Meeting of School of Business Council  
Wednesday, April 18, 2018  
4:00 – 6:00 p.m.  
Room 7-284, 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.  
As is always done at MacEwan University, 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 tobacco to Roxanne Tootoosis, MacEwan Indigenous Knowledge Keeper and Facilitator. In response to the Dean’s request, Ms. Tootoosis opened the meeting with an indigenous ceremony.

2.0 Approval of Agenda/ Consent Agenda  
SOBC-01-2018-04-18 Carried  
MOTION: It was moved by M. Gulawani and seconded by K. Al-Jarrah that School of Business Council (School Council) approve the Motion to approve the Agenda and Consent Agenda as presented, which included the following items on the Consent Agenda:

2.1 Minutes: School Council Meeting, Feb. 15

2.2 Executive Committee (W. Costen, Chair):
   2.2.1 Minutes, March 19, 29 (for information)
   2.2.2 Motion – to recommend the winding down of the Institute for Innovation in Management Education (IIME) and Director’s Report (S. Elbarrad)
   2.2.3 Annual Report, Institute for the Asia Pacific Studies (IAPS) (to the Dean, Research Council, and Office of Research)
   2.2.4 Motion – to approve Revised Bylaws of the School of Business Council, plus draft Revised Bylaws (B. Graves, Vice Chair)

2.3 Business Programs and Curriculum Committee (S. Ibach, Chair)
   2.3.1 Report – including major course change proposals and Master Course Syllabus revisions for two departments: Accounting and Finance, and Organizational Behaviour, Human Resources and Management.
   2.3.2 Motion – to recommend five 2019-20 Program of Study Revisions for two departments: Accounting and Finance, and Organizational Behaviour, and Human Resources and Management, as noted below:
   2.3.2.1 Accounting and Strategic Measurement (S. Elbarrad)
   2.3.2.2 Business Mgmt. – Certificate Exit (N. Ouedraogo)
   2.3.2.3 Business Mgmt. – Diploma (N. Ouedraogo)
   2.3.2.4 Business Mgmt. – Aviation Mgmt. Major (N. Ouedraogo)
   2.3.2.5 Human Resources Mgmt. (N. Ouedraogo)

2.4 Faculty Development Committee (W. Costen, Chair)
   2.4.1 Report

2.5 Academic Governance Council (AGC) Update
   2.5.1 Meeting Synopsis: March 20

3.0 Dean’s Update  
Dean Costen shared her vision for the School in a presentation entitled “Building on our past but evolving towards our future”. The Dean talked about her background and the values of responsibility, accountability and hard work that were instilled when she was raised as an ‘army brat’ in a U.S. military family. Honour and integrity are paramount to her and it is essential that she can trust the people she works with. The Dean attended West Point United States Military Academy, Pepperdine University and Washington State University. The Dean’s personal mission statement is “To combine love and enthusiasm with passion, honesty and integrity to positively impact people development”. As a post-secondary institution, the Dean noted that we mold future citizens, and we must take this seriously. The School of Business must move forward collectively and collaboratively as a unit towards the same overall goal. Collectively and unified, there is nothing we cannot do. Everyone is equally important and valued and has a role to play within the School. We will have a culture of integrity, accountability and transparency. Going forward, the School needs to take what we do and elevate it. We have a unique opportunity to position the School in the academic marketplace in ways that have never been considered. The School must have a unified message of who we are, what makes us unique, why corporations should partner with us, and why students should choose us. The School is in on this journey together, unified. The Dean has the following desired outcomes for the School of Business:
• That we produce industry-ready graduates, who are intentionally focused on corporate social responsibility, and ethical values and principles; and
• That we partner with industry both to stay current in our fields, and to provide career opportunities for our students.

Staff must be cross-trained and understand how we provide our services. We need to be engaged with our students and really know them. We help them develop professionally, not just academically. We should be role models for them and we need to incorporate professionalism into the curriculum. The School provides a unique academic environment with an outstanding undergraduate student experience, social responsibility-focused curriculum, intentional internationalization, student-engaged scholarship and research, and student professional development programming. We are a teaching institution and student-oriented. Accordingly, the Dean would not recommend granting tenure to someone who is not a good teacher.

The School is pursuing the European Federation of Management Development Network’s ‘EPAS’ accreditation of the BCom because it aligns with who we are and gives us an opportunity to look at whether we really do what we say we do in our courses. The Dean noted that the literature review for her most recent publication was done by an undergraduate student. The Dean recently met with Librarians and they are ready to train our students on whatever we wish. We are going to begin inviting industry in to be keynote speakers, conduct mock interviews, help with resume reviews, and do dress-for-success events. We need to prepare our students. The Dean is committed to supporting collaborative and student-engaged research. Examples of research support included purchasing software for faculty research, or databases that are useful for applying for grants.

The Dean would love to identify a top teaching conference in Canada and select a faculty member from each department to go and upon their return share what they learned in workshops and seminars. The School is starting a peer mentoring program where we are partnering junior faculty with senior scholars who would help with research and case studies. We must provide faculty with the support and resources they need to be successful. The Dean’s goal is a School that is united and focused on making us even better than what we are now, and really getting the MacEwan School of Business brand out there. A diagram of the new reporting structure was in the package. The plan was for an Associate Dean, Students, an Associate Dean, Research, and a Director of Administration. William Wei has applied for reappointment to the position of Associate Dean, Research. Also, department administrative assistants now report directly to their Chair.

The Dean stated that a key goal is a new Business building. It is part of the Campus Master Plan, but the School needs to be in a position that when the President is ready to go to the Province, we can say these organizations are willing to support this endeavor. We need to be who we say we are when engaging with industry and tell our story as one unit. When industry comes in, they must see who we are, what we do and why they want to partner with us. We need to evaluate who we are and the impact we can have not just in this university and city, but in this province and country. The Dean needs everyone’s help and support to make that happen. The Academic Leadership Team, which comprises the four Department Chairs, two Associate Deans and the Dean, meets every two weeks. The team makes sure they reach consensus before a decision is made. The Dean advised that there will be no course releases and faculty should not normally have teaching overloads.

Comments and Questions from Faculty: L. Benson asked for more information about “Experiential Learning,” which was listed under Associate Dean, Students on the diagram. The Dean advised that this refers to the work of Launa Linaker, Director, Changemaker Education, and Experiential Learning Educator (Professional Resource Faculty Member of School Council).

4.0 Presentation

4.1 Ashoka U (Dr. J. Corlett, then Provost & Vice President Academic)
Dr. J. Corlett presented on an initiative that is moving forward out of the President’s Office. The rationale behind the Ashoka U movement internationally is that institutions are probably not sufficiently preparing students for how to deal with the future. Ashoka U is a global network of social entrepreneurs with a presence in 90 countries and 44 universities. Their mission is to shape a global, entrepreneurial, competitive citizen sector: one that allows social entrepreneurs to thrive and enables the world’s citizens to think and act as change-makers. The university of the future empowers students and all university stakeholders to be change-makers, firmly embeds change-making into its culture and operations and works to address both local and global challenges. The fundamentals of a Change-maker Campus are as follows:

• Higher education as a force for social impact
• Students empowered to lead and develop the skills of empathy, distributed leadership, collaboration, and creative problem solving
• The importance of the continuous development of faculty and staff as educators and change-makers
• The centrality of effective communication
• The need for mutually beneficial partnerships with local and global communities
• The obligation to work in socially and environmentally conscious ways to model change-making for students and other institutions and contribute to the vitality of people and planet
• The duty to lead by example and actively sharing their learning and best practices
• The commitment to measure their impact and sharing results to advance the field of social innovation in higher education
• Support for the Change-maker Campus Network and its collaborations that advance the field of social innovation and change-making in higher education
• The goal of an Everyone A Change-maker World
According to the Ashoka U website: In a world that is changing faster and faster, students need interdisciplinary, entrepreneurial, and solutions-oriented skillsets to succeed. Ashoka believes the way colleges and universities can stay relevant is to embed Change-maker skills such as empathy, teamwork, leadership and change-making into their culture and across their curriculum.

In summary, Ashoka U is about empowering students as change-makers, being a force for social innovation and building local and global collaborations and partnerships. We need to acknowledge what students can do now and make them the kinds of people we know they can be. The School of Business does this well, but the goal is that the whole campus should do it. We have a lot of work to do as a university administratively, structurally, and functionally, to become a more innovative place. The Provost shared as an example, young people from Mexico that made a positive change by starting their company, PROTRASH, which is a powerful social impact project that takes trash and turns it into money and food for kids. MacEwan’s vision, mission and pillars demand resonant strategies to embody them. Ashoka U accreditation offers a framework aligned to our fundamental beliefs to develop, implement and measure those strategies. We have a diverse array of educational activity beyond the usual already in place that could be far more powerful if integrated rather than fragmented. As a campus, we may not know what others are doing, but part of what we are trying to do with the project is move it to a point where the campus understands what it is doing collectively. Ashoka U accreditation provides an opportunity to achieve that integration.

Students are looking for a way to be a force for good and to make a difference. Our students want their educational experiences to create opportunities for them to be forces for good. It is very much about entrepreneurship, but not always what everyone understands entrepreneurship to be. It is not always about making money. Ashoka U accreditation provides clarity and structure for social innovation and social entrepreneurship aligned to our students’ goals. It requires the entire university to embrace this way of looking at things. In terms of change-making, we have a great opportunity being in the core of the city.

The focus right now is not so much on accreditation, but on the process and where it leads us. It is more about the process you go through to think carefully about who you were and why you were doing the things you would do, and this is something we should be doing. As an accredited changemaker campus, we will be required to have the following:

- Visionary Leadership
- Innovation and Excellence in Change-making Education
- Institutional Culture and Operations
- Major Contribution to the Field of Social Innovation and Change-making in Higher Education and Commitment to Contributing to and Everyone a Changemaker World
- Distributed leadership and broad enthusiasm for a more innovative entrepreneurial university
- Commitment to the expert teaching of social innovation across the campus
- Authentic engagement with our community
- Innovative, responsive and adaptive administrative and academic services
- Belief that our students ARE change-makers locally, nationally, and globally.

We need to become a kind of place that the world is going to expect our students to be a part of, but we are not there yet. The original idea was that this would need to be led out of the Provost’s Office, but they are not so sure of this anymore. His concern is that it may be too broad of focus if it comes from the Provost’s Office and as much as the Provost can lead in the way of bringing the Deans together around this, it may be more sensible to have a faculty or school project that is going to be stable and ongoing. It may make more sense to have it housed in the School of Business. The Provost wants to ensure that he has a stable foundation for this and has asked Launa Linaker to take over in a Director’s role for what would be a Change-maker Education Initiative. The Provost provided examples of other universities and advised that is easier for private universities to make this change more quickly. It will be a challenge and a long process, but the Provost is determined to do as much as he can do to support it and is looking for the support of as many people as possible amongst the faculty. The Provost will be looking for the support of Deans - particularly the Dean of Business - and will be counting on Launa to be the person to oversee a large-scale project. There will be a lot of other things happening around entrepreneurship, innovation and creativity. Leo Wong’s operation at the Roundhouse is going to be central to a lot of the thinking people do (see Leo’s update below). The student groups that faculty are used to working with are all going to be integral parts, but the Provost shared he does not want them to just be parts anymore, but part of something.

Comments and Questions from Faculty:

L. Benson expressed his support for this initiative and suggested that it should be a requirement of the Commerce degree. The Provost agreed and added that while it may be housed in the School of Business, it is for the entire university.

W. Jaciuk inquired if MacEwan University would be among the first Canadian schools to move this forward. The Provost responded that Mount Royal and Simon Fraser have certification, as do many others. The initiative is change-maker education for all. That kind of philosophy can pervade the campus while being led by the School of Business.

F. Saccucci asked what was meant by ‘grassroots’ changes in the classroom. The Provost responded that he had learned from other change-maker campuses and talks that, over a decade’s time, everybody does change somewhat in how they approach curriculum and pedagogy. The more challenges we create, the more experiential learning we create, the more opportunities for students to fail there will be. The single biggest thing that a change-maker campus can do is to get students in situations where they might fail. When they do fail and are not punished for it, they will learn something critical. There will be a foundational plan with a theory of change, and below that a grassroots operational plan that will devolve into every department and class. The more faculty demand the opportunity to teach differently, the more we will know that we have succeeded. Ultimately, it will wind up in the faculty’s hands.

5.0 Roundhouse.ca Update (L. Wong, Director, Social Innovation Institute)

Roundhouse is a space to be innovative. It is operated by Campus Services on the main floor of Allard Hall. It is a joint initiative between the Social Innovation Institute and Roundhouse. They are campus-wide initiatives, although a lot of the initial support came from the School of Business. Leo and the Executive Director of Campus Services strategize on how to move Roundhouse forward as a collaborative initiative. The Senior Manager,
Amor Provins, looks at the operations/ business side of things, and three staff members help with programming and other initiatives. The Institute and Roundhouse receive guidance and support from their advisory council and six committees, as follows: Community Service – Learning, Interdisciplinary Impact, Impact Measurement, Community Animators, Culture and Awareness Building, Community-Engaged Scholarship. The committees and advisory council have a total of 70 members - from different faculties, alumni, students and community leaders. For example, Community Service – Learning Committee brings community organizations into classrooms.

Across all committees, there is a group of about 10-12 people working on cross-disciplinary initiatives. The Institute focuses on students as change-makers, looking at their impact in society overall. The Roundhouse is meant to be inviting and comfortable, so that students and faculty can work in a much more collaborative way.

Roundhouse is a member-based co-working space where diverse groups of people such as freelancers, remote workers and other independent professionals can work together in a shared, communal setting. The goal is for the Roundhouse is to generate sufficient revenue to recover costs, and to be able to provide some subsidies, which would promote its social mission and its impact in the community.

The following Academic Collaborations are possible: Experiential Learning, Incubating Prototypes, Social Labs, and a Social Innovation Fellowship. Social Labs are a new and possibly unfamiliar concept. They focus on organizations that need to quickly create new innovative prototypes to meet the changing needs of community members. The idea is to do small pilots, and get feedback, which would help them understand their audience. Those organizations expect to come up with ideas of how to do things better. The City of Edmonton is trying to create a more vibrant downtown core that bridges the various elements, which is also part of MacEwan’s narrative. Currently, a group of about 80 people across the city that are creating fourteen prototypes to improve our downtown’s vitality. Roundhouse is supporting efforts to turn the prototypes into sustainable, implemented ideas.

The Social Innovation Fellowship supports students (not necessarily from MacEwan) so they can dedicate four to six months on a specific project. It is typically not a part of a course, but something for which the student has a passion. Information about membership and rates is available on Roundhouse.net. We are hoping students will be a major component of the membership, and they have many opportunities to get involved. SAMU grants to cover membership fees are available, and there will be a student discount. Students can be part of committees or other initiatives. Council members were encouraged to attend upcoming Grand Opening events at Roundhouse.

Comments and Questions from Faculty:
C. Keim asked how Roundhouse differs from Startup Edmonton. L. Wong responded that Startup Edmonton is a co-working space that supports tech-oriented entrepreneurs, while the Roundhouse focuses on social change and not necessarily for profit initiatives. Entrepreneurs have told us Startup Edmonton does not have the same focus on the social or environmental dimensions of projects. Roundhouse is meant to be collaborative and complementary to Startup Edmonton, other co-working spaces, and other post-secondary institutions. The focus on social change sets MacEwan apart.

6.0 Budget Update (T. Kachmar, Manager, Finance & Administration)
T. Kachmar presented on spending under the budget for 2017-18. He described the current incremental project-based budgeting. The School is given a target deficit, as we do not know exactly how much revenue we will receive. Our revenue comes from student and material fees, donations and grants, plus some study tour profits. The university budget process is going to change from incremental target budgeting to a zero-based budgeting system.

From 2016-17 to this year, the only difference in our target was scholarships, which used to be held within the School and are now central. Ninety two percent of the budget is spent on salaries and benefits, which are quite fixed, while eight percent is for supplies and other expenses. If cuts are made in the future, we have the most room to maneuver about eight percent of the budget. Of the top items in the eight percent, ‘general travel’ was first, followed by ‘other supplies and services’. The latter expenditures can be covered by things like grants and endowments. Many of those expenditures are for case competitions, events and other student initiatives. Number four on the list are Software and Website Fees, for things like Compustat and Blackboard. Fifth on the list is staff development. ‘Other’ refers to all other small expenditures like postage, office administration expenses, and staff recruitment costs.

The School’s preliminary 2018-19 Budget was shared. It is a status quo budget, though it had not yet been approved by the Board of Governors. The only change was the elimination of two vacant positions, and sabbatical costs were transferred back to our budget. The net difference between last and next year’s budget is 105,000. There will still be money for travel and recruitment.

The Q3 forecast information was shown. T. Kachmar highlighted some of the causes of positive variances. We have a positive surplus in part because of the Everest insurance cohort from India. We had not budgeted for the additional revenue last year and it occurred in the Fall. Another big reason for the surplus was vacant faculty positions that were not filled. We spent more than budgeted on materials and supplies. We still spent on travel this year, and supported faculty’s scholarly activity. Faculty members going onto long term disability, later start dates of newly hired faculty, and mid-year resignations and retirements, can increase our surplus.

Questions and Comments from Faculty:
D. Lowe inquired if the new benefit plan is saving MacEwan money. T. Kachmar advised that costs for the University have increased minimally overall, but it does not impact us because grid movements, benefit adjustments, etc. are transferred to our budget later in the year.

K. Al-Ijarah inquired if the increase was due to an increase in the number of beneficiaries or increases per person? T. Kachmar advised that the calculation in PeopleSoft of the benefit may be more of an in-depth analysis now so it is more accurate.
F. Saccucci asked what our surplus would be if they calculated all the School of Business student’s tuition and transfers from the Government of Alberta, less our direct expenses. T. Kachmar advised that even if we had a hundred extra students, we would not see it on the revenue side at the School level, because the University allocates the revenue to the units.

The Dean stated that the President, the then Provost and she, believe that they should do more collaborative, responsibility-based budgeting. The Dean shared that when she arrived, she was part of a budget presentation with VPs and Deans. There were a couple of initiatives that were important to the institution, but they did not have funding. Therefore, she told them that she had a surplus and could not hire faculty that fast, so she suggested to take that money on a one-time basis and fix the issues, with the understanding that next year that money would be there to pay for new faculty. The Dean explained they are trying to think more collaboratively across the institution, so they can move the whole institution forward as opposed to hoarding the money in units. However, they will not have a total RCM model. The University has a surplus now, but most is being applied to Allard Hall. The Dean is committed to filling every faculty vacancy.

7.0 Executive Committee

7.1 Update: Revised Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria (B. Graves, Vice-Chair)
The Draft Revised Faculty Performance Evaluation Criteria was sent by Executive Committee to Department Chairs to be distributed by them to all faculty. The next step was to solicit feedback from faculty through their departments, ideally at department council meetings. Each department has at least one representative that sits on the Executive Committee, so one person will be tasked with submitting her or his department’s feedback to Executive Committee.

Executive Committee has been trying to balance clarity and flexibility, so that faculty know what they are being asked to do, but at the same time the criteria fits all disciplinary and departmental needs. Although all feedback is appreciated, the preferred feedback will give direction on improved language. For example, the Deans and Chairs meeting earlier that day, had a conversation on the roles of scholarship and community scholarship. There is an expectation that going through the ranks there will be more engagement of students, greater impact of research and the broader community being interested in faculty’s work. Community refers to the research community, not the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, like accountants dialoguing with CPA.

Comments and Questions from Faculty:

L. Benson inquired if department council minutes describing feedback on criteria would be available to be viewed. B. Graves advised that it was not talked about, so he did not want to make any commitments. He shared his view that if they see a lot of consensus emerging, there might not be a need for that, but if there are very divergent contributions, it might be worth it. It depends on the feedback.

R. Jenne emphasized the importance of the Criteria. This is important for annual performance evaluation, for movement from probationary to tenure, and for progressing through the academic ranks. This is your chance to have input in this critical document.

E. Perez inquired on why there could not be a Google document that faculty have access to, so they can see what other departments are talking about. She stated that we are not doing this by department, but for the whole school and asked why they cannot have an input that is unique for all of them. Why can they not see what other departments are saying and why can they not discuss this at School Council? Why can they not have a committee that is big enough and has representation from all three types? B. Graves advised that Executive Committee’s view is that having that conversation in a forum this large might be difficult. Therefore, having the discussion in departments would allow everyone to participate. However, keep in mind that this will come back to School Council for approval at the first School Council meeting in the Fall. Council members reacted positively to the Dean’s proposal that department council meeting minutes related to criteria be posted on Google Drive. (Note: Department Council Minutes are to be posted on the Google Drive – Shared with me – School of Business Council – Department Council Documents – Minutes.)

R. Jindal asked how presenting to conferences differs from presenting to regional meetings. B. Graves responded that this is about expanding the size of community presented to, as faculty moves through the ranks. The Dean advised that adding “regional” provided greater clarity and flexibility, since not all faculty are type one. Faculty were encouraged to share any better terminology they might have. Executive wants all ranks of faculty to be able to progress through the ranks and are trying to come up with terminology that has this breadth so that each faculty member can successfully weave her or his way through it.

E. (Murli) Muralidharan cautioned that criteria in relation to scholarship should not infringe on academic freedom as defined in the collective agreement. The language cannot be prescriptive about the way research is conducted. The Dean responded that was not the intent. For example, there is an expectation that a full professor would work with junior faculty and students. Who one works with is not being dictated, but instead, full professors are expected to be leaders and mentors, involving students in research and chairing committees. The expectations would be different for an assistant professor.

The Dean encouraged faculty to have intentional, in-depth conversations in their departments and funnel their input up through their representative on Executive Committee.

The Dean explained that criteria for “meets expectations” was the starting point. Once that is settled, we can get into what “exceeds”, etc. means. It is critical that we move quickly on this because we should be using this for next year’s evaluation. It is not perfect, but we must start somewhere.
R. Enstroem inquired about the descriptive rule saying one must do research on what you teach, but what about an interdisciplinary approach? That may not fit that expectation. B. Graves stated that it would be discussed.

F. Angulo advised that some of the points on the document were incomplete, so it was difficult to equate, but also suggested having an ad hoc committee that represents all types of faculty that discusses the criteria. E. Muralidharan agreed with this. The Dean and B. Graves advised that the Collective Agreement dictates that the criteria will be drafted by the Dean in consultation with the Executive Committee.

A. Taleb suggested that it might be better to have feedback provided by type, rather than by department, because they would have common interests and concerns.

E. Muralidharan added that the difference in the challenges between the types are very distinct so they cannot be evaluated in the same way. The Dean responded that it is supposed to be the Dean and Executive Committee writing this, but it is important to her to be collaborative, reach consensus and have faculty input. She explained the reason it is to be done by department is because there are department representatives on Executive Committee. However, if the departments decide it is best to meet by each type, that would be fine. Each department has a representative on Executive Committee and he or she must get this feedback to present back to the Executive Committee. It is not an easy process and Executive wants to ensure it is done right. The Dean shared that she appreciates that faculty understand what the intent was and asked for help on ensuring the document reflects the intent. Each department can figure out how the feedback is set up.

E. Bocatto asked for clarification on the portion on the criteria “Students’ evaluations of teaching relative to departmental and faculty norms”. The Dean clarified that when you submit your dossier, you know how you rank among your peers. Are you above the norm? It is a way to provide evidence on the quality of what you do. These are different ways of how to demonstrate how you position yourself within the school, university, and department.

E. Bocatto stated that it was problematic because in a normal curve, you could be the worst of the best. The Dean said yes, but then you are assuming we must evaluate on a normal curve and advised that it is up to every faculty member to put in what he or she wants. It is one of the ways you could demonstrate your excellence in teaching is comparative. It is an example, but there is no limit on how you might choose to do that. It is about how you choose to present your own case, we were just saying “here are some ways that you might choose to do that”, but how you do it, is completely up to you.

8.0 Associate Deans’ Updates

William Wei, Associate Dean, Research

W. Wei shared that April 23rd is Student Research Day at MacEwan University with over 200 student projects being presented. F. Angulo and L. Wong submitted five student projects each and E. Muralidharan submitted three. The School has the second largest submission of student projects. Faculty members were encouraged to support the students by attending their presentations W. Wei also shared the Research Showcase would be held on May 3rd from 11 a.m. – 2 p.m. W. Wei shared the list of eight presenters as follows: Dr. Etayankara Muralidharan, Dr. Eloisa Perez, Dr. Xiaojia (Sunny) Wang, Dr. Masoud Shadnam, Sabrina Gong (U of A PhD student), Dr. David Cooper (U of A), Dr. Brian Gold.

W. Wei and A. Pergelova received funding from Alberta Summer Temporary Employment Program (STEP) to hire at least two full-time research assistants for the summer. Last year, six faculty used the service. C. Macdonald will be sending all type 1 faculty an approval link and after looking at all type 1- time requirements, it may be opened to type 2 faculty if there is availability.

Gordon Lucyk, Associate Dean, Students

MacEwan students won first place at the Alberta Deans of Business Competition that was held here. G. Lucyk shared that he is on the Travel Advisory Committee and that they are looking at travel policies. G. Lucyk will be asking for group leaders to get together to develop group leader materials for study tours and other initiatives and advised more information would be sent out in early May. G. Lucyk shared that he is also involved with the Student Success Committee that looks at things such as retention, student engagement, academic performance, and educational attainment. One of the things that he shared with the committee is something the School’s advisors group put together. That is a protocol for reaching out to students that are on probation to have them come in and finding out the reasons why they are not successful. G. Lucyk thanked the advising team for developing that.

9.0 Chairs’ Updates

Sherif Elbarrad, Accounting and Finance

The Accounting and Finance department is hiring. S. Elbarrad shared that he will be presenting at a CPA Conference in Red Deer about structuring in higher education and the tools used, along with assistance from H. Qadri and F. Saccucci. The Program of Study for Accounting and Strategic Measurement was submitted. E. Perez, D. Roberts, and A. Ufodike were accepted to conferences and at CAAA, they received the best paper award.

Richard Enstroem, Decision Sciences

R. Enstroem shared that they are almost finished eight months of preparation for the upcoming Business Intelligence Minor.

Noufou Ouedraogo, Organizational Behaviour, Human Resources and Management
N. Ouedraogo shared that they are still in the process of hiring for the Library and Information Technology Program. L. Shamchuk assisted four students that would be presenting their work at the Alberta Library Conference in April.

10.0 New Business
The Dean congratulated Stephanie Ibach on winning the teaching prize from the CPA Education Foundation.

11.0 Announcements
L. Benson shared that he and R. Enstroem would be leaving soon with 32 students on a study tour to Prague, Budapest and Vienna. A. Taleb added that the France and Africa study tour would also be leaving soon.

12.0 Question Period/Open Discussion
The Dean addressed an anonymous flyer that had been mailed via Canada Post to some Business faculty. Faculty members criticized the action as being un-collegial, and they expressed support for the Dean. Faculty were encouraged to meet with the Dean or department chairs to discuss concerns. Town hall meetings and receptions prior to Council meetings would continue.

13.0 Future Agenda Items/Next Meeting
The next meeting will be held in the Fall. There will be a retreat in late August to kick-off the new year to discuss current initiatives in accreditation and planning.

Comments and Questions from Faculty:
F. Angulo inquired if there would be any change in terms of travel for the upcoming academic year. The Dean shared that the academic leadership team would prefer to spend the funds on supporting research as she had discussed earlier in the meeting. That is not to say we are not going to support travel. Each department has a budget to support travel, each faculty member has PD funds for travel and the university has various funds. The process would be open, transparent, fair and equitable. The Dean explained that she would like to see an equitable mix of faculty, with junior faculty going to conferences. Funding must align with the School’s ethical principles and values.

A. Pergelova raised a concern that the performance evaluation needs to be done as soon as possible so it can be voted on at the next council meeting.

14.0 SOBC-02-2018-04-18
Adjournment was moved by T. Huckell. CARRIED
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