1. **Approval of the agenda**

**MOTION** to approve the February 27, 2014 Faculty Council agenda.

**FFACFC-01-02-27-2014**
Moved by Bill Richards and seconded by Rey Rosales.

**MOTION CARRIED**

2. **Approval of January 29, 2014 Faculty Council minutes**

**Amendments**
- Change ‘moved by Rose Clancy’ to ‘moved by Rose Ginther’ under motion to approve January 29, 2014 Faculty Council minutes
- Remove ‘feedback can be sent to Kim Warkentine by February 10. The final academic plan will be revised in March’ from the AGC report

**MOTION** to approve the January 29, 2014 Faculty Council minutes be approved, as amended.

**FFACFC-02-02-27-2014**
Moved by Leslie Vermeer, seconded by Darci Mallon.

**MOTION CARRIED**
3. Review of February 13, 2014 Executive Committee draft minutes

There was no discussion.

4. Chair’s update

Fine Art visiting artist Lyndal Osborne gave a lecture on February 26, which was attended by a number of faculty members who had been Lyndal’s assistants at some point in their careers. Other guests included a group of seniors, who travelled to the university to hear Lyndal speak. The evening featured a lecture from Dr. Shiv Ganesh who spoke about international communications and a faculty performance featuring Jim Head. One performer came from New York and was a graduate of the music program 30 years ago. Denise thanked everyone who helped to make these events possible.

The Executive Committee revised the Faculty Council schedule so meetings that occur after the end of the term begin earlier in the day. The May meeting will now start at 3 p.m. and the June meeting will begin at 11 a.m. Revised schedules have been sent to all members.

5. Committee reports

5.1 AGC – Peter Roccia

A special session was called to review the Review Task Team report on restructuring AGC and also to receive feedback on John Corlett’s academic plan. Feedback from the academic plan will go through revisions and will be given to Kevin Shuffebotham and Alan Vladicka for review. The different foundation plans will be combined into a final strategic plan, which will also go through a consultation and revision process.

Major discussion points

- Abolition of Academic Policies Committee (APC), so policies go straight from standing committees of AGC to AGC directly. There were some concerns, specifically about policies that do not follow a proper format, which may have legal implications, etc. As a solution, the Policies Advisory Group (PAG) will be formed under the direction of Michelle Plouffe. It was emphasized that PAG is purely an advisory group with no decision-making power, whose function is to help facilitate policy
- A formula for assigning a portion of faculty seats on AGC by population has not yet been determined
- Some debate about whether to make the VP Academic the Vice Chair of AGC
- Merge Faculty Evaluation, Faculty Development, and MacEwan Sabbatical Leave Committees into one Faculty Innovation and Excellence Committee (FIE). There was some discussion about whether Faculty Evaluation should be a part of that combination
- Some debate about why the percentage of faculty representation on AGC should be brought down to 50% when it is currently 60%
- The Nominations Committee may be abolished, in which case AGC would handle elections and decisions themselves. There is discussion about the use of rubrics for unsuccessful candidates and allowing these candidates to put their names forward from the floor
- The Review Task team will be meeting this month to take
into account all the feedback they have received. The report will come forward for AGC approval in April and not in March, as planned.

Identified issues

- There is still anxiety about the future of diplomas and certificates under the new academic plan, however there was reassurance that successful programs will not be compromised.
- Diplomas may be aligned with existing degrees by mirroring degrees in the first two years or by acting as post-graduate diplomas.
- Issues of research and what is meant by student engagement, especially when research does not involve students.
- Much of the feedback received identified strategies, which will be developed as a future step in the planning process.

5.2 Curriculum Committee – Rey Rosales

The Committee met in February to review and approve 1 Design Studies syllabus and 4 Music syllabi.

5.3 Faculty Development, Research, and Sabbatical Committee – Rey Rosales

The Committee met in February and adjudicated applications for conference travel funding. They received a record number of applications with funding requests amounting to $30,000. The money available for distribution was $15,000. The Committee will meet this month to refine the criteria and application forms related to travel as well as research funding. The call for applications for FFAC research funding for the 2014-15 academic year will be released soon.

5.4 Visiting Scholar and Artist Committee – Rey Rosales

The Committee will meet sometime in April to discuss the lessons learned from the previous year’s rollout of the visiting scholar initiative, to do some short and long-term planning, and to refine the criteria and guidelines for visiting scholar/artist.

6. New business

6.1 Building design presentation

Shafranaz Kaba and Fraser Plaxton from Manasc Isaac and Frank Salopek, project manager, gave a presentation on the new CFAC building. They presented the work that has proceeded on the construction drawings so far. A 50% sign off on drawings is expected in March and 100% sign off will be in June, so construction could begin as early as September 2014. This project has not yet received final approval from the government and will cost a total of $153 million.

Main features

- The main floor of the new campus will feature a pedestrian-friendly restaurant and patio as well as retail opportunities.
- A multi-functional media device with backlighting will be installed in the front of the campus to display student work.
- Exterior glass panels along the side of the building, which have different opacities during the day and night.
- The courtyard will be developed into a multi-purpose plaza for sculptures, theatre or music performances, etc.
- An open atrium, which can be used as an event space.
- Staircases that create a criss-crossing pattern and bleacher-
like seats, which act as informal learning spaces
• An unfinished fifth floor, which offers future growth potential for the university or a rental opportunity

Feedback
• Sound: Special consideration has gone into figuring out the acoustics to manage sound on the third floor. The building is made of concrete, music rooms will be built with a double slab of concrete for an extra sound barrier, and the atrium will act as a buffer for classrooms on the opposite side of the building
• Security: Security cameras will be installed in every corridor and any offices that can be accessed via stairwell will require a card reader for access. A security consultant is involved in the design process to watch for trouble areas in the building that might be difficult to monitor
• Quiet space for students: Study space for students is carved out throughout the building
• Library: Library services will be centralized so there will not be a library in the new building
• Displaying art: Consideration is being given to displaying art and installations around the campus

Further feedback or questions can be sent to Dianne Westwood.

6.2 Nominations process and committee overviews
The deadline for FFAC committee nominations is March 3. The AGC deadline is March 5. There will be two faculty spots opening up on AGC itself, which is a separate nomination process with a deadline in late March/early April. The Research Council is looking for one FFAC faculty member to add to its membership.

6.2.1 Curriculum Committee – Rey Rosales
The committee overview presentations were deferred for the next Faculty Council meeting because of time constraints.

6.2.2 Faculty Development, Research, and Sabbatical Committee – Rey Rosales
There was no discussion.

6.2.3 Visiting Scholar and Artist Committee – Leslie Sharpe
There was no discussion.

6.2.4 Executive Committee – Peter Roccia
There was no discussion.

6.3 Academic planning process
Over the next few months, conversations with programs, committees and Faculty Council will help to shape an FFAC academic plan to position the faculty for the development of new academic programming. The target date for the completion of this plan is December 2014.

6.4 Changes to the 2015-16 academic schedule
Mike Sekulic gave a presentation on proposed changes to the 2015-16 academic schedule. ARUCC (Association of Registrars of Universities and Colleges in Canada) survey respondents from across the country participated in a project to collect information on academic scheduling practices. The 2015-16 academic schedule has been suspended in the event that these changes are adopted.
Key discussion points

- Divide hours of instruction between instruction time and examination time
- Later start in January and staggered drop/add deadlines will benefit students who want to attend MacEwan University. A confirmation fee/refund may help to guarantee attendance
- Adjust tuition deadline, move withdrawal date to the end of the term and eliminate the graduated refund
- Hold the new student orientation to the first week of term rather than the end of August
- Add a short break for students in the fall term

Feedback

- Student orientation: Moving student orientation to the first week and a 13-week term may put tension on classroom time
- Defined examination period: Some students have final projects instead of exams, so this will need further consideration
- Student consultation: Students sit on many of the committees that have been consulted about these changes and they have had opportunities to provide feedback. Students particularly like late withdrawals, paying after settling courses and the fall break. Further ideas on how to engage students are welcome
- Fall break: A fall break may be a good idea to help reduce stress in students, but may not require a full week
- Faculty evaluation: How does a later fall start date line up with faculty evaluation? Currently, evaluations happen after the withdrawal date so those who withdraw do not have an impact on this process. This issue will also need further consideration.

Further feedback can be sent to program chairs, Denise Roy or Mike Sekulic.

7. Open discussion and future agenda items
   There was no discussion.

8. Announcements and program updates
   There was no discussion

9. Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.