1.0 Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m.

2.0 Approval of Agenda/Consent Agenda
The following items were approved on the consent agenda:

- 2.1 AGC Open Meeting Minutes: November 26, 2013
- 2.2 Executive Committee Minutes: November 5, 2013
- 2.4 Academic Policies Committee memo RE: Academic Decision Making Policies Review Update
- 2.5 AGC By-election Schedule
- 2.6 University Rank and Title Committee Annual Report 2012-2013
- 2.7 Faculty Development Committee Annual Report 2012-2013

It was requested that Consent Agenda Item 2.3 Executive Committee Minutes: December 10, 2013 be discussed under Agenda Item 7.4 AGC Executive Committee, to which AGC consented.

AGC-01-01-21-2014
Moved by M. Sekulic, seconded by K. Hood to approve the agenda for January 21, 2014 and the items on the consent agenda, as amended.

Carried
2.3 Executive Committee Minutes: December 10, 2013

[Scribe's note: Consent Agenda Item 2.3 was moved to the Agenda for discussion under 7.4 AGC Executive Committee.]

David Atkinson, Chair of AGC Executive Committee, presented the December 10, 2014 Executive Committee minutes for information. The following point arose during discussion:

- The start time of the AGC meetings beginning in 2014-2015 was changed to 5:00 p.m. based on the majority of respondents' votes; however, that may have ignored the minority concerns about scheduling. For example, some Seminar classes run until 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday evenings, which conflicts with AGC meetings.

It was agreed that AGC Executive Committee will discuss at their next meeting.

3.0 AGC Review Task Team

3.1 Draft AGC Review Report

Bill Richards, AGC Review Task Team member, presented the draft AGC Review Report (December 12, 2013) for discussion. AGC Committee Chairs and AGC Review Task Team members who are not AGC members were invited to attend and participate in this portion of the meeting. The following points arose during discussion:

- The timing of the approval of the final AGC Review Report was questioned as being too soon.
  - The AGC Chair reminded that the draft document was circulated in its various iterations for input by the academic and administrative communities, including the Faculty Association, senior administration, President/Vice President group, Presidents Group, AGC Review Task Team, AGC Executive Committee, and AGC Committee Chairs, and now to solicit more feedback from AGC members. As well, many of the recommendations came from the Dr. Ronald Bond external report that was originally circulated in May 2013.

- How are the changes recommended by AGC members at this meeting going to be considered?
  - All discussion will be recorded in the minutes and provided to the AGC Review Task Team for consideration in the final report.

- Recommendation regarding total AGC membership: It is not easy to find recommendation A4 included in the breakdown provided in A8 regarding AGC membership. A3 and A6 are easily identified in A8.
  - Such details will be clarified in the final report.

- Recommendation A8, point 4: For the 18 faculty selected according to representation by population, what is the definition of "population"? Will each Faculty/School/Division have adequate representation, no matter their size?
  - "Population" refers to Full-Time (FT) continuing faculty members.
    - Does that include Continuing faculty members who are not FT faculty members (i.e. part-time continuing faculty members)?
      - Yes, the language will be clarified in the final report.

- Recommendation A8, point 5: Increase the number of student members to 9, in order to match the number of administrators, and adjust the number of faculty members if needed to accommodate for that change. It was noted that even with the addition of two more student members, AGC's composition would still include over 60% faculty members.

- Recommendation B2: Concern was expressed regarding the inclusion of Faculty Evaluation Committee in the new Faculty Innovation and Excellence Committee, due to the negative connotation that development is remedial action brought about through evaluation. Faculty Development has been working to remove that stigma, focussing more on teaching innovation and excellence.
  - Faculty evaluation used to be formative and productive, and bringing it back into the fold of development should allow for that again. It should make faculty evaluations more productive and helpful. If faculty evaluation is outside of the Faculty Innovation and Excellence Committee, it will continue to be seen as punitive, performative, and summative. It makes sense that evaluation be tied in to development.

- Recommendation B2: The work of the Faculty Evaluation and Faculty Development Committees is heavy and it does not make sense to combine two such committees into one super committee that will need two subcommittees to deal with the workload.
• Recommendation B4 regarding including a student appeals subcommittee with the Student Services Committee: What will the change to the student appeal process be?
  o The Provost is currently reviewing various policies and procedures, including those dealing with student appeals.
  o It was requested to have a student appeals committee/panel separate and distinct from the AGC governance structure, rather than a subcommittee of the proposed Student Services Committee.
• Page 7 of the draft report regarding phasing out the Information and Technology Management Committee (ITMC): The new ITMC mandate may not have been interpreted correctly.
• Page 7 of the draft report: Academic Policies Committee should be not dissolved until all policies have been delegated to the appropriate committees. It is important that the sequence of events is appropriate.
  o Recommendation E1: Has the comprehensive process for institutional policy development been determined? If not, delegating the ownership of policies to other AGC committees should not occur until then.
    ▪ It will be included in the final report.
• Recommendation C2 regarding AGC Executive Committee: Why is “coordinating role” given emphasis? How is that different from the current role of the AGC Executive Committee?
  o That wording is used to emphasize that Executive Committee does not interfere with the substance of an AGC committee report; rather, they ensure reports are in the proper format and expressed in a way that will be understandable to AGC. They are not a censor of material going to AGC.
• Recommendations C5, C6, C7, and C8 regarding AGC Nominations Committee: The role of the AGC Nominations Committee should be clarified in order for the Committee to have a clear mandate approved by AGC.
• Recommendation C3: Executive Committee membership – Even though the current composition is not ideal, having the Chairs of all AGC committees sit on Executive Committee is also not ideal. From past experience, Executive Committee membership should be arm’s length from AGC committees.
  o Is it a concern that some AGC Committee Chairs are not AGC members? Should AGC be a source for AGC Committee Chairs or vice-versa? There are pros and cons to both.
• Recommendation C4 regarding Provost as Vice-Chair of AGC: What is the rationale behind moving the Vice-Chair of AGC and AGC Executive Committee from being elected from the general AGC membership to the Provost?
  o It was changed to be consistent, since the Provost sits in for the President in his absence for every other activity in the University.
• Recommendation C9: Concern was expressed regarding faculty member workload if faculty are required to also take on the role of AGC committee Chairs.
  o AGC must be cognizant not to overlap the collective agreement regarding workload negotiation.
    ▪ Perhaps the wording could be revised to, faculty members have the opportunity to Chair the committee.
      • The principle followed is that the academic business of the institution should be in the hands of faculty, not administrators. As the University moves to a bicameral system, it is not appropriate for administrators to control the academic program. The authority and responsibility must be shifted to AGC.
• Recommendation C10: Terms of References for AGC committees should allow for students to have a system of alternates, to ensure student attendance at meetings.
• Recommendation C11: Why is it being recommended that 50% of AGC committee members should be faculty members, rather than the current 60% ratio?
  o The concern was that if the requirement was 60%, it may be difficult to meet quorum at meetings. 50% ensures the academic voice has parity with the other voices.
    ▪ Does that have anything to do with faculty layoffs during the budget exercise?
      • No. While it is regrettable, only 10 faculty members were laid off. The remaining cohort is large enough to find appropriate membership.
• What is the procedure for voting on the recommendations at the March 18, 2014 AGC meeting?
  o Voting will be done on each section of the report, not on individual recommendations, and not as an omnibus motion.
The Chair thanked AGC for its input. AGC recognized the work of the AGC Review Task Team and of John Friesen, for his work on researching and writing the draft AGC Review Report.

4.0 Report of the President
David Atkinson, President of MacEwan University, reported on the following items:

- The squash courts at MacEwan University have been closed in order for renovations to the Christenson Family Centre for Sport and Wellness to accommodate student usage requirements.
- The new Minister of Innovation and Advanced Education has decided not to reopen the Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA); however, he will be conducting public consultations regarding the post-secondary education system. The Minister is willing to renegotiate specific items in the PSLA, if requested by a post-secondary institution.

5.0 Board of Governors Report
David Atkinson, Chair of Academic Governance Council, reported that the Board of Governors’ Report was included with the meeting package.

6.0 Report of the Provost and Vice President Academic
John Corlett, Provost and Vice President Academic, reported on the following items:

- The Academic Foundation Plan has been forwarded to deans for feedback. Once feedback is received, it will be forwarded to the Strategic Planning Consultant, Alan Vladicka, to compile into the Integrated Strategic Plan 2014-2019, which will then undergo more public consultations. The focus of the Academic Foundation Plan includes:
  - An undergraduate student experience of life-changing personal meaning and professional preparation.
  - A thriving culture of faculty scholarship as the basis for excellence in teaching and learning.
  - An academically-, socially-, environmentally-sustainable and responsible university of local and global significance, relevance, and value.
- The move of faculty and programs from South Campus to City Centre Campus is scheduled to be completed in time for the start of the Fall 2014 term. South Campus and City Centre Campus staff and faculty will be informed of the status of the move.

7.0 Committee Reports
7.1 Faculty Development Committee
7.1.1 Work Plan 2013-2014
Paul Martin, Chair of Faculty Development Committee (FDC), presented the Work Plan 2013-2014 for information. At its November 26, 2013 meeting, AGC requested FDC to include discussion of faculty development funding in the Work Plan, which, it was noted, had been included.

7.2 University Rank and Title Committee
7.2.1 Revised Work Plan 2013-2014
John Corlett, Chair of University Rank and Title Committee (URTC), presented a revised URTC Work Plan 2013-2014 for approval. At its November 26, 2013 meeting, AGC requested their comments be considered by URTC in the Work Plan regarding reviewing the current rank and title process (motion number AGC-05-11-26-2013). J. Corlett noted that the review had been included and would be discussed further in AGC agenda item 7.2.2.

AGC-02-01-21-2014
Moved by J. Corlett, seconded by J. Withey to approve the revised University Rank and Title Committee Work Plan 2013-2014, as presented in Agenda Item 7.2.1.

Carried

7.2.2 Revising Rank and Title at MacEwan University
John Corlett, Chair of University Rank and Title Committee (URTC), presented a proposal for reviewing the rank and title process at MacEwan University, for decision. The following points arose during discussion:

- How will applicants for the next cycle be affected by the review?
  - If faculty apply for rank and title in the current academic year, they will follow the existing procedures.
• What is the source of the dissatisfaction with the current process?
  o There are certain technical difficulties with the current process. Many comments have been received regarding how the University deals with rank and title. AGC will determine whether or not the recommended changes reflect the original intent of the process; or, AGC may tell URTC not to review the rank and title process.

• Most of the focus seems to be on the process for bipartite and tripartite rank and title. It is also important to be clear on what is required by the other categories (e.g. Librarians and Counsellors).

AGC-03-01-21-2014
Moved by R. Ginther, seconded by A. Skye that University Rank and Title Committee review the current rank and title model and provide a report and recommendations to Academic Governance Council at its May 2014 meeting.

Carried

7.3 MacEwan Sabbatical Leave Committee
7.3.1 Revised Terms of Reference
John Corlett, Chair of MacEwan Sabbatical Leave Committee (MSLC), presented revised Terms of Reference for approval. During the Fall 2013 sabbatical leave review cycle, the Chair of MSLC was contacted by the Dean of Libraries, Jane Duffy, regarding the need for a librarian on MSLC to review librarian sabbatical leave applications, as per section 4.4.2 of policy D2080, “that when an application is reviewed, at least one voting member of the University Sabbatical Leave Committee will be from the applicant’s Division/Faculty/School.” As there were no professional resource faculty (PRF) (e.g. librarians, counsellors) on the MSLC, it was requested that the Terms of Reference be revised to specify that PRF would need to be included in the Committee’s membership. At the same time, it was recognized the some of the terminology and titles in the Terms of Reference would need to be updated to reflect the current processes of the Committee. The housekeeping edits were requested to ensure currency and accuracy in the description of the process of MSLC. The Terms of Reference were revised to accommodate these changes.

AGC-04-01-21-2014
Moved by J. Corlett, seconded by T. Costouros to approve the MacEwan Sabbatical Leave Committee revised Terms of Reference (December 2013), effective January 22, 2014, as presented in Agenda Item 7.3.1.

Carried

7.4 AGC Executive Committee
7.4.1 Academic Schedule 2015-2016
Rose Ginther, AGC Executive Committee member, reported that at the AGC Executive Committee December 10, 2013 meeting, the Committee received and approved the motion to defer the approval of the 2015-2016 Academic Schedule until December 2014 (Executive Committee motion number EC-02-12-10-2013), in light of anticipated significant changes to key elements of the academic schedule. Normally, Academic Schedules covering two years – the next academic year and a proposed academic schedule for the following academic year – are published in the MacEwan University Academic Calendar. Each year, the previously-proposed academic schedule is approved by AGC Executive Committee, and an academic schedule is proposed for the following academic year, which is reviewed by the Committee at the same meeting.

Regarding changing the withdrawal date, Mike Sekulic, University Registrar, said that he would be presenting the proposed changes to Faculty/School Councils for feedback and would consult widely before any changes are implemented.

8.0 Faculty/School Councils
8.1 School of Business Council
8.1.1 Bylaws Amendment
Elsie Elford, Chair of the School of Business Council, presented amended School of Business Council Bylaws for approval. The following amendment to the Bylaws was proposed: that Section 5.1.3 include full-time limited-term academic staff in the membership, effective January 22, 2014.
AGC-05-01-21-2014
Moved by E. Elford, seconded by C. Hancock to approve an amendment to Section 5.1.3 of the Bylaws of the School of Business Council that would add full-time limited-term academic staff to the membership of School Council, effective January 22, 2014, as recommended by School of Business Council (November 27, 2013), as presented in Agenda Item 8.1.1.
Carried

8.1.2 Institute of Asia Pacific Studies Annual Review Date and Terms of Reference
Elsie Elford, Chair of the School of Business Council, presented draft annual review date and draft Terms of Reference for the Institute of Asia Pacific Studies (IAPS), for approval. The Research Institutes and Research Centres Policy C5055 took effect on July 1, 2013. IAPS was created by the School of Business prior to the promulgation of this Policy, and so is required by subsection 4.6 to submit Terms of Reference to AGC for approval and be assigned an annual review date by AGC. The following points arose during discussion:
• The Terms of Reference state the membership will be appointed by the Council. Who is “the Council”?
  o Until the Terms of Reference are approved, the Council cannot be implemented. The Council will be implemented according to C5055. It was clarified that the Terms of Reference followed C5055 as much as possible, which made some items unclear; however, the School of Business will work with the Research Council to implement C5055.
• Who is the “appropriate authority” and what are “other appropriate bodies”?
  o By not specifically naming a position title or committee, C5055 allows for flexibility in determining the appropriate authority and appropriate body. Collection will be through the Research Council.

AGC-06-01-21-2014
Moved by E. Elford, seconded by D. Couves to approve June 30 as the Annual Review Date for the Institute of Asia Pacific Studies, effective January 22, 2014, as recommended by the School of Business Council (November 27, 2013), as presented in Agenda Item 8.1.2.
Carried

AGC-07-01-21-2014
Moved by E. Elford, seconded by C. Hancock to approve the Terms of Reference of the Institute of Asia Pacific Studies, effective January 22, 2014, as recommended by School of Business Council (November 27, 2013), as presented in Agenda Item 8.1.2.
Carried

8.1.3 Institute for Innovation in Management Education Annual Review Date and Terms of Reference
Elsie Elford, Chair of the School of Business Council, presented draft annual review date and draft Terms of Reference for the Institute for Innovation in Management Education (IIIME), for approval. IIIME was created by the School of Business prior to the promulgation of policy C5055, and so is required by subsection 4.6 to submit Terms of Reference to AGC for approval and be assigned an annual review date by AGC.

AGC-08-01-21-2014
Moved by E. Elford, seconded by T. Costouros to approve June 30 as the Annual Review Date for the Institute for Innovation in Management Education, effective January 22, 2014, as recommended by the School of Business Council (November 27, 2013), as presented in Agenda Item 8.1.3.
Carried

AGC-09-01-21-2014
Moved by E. Elford, seconded by B. Parker to approve the Terms of Reference of the Institute for Innovation in Management Education, effective January 22, 2014, as recommended by School of Business Council (November 27, 2013), as presented in Agenda Item 8.1.3.
Carried

9.0 Question Period
• Will renovations be required at City Centre Campus to accommodate the South Campus move?
  o Yes, a number of small renovations will be required. All renovation plans have been approved.
10.0 Future Agenda Items/Next Meetings – March 18, 2014
The next meeting of AGC is March 18, 2014 at 5:45 p.m. to 8:45 p.m. in room 9-201 City Centre Campus.

11.0 The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Approved by Academic Governance Council
March 18, 2014 (motion AGC-01-03-18-2014)