea was that it would be the Chair in consultation with the department council. The Dean advised she will ask each Department Chair for their representative.

### **Questions and Comments from Members of Council**

- The Dean spoke to F. Angulo after he left the room and recorded his concerns. Fernando advised he was concerned about the membership for BPCC as he wants to ensure it is full time faculty who are representing the faculty on the curriculum committee and there is nothing saying that.
- M. Roberts raised concern that there should be a Department Chair representative on both BPCC and Executive and that has been taken out. This communication is important for faculty because previously there was a Department Chair on both and they would share notes. Faculty do not always read these documents, but Department Chairs know what is going on which is why it is so important to keep them on these committees. The Dean agreed that it was a great point and shared that Executive Committee's concern was that with the Dean and Associate Deans on the committee already, it was too administrative heavy.
- M. Roberts shared that, in particularly for Executive Committee, the perhaps the idea originally was that the Associate Deans would not be voting on Executive Committee. The composition has been one Dean and one Associate Dean to vote, but now it would be both Associate Deans and the Dean. M. Roberts suggested to keep one Dean and one Associate Dean but add a Department Chair because the Department Chair is ultimately a faculty member. This would be best for both BPCC and Executive in terms of faculty governance.
- E. Muralidharan inquired if the Associate Dean is considered a faculty member. It was advised that Associate Deans were not considered faculty while they are in the position.
- It was discussed that there must be a quorum of four with a minimum of three faculty members on Executive Committee, so it is not a complete quorum if it is two Associate Deans and one Dean. T. Costouros shared that she recalls having that discussion with the committee about being top heavy and agreed with M. Roberts proposal to address the issue.



**SOBC-06-2018-10-03****Failed**

**Motion:** It was moved by M. Roberts and seconded by T. Costouros that in the Terms of Reference for BPCC and Executive, the line saying "the Dean and two Associate Deans" be changed to say "the Dean, one Associate Dean selected by the Dean, and one Department Chair elected by School Council."

**Questions and Comments from Members of Council:**

- G. DeVeaux advised that in her view Executive must stand alone and it should be top heavy. M. Roberts disagreed as it comes from School Council and faculty represent School Council. She advised she is not speaking in terms of the School of Business, but in a broader perspective in terms of the purpose of Executive Committees. G. DeVeaux advised that some would object to an Executive Committee at all because it is top heavy. G. DeVeaux recommended if making changes, it does need to be broken out, so it is very clear which ones are changing based on the motion and the draft Terms of Reference.
- M. Roberts advised to think about the Executive Committee as the executive committee of school council. School council is the shareholders, so we are choosing a governance. In many places, the officers are not even on the board. In many Universities, the Dean is not even the chair of the faculty council. If you look at it from a corporate structure, as stakeholders we are choosing an executive committee based from the stakeholders. That is why I think the more stakeholder focused it is, the better it is rather than it being the officers. The less officers the better on this kind of committee.
- The Dean shared that F. Angulo did comment that he initially was equally concerned, but now that he sits on AGC he recognizes that this is how it is on AGC. You have the President, and other senior leaders who sit on Executive Committee for AGC. While initially this was a concern of his, now that he sees how AGC operates. His comment was that it was no longer a concern for him in terms of that.
- The Dean advised that she would argue we take our lead from AGC in terms of how we should operate, and we should align with AGC. The Dean advised she has no problem with the Department Chair being on there but inquired how that person would be selected. M. Roberts advised that it would be elected by School Council. B. Graves shared that the Chairs would get together and decide who wants to be on each committee and nominate. However, School Council will ultimately make the choice.
- G. DeVeaux advised to be clear as to whether the School is following parliamentary procedure or corporate procedure. For corporate procedure, the School should have a board of independent directors, not shareholders or officers, one of whom may serve to represent the larger group. For parliamentary procedure, the cabinet is made up of senior officials. If the perimeters and criteria being used are clear, when this comes around the next time, you can truly assess the effectiveness of it.
- T. Huckell advised that an independent corporate director may be a shareholder, but not an officer.
- B. Graves advised the motion could be pulled apart to look at the language of both committee separately.
- For Executive, the Dean shared that the real importance for saying both Associate Deans is that both Associate Deans have been attending forever and the logic was to make it official instead of having one as a guest at every meeting.
- M. Roberts advised that faculty need to signal that they want to take charge of these things.

**SOBC-07-2018-10-03****Carried**

**Motion:** It was moved by M. Roberts and seconded by T. Costouros that the amendment to change the language for Executive Committee such that the representatives are the Dean, one Associate Dean appointed by the Dean, and one Department Chair elected by School Council.

**SOBC-08-2018-10-03****Failed**

**Motion:** It was moved by T. Costouros and seconded by B. Panganiban that the amendment to change the language for Business Programs and Curriculum Committee such that the representatives are the Dean, one Associate Dean appointed by the Dean, and one Department Chair elected by School Council.

**Questions and Comments from Members of Council:**

- The Dean shared that she believes there is value added in having both Associate Deans at BPCC. It is important to have both Associate Deans equally represented in one of the most important committees we have in the School.
- M. Roberts inquired why the Associate Dean of Research needs to be on BPCC as it is understandable the Associate Dean, Students would be since it relates to programming. The Dean shared that just because that is how they are currently delineated but that is not how they might always be delineated, and they are treated equally. The Dean advised that matters are discussed with both Associate Deans like how she operates the Academic Leadership Team, all that

information comes through Department Chairs. The Dean shared it is important to her to have both of their perspectives there and that just because he is the Associate Dean, Research and International does not mean he does not have a vested interest in the curriculum.

- R. Rudko suggested having one Associate Dean as a voting member. It was discussed that this is what we currently have.
- E. Bocatto advised that there are research aspects in many courses and with the Honour designations so having the Associate Dean, Research and International in the meeting is important and strategic for support.
- T. Costouros agreed that it could be very important to have them both there. However, the voting is the key issue and we should only have one voting, but that does not stop the other one from attending.
- M. Roberts advised that the change in the language to Executive Committee made sense because it is a governance group and the idea of it being top heavy was not right. However, BPCC is a functional committee and agreed with the Dean's argument.
- D. McLaughlin shared that in terms of the structure of governance councils, one of the decisions at AGC was to ensure that there was faculty representation of at least sixty percent on all AGC committees. With three deans plus eight faculty members at around 72%, it is within the threshold. Therefore, there is no issue of under representation of the faculty members at BPCC. However, it would have been a problem for Executive with three Deans and four faculty members.
- C. Hancock advised that there are times when people cannot attend meetings, but items must be passed and inquired what the committees' thoughts were about the electronic vote as it appears to be removed. Each Terms of Reference are slightly different. For the Faculty Development committee, on 6.4, it brings in the notion of Skype. Is there a concern that we might get to a point where we do not have enough people in a meeting, and we may have to do an electronic vote of those committees? It does not seem like that is possible with the words "must be present".
- E. Muralidharan agreed that there are times that most faculty cannot attend these meetings because they are in classes so important to bring in some form of electronic voting.
- D. McLaughlin advised that there is a difference between electronic voting and electronic participation. Most of the committees have electronic participation so then one must ask, is there a requirement to have presence in some form for the vote and therefore, if you have electronic participation, then you could have an electronic vote because they could be heard and seen.
- C. Hancock agreed with that but is hoping there is still opportunity for electronic voting to reach quorum.
- D. McLaughlin advised that the problem with the electronic voting without electronic participation, is that arguably the voter has not been fully informed. D. McLaughlin suggested to rely on electronic participation and have electronic voting if the person is included in quorum in the sense that they are participating electronically. After the fact voting is very problematic. The Dean agreed with this.
- C. Hancock advised that on the BPCC Terms of Reference under 7.3.1, it first starts out saying "two" and then in parentheses it says "one". It was discussed it should be two and it will be corrected as a typo.
- T. Costouros stated that when it comes to people not being able to attend these committees, it is more often going to be faculty so what might that do to our quorum to make sure we have sixty percent. The Dean advised that when a time is picked for a committee meeting, the outlook calendar is looked at for each committee member to ensure they are available. T. Costouros advised that from experience, she has missed committee meeting due to classes and her calendar is up to date. The Dean advised that she cannot say it will not happen, but for example, this meeting was scheduled when we think the bulk of the people are available, but some people could not be here for a variety of reasons, but we want to make sure that we are mindful of that. These are standing committees so, in general, we are going to know when these meetings are.

**SOBC-09-2018-10-03**

**Carried**

**Motion:** It was moved by S. Elbarrad and seconded by W. Wei that the School of Business Council approves the revised Terms of Reference for standing committee – Executive Committee, Business Programs and Curriculum Committee, and Faculty Development Committee with the one amendment to Executive that was passed.

## 6.0 Motion – approval of composition of Bachelor of Commerce Self-Study Committee under Policy C3010, Baccalaureate Program Review

SOBC-10-2018-10-03

Carried

It was moved by W. Wei and seconded by C. Babiuk that the School of Business Council approves the composition of the Bachelor of Commerce Self Study Committee as presented:

1. Mark Arnison (Supply Chain)
2. Travis Huckell (Legal Studies)
3. Fernando Angulo (Marketing)
4. Murli Muralidharan (International Business)
5. Mike Annett (Human Resources)
6. Charles Keim (Management)
7. Dal Pirot (Accounting & Finance)

## 7.0 Updates by the Dean

### 7.1 Campus Master Plan (SoB Bldg.)

The Dean advised that the Campus Master Plan is posted and encouraged faculty to look at it because there is a space for the “School of Business Building”. The important thing to note is that the School is going to begin thinking and talking about what this means for the School. The Program Review Committee is going to be the foundation for how we begin to move forward and think about where the School is going from a curricular standpoint, but we also must begin to think about what the venue will look like for the future of Business education literally. We must begin to strategically think about how many students we are going to try to serve and what that looks like. This will be an in-depth discussion with the Dean, the President and Myrna, the new VP of External Relations. The Dean shared that all faculty will be involved. As a School, we are looking at the notion of values and direction. That is going to be essential in how we move forward with the development of this building and by development, it is meant with whom we going to partner with and what industry partners would support this endeavour.

The Dean shared her personal desire that, within two years, the President would have the information she needs to go the province with the proposal with the industry partners supporting it. It is a very fast timeline, but the Dean shared she is committed and believes it can be done. The Dean shared that the School is uniquely positioned in the province to offer a different type of Business education as a degree and that attracts a broad array of students and MacEwan is better situated for most of those people than the U of A. The question becomes how to you begin to talk about this within our brand and within the programs the School offers. The Dean shared that the School can have an impact in this province and perhaps across the whole country. The work School is going to be doing over the next couple of years is to support that endeavour. The first thing that we must do is to develop a business case which falls to the Dean, in consultation with faculty and the Academic Leadership Team which consists of the Department Chairs and the Associate Deans. The Dean is required to produce the business case for review to the President, VP of External Relations and the Provost in terms of how the School will be moving forward. This is not an easy task, so the Dean advised she will be asking for feedback and sharing that work with faculty. The School of Business Building is the number one capital improvement project for the entire university.

*The question was raised if programs meant certificate, diploma and degree.* The Dean advised certainly the Bachelor of Commerce, but because of how the School is structured, yes. The Dean shared that she believes that it is unique that we can we can get students who do not think they can pursue a degree, but we know they are. Once they begin, they realize it is possible and continue to ladder into the diploma and degree. That is the importance of the laddering and ensuring that we have no longer diploma courses and degree courses, but that they are intertwined. That is the real value of that.

### 7.2 University Strategic Planning Update

The Dean advised this was shared on the Google Drive for faculty members to access. The President has created a President’s Council now through which this information is shared. The Dean pointed out the **Core Values: MacEwan embraces Curiosity, Change, and Optimism**, the **Mission: Committed to student-focused undergraduate and continuing education, We Teach, We Learn, We Serve** and the **Vision: A nationally recognized inclusive hub of creative, scholarly and cultural activity in Downtown Edmonton**. The strategic direction of the university is shown in the document. W. Costen shared that K. Ristau took the pieces of paper we had on the values, and after accessing all of that, he has given us what our values are as a School and they all align with the university’s direction. The Dean advised that document will be sent out separately. The Dean advised that

everything we do as a School must support the strategic direction of the university. The strategic directions of the university are as follows:

**TRC Calls to Action:** Be a national leader in the implementation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Calls to Action.

**Learner Experience:** Strengthen an extraordinary urban and metropolitan Undergraduate student experience with an emphasis on student and alumni success.

**Inclusive Institution:** Develop our capacity and reputation as an inclusive community university.

**MacEwan Effect:** Build on and promote our distinctive MacEwan curriculum, to provide greater flexibility and opportunities for life-long learning.

This is the foundation of who we are and how we came to be. The Dean shared that these are things the School must think about where we fit in and how we can support this strategic and strategic plan. These are what we are going to be doing as a university so when I come back to you and we start having these meetings about how does the School of Business fit in these areas. The Dean explained that the **Foundational Plans: Academic Plan, Resources Plan, Community Plan and People & Culture Plan** will fall in together and integrate to become the integrated strategic plan. The Dean explained it begins with the Academic Plan. We must remember that at our core, we are the academy. The academy drives where this institution is going, and the other components support that. The Dean shared that she has been asked to sit on the People and Culture Plan so everything they do in each one of the foundational plans support the overarching strategy, but ultimately the Academic Plan. The Dean shared that there is representation on each of these groups. E. Muralidharan and R. Jindal are on the Academic Plan, so we have two people there who are developing this, but it is important for faculty to see how all of this works together.

The Dean shared where the Schools come in, is in the Operational Plan, the Deans all report to the Provost so the Academic Plan will be given to us and as a School, we have to say how are we going to support the Academic Plan. The question must be asked what is required of us as an individual School to support this plan? The Dean shared that the Program Review Committee's work will feed into that plan for us as will the business case of how we are going to create this new building. All of it is interconnected. Each one of these foundational plans must address each other. The Dean advised she will share any updates with faculty. The Dean shared this will be discussed as a School and faculty should know that there are opportunities for them to engage across the broader academic and university community, but it is important to understand that this is being done and that these are the foundations of who we are as a university and how we are moving forward.

### 7.3 Faculty Hiring

The Dean shared that the Department Chairs submitted a request to her for faculty. The request was for 14 faculty members and the Dean shared they have freed up the funds for 11 faculty members due to efficiencies within the Dean's Office. Two of those new faculty will be Chairs because there are two open Chair positions.

*R. Jindal inquired if there is a department distribution of those and if it will all be done for the next academic year.* The Dean advised not yet because she will have to sit down with the Department Chairs allocate and advised it will be done for the next academic year.

The Dean shared that the thought would be that for many of the departments we could write a position announcement by which hopefully when we got to the finals, we would have two people we could hire for two slightly different positions in the same unit. The Dean shared she cannot be on 12 different committees, but there will be a separate committee for each department. The Dean shared that the departments would have to share with her through their Chair what the priorities are and advised that within the next two weeks, she would be meeting with the Chairs to discuss this.

The Dean thanked T. Kachmar for the amazing work he did to show support financially that we can fund 11 faculty positions. The Dean shared that in November, faculty will see the presentation about how T. Kachmar made that happen, but this is what it means to be strategic and frugal about how we spend the money we are given to run our School and the number one thing we owe our students is quality faculty. Full time faculty to do the work of the School. We are an undergraduate university and we will teach. That is the number one thing we do.

### 7.4 AGC Update

AGC just had a meeting last week and they went over a lot of annual reports.

## 8.0 Updates by Associate Deans

W. Wei advised he had finished his meetings with all Type 1 and Type 2 faculty members which was about 50 people. The School has about 39 Type 1 faculty and 11 Type 2 faculty. Within 39 Type 1 faculty members, there are about 15 junior faculty members. In discussion with the Dean, W. Wei advised they want to encourage more people to collaborate, particularly those who are already tenured and has a substantial research agenda, with new people who just joined the School

W. Wei advised that three scales of the funding were set up. As a solo researcher, the maximum fund will be \$2000, as an interdisciplinary research team, the maximum fund will be \$5000 and in a team with Students, the maximum fund is \$7500.

The Dean clarified that this is not travel money. The Dean advised it is seed funding for research proposals and it is not to fund your entire project. However, if you have an idea that you want to get started, this is money to start collecting data and begin a research project. Most external funds require you to have some data that suggest that your project is worth funding externally and the Dean shared this is how she would like faculty to get it. The Dean advised that faculty have travel budgets within their departments and to see their Department Chair if you want to travel. The Dean advised you can or may get that amount of money, but faculty must have a budget and proposal.

This funding is ad hoc, and faculty were encouraged to submit, the committee will then meet to decide. The Dean advised she wants to see these funds being used and that it is to support faculty's research endeavours. The Dean shared that in the way it is tiered, faculty is encouraged to collaborate and work with students, but there are no limitations other than what your idea is and what your budget is. W. Wei shared that he is expecting 15-20 proposals.

W. Wei advised he sent out a call for study tour proposals and there has been some interest. W. Wei encouraged faculty to contact him if they need assistance with designing a study tour. W. Wei shared that the first visiting professors from VSE, David Riha arrived yesterday (October 3 – 14) and is eager to meet faculty. E. Iskra volunteered to pick him up from the airport. Another visiting professor, Marek Prokupek, in Arts Management, will be staying from October 6 -19 and M. Gulawani volunteered to pick him up. Petr Jirsak, in Supply Chain Management will be staying October 13 -27 and M. Moreno volunteered to pick him up. W. Wei advised faculty to reach out to E. Iskra, M. Gulawani or M. Moreno if they would like these professors to speak in your class or to meet with them to discuss research opportunities.

The EPAS Committee is going to meet on October 9<sup>th</sup>. The EPAS data sheet review was revised this summer based upon the EPAS data sheet review document and the committee are looking to an November deadline to send in the revised data sheet.

S. Elbarrad advised that a survey had been sent out to students to get their feedback about their experience with the waitlist and once we have this feedback, we will share it with you. S. Elbarrad thanked the advisors for all the work they have done at the beginning of the semester and we are currently identifying students that are at risk to go on probation and we are going to start working with them before going on probation to try to develop a plan that will help them avoid going on probation.

#### **9.0 Updates by Department Chairs**

E. Bocatto advised that they have a new Ph.D. faculty member in their department, Dr. Norene Erickson. N. Erickson was congratulated by members of Council.

#### **10.0 Updates by Representatives to Other Faculty/School Councils**

T. Chika-James advised that the FFAC Council approved the 2018-19 Performance Evaluation Criteria. There were no changes based on the review of the most recent version of the performance evaluation criteria that was in accordance with the new collective agreement. The level of performance includes five rather than three levels of performance evaluation; meritorious, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, requires improvement and unsatisfactory. All references to "creative activity" were removed as creative work is captured in the definition of scholarly activity found in Article 12.1.4.3 of the Collective Agreement. The FFAC Council ratified their Tenure and Promotion Committee common external members and alternates for the 2018-19 academic year.

The Dean shared that Executive Committee will be at both approved Arts and Science and FFAC criteria.

#### **11.0 Updates by Library Members**

K. Sobchyshyn shared that they have been happy with the many requests they have received from faculty. K. Sobchyshyn advised she had a couple of meetings with B. Graves adapting an open textbook in one of his courses and that led to some discussion about how to open that up to the School in general. Therefore, there will be a meeting sometime in October where K. Sobchyshyn and A. Foster, OER specialist in the Library, will talk a little about what OER is. K. Sobchyshyn asked faculty members who are currently using them to her, so their work can be possibly used as an example to show faculty what they could be doing in the classroom. An invitation would be sent out to faculty for this meeting.

#### **12.0 New Business**

No new business.

#### **13.0 Announcements by Members of Council**

None

#### **14.0 Question Period/Open Discussion**

None.

#### **15.0 Future Agenda Items/ Next Meeting**

The Dean shared there will likely be an update from the Social Innovation Institute, so we have a better idea of what that is since it is now housed in the School. The Dean advised that Lynn Wells, the new AVP for Student Affairs, will come and talk about her portfolio. The Dean shared she went to the Cannabis presentation and that we will likely have them come to School Council to address questions.

**16.0 Adjournment**

**SOBC-11-2018-10-03**

Adjournment was moved by R. Jindal. **CARRIED**