### Chair: David Atkinson
### Vice-Chair: Chris Hancock

#### Members Present:
- Rafat Alam
- Gerard Bellefeuille
- Sharon Bookhalter
- John Corlett
- Teresa Costouros
- Debbie Couves
- Nina Christine Delling
- Jane Duffy
- Elsie Elford
- Kevin Friesen
- Rose Ginther
- Jim Head
- Gerard Bellefeuille
- Muhammad Hossain
- Norene James
- Alan Knowles
- Lucille Mazo
- Cory McAuley
- David McFadyen
- Valla McLean
- Ron Meleshko
- Susan Mills
- Margaret Milner
- Craig Monk
- Pat Moore-Juzwishin
- Brian Parker
- Peter Roccia
- Denise Roy
- Mike Sekulic
- Aimee Skye
- Rebecca Taylor
- Liz White-MacDonald
- Jonathan Withey

#### Regrets:
- Craig Gnauck
- Ryan Roth
- Brent Quinton
- Holly Symonds-Brown

#### Presenters:
- Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee
- John McGrath, Chair, Information and Technology Management Committee
- David McLaughlin, Executive Director, Institutional Analysis and Planning

#### Guests:
- Gail Couch, Program Chair, Post Basic Nursing: Palliative Care/Gerontology and Holistic Health Practitioner
- Ken Ristau, Coordinator, Academic Quality Assurance, Institutional Analysis and Planning

#### AGC Secretariat:
- Kim Warkentine
- Donna Harbeck (Scribe)

### 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: January 21, 2014
- 2.3 Executive Committee Minutes: February 24, 2014
- 2.4 President’s Medal for Academic Excellence and Student Leadership revised Terms of Reference
- 2.5 Nominations Committee Report
- 2.6 Information and Technology Management Committee Annual Report 2013

It was requested that Consent Agenda Item 2.2 AGC Special Session Minutes: February 25, 2014 be discussed after Agenda Item 2.0 Approval of Agenda/Consent Agenda, to which AGC consented.

**AGC-01-03-18-2014**

*Moved by C. Hancock, seconded by K. Hood to approve the agenda for March 18, 2014 and the items on the consent agenda, as amended.*

*Carried*
2.2 AGC Special Session Minutes: February 25, 2014

The following point was added to page 3 of the Proceeding Notes of the Committee of the Whole, in Attachment 1 of the February 25, 2014 Special Session minutes:

**C8. That AGC committees review their membership to ensure that faculty, students, and senior administrators are the only voting membership categories, as may be appropriate. Each committee shall have one designated ex-officio member from senior administration who provides executive advice and support as needed.**
- It was requested that staff also be included as a voting membership category.

**AGC-02-03-18-2014**

Moved by A. Skye, seconded by R. Ginther to approve the minutes of the February 25, 2014 AGC Special Session, as corrected.

Carried

3.0 Report of the President

David Atkinson, President of MacEwan University, reported on the following items:
- With the announcement on March 12, 2014 of government funding of $30 million over the next three years for the new Centre for the Arts and Communications, construction of the new building is scheduled to begin later in Fall 2014.
- The relocation of all programs from South Campus to City Centre Campus will occur prior to September 2014. Some of the School of Business programs will be moving for May 1, with the rest of South Campus operations, including all faculty, staff, and students, moving over the summer months.
- A joint Board of Governors/AGC Workshop is scheduled for April 24, 2014 to discuss the draft MacEwan University Integrated Strategic Plan.
- University-wide consultations will be arranged to discuss the draft Integrated Strategic Plan.
- Nominations for AGC membership close on March 27, 2014.

Sharon Bookhalter, Dean of the Faculty of Health and Community Studies, noted with sadness the recent passing of Dr. Sherrill Brown.

4.0 Board of Governors Report

David Atkinson, Chair of Academic Governance Council, noted that the Board of Governors’ Report was included with the meeting package. The following points arose during discussion:
- With whom will the community engagement resources be shared?
  - The Board of Governors observed that MacEwan University does not currently produce a Report to the Community to promote the accomplishments of the University and requested that the Office of Communications and Marketing develop the resource.

4.1 Board of Governors Report

David Atkinson, Chair of Academic Governance Council, noted that the Board of Governors’ Report was included with the meeting package. The following points arose during discussion:
- With whom will the community engagement resources be shared?
  - The Board of Governors observed that MacEwan University does not currently produce a Report to the Community to promote the accomplishments of the University and requested that the Office of Communications and Marketing develop the resource.

5.0 Report of the Provost and Vice President Academic

5.1 Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Innovation and Excellence Final Report Implementation Update

John Corlett, Provost and Vice President Academic, presented a written update on the status of the implementation of the 2013 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Innovation and Excellence. The following points arose during discussion:
- Recommendation 1 in the final report, last sentence, states that “Student feedback alone is insufficient as evidence of excellent and innovative teaching.” How is that being addressed?
  - Faculty evaluation is an ongoing matter. Student feedback is not the only way we evaluate teaching, but there are ongoing issues regarding how we solicit student input and determining a method to receive maximum student feedback.
- Recommendations 2 and 3 update in the memo regarding the definitions of “outstanding” and “excellent” being addressed by the University Rank and Title Committee (URTC): It is unclear at this time whether or not URTC has been discussing this item.
  - URTC will develop principles regarding how to deal with this issue for inclusion in the follow-up report for review at the May 2014 AGC meeting.
Recommendation 5 in the final report, point 2, regarding including a statement of reflection and self-assessment of teaching as part of annual reporting: It seems that this point is out of place, as it does not deal with academic governance.

- Faculty Evaluation Committee will be reviewing the faculty evaluation policy in late spring and discussing other evaluation methodologies, such as teaching dossiers, peer evaluations, etc., in addition to the traditional survey utilized. This point will be included in the discussions.

5.2 Academic Program Review

David McLaughlin, Executive Director, Institutional Analysis and Planning (IAP), presented a green paper on Academic Program Review at MacEwan University for discussion of the proposal to revise policy C3010: Academic Program Review. The green paper contained principles that resulted from deliberation of the current policy and will form the basis of the proposed changes. The following points arose during discussion:

- Item (1) a. and Item (2) g. iii. both mention bibliometrics. Roles and responsibilities of the librarians should be defined more clearly, to enable program areas to request the proper data. It was requested that timelines be shared with the librarians to plan for the academic program reviews.
  - IAP will provide the librarians with timelines that identify each degree to be evaluated and due dates.

- Recognizing that all diplomas and certificates will link into degrees, would diplomas and certificates engage in the academic review process now or only once they link into a degree?
  - Diploma programs will undergo program review once linked, but only in relation to the review of the linked degree.
  - In future, the University would like to aggregate programs that have logical and meaningful relationships to each other into a common comprehensive review of an area of study, with diplomas linked to a degree where they naturally fit. The intent is for a comprehensive review of an area of study. How those areas of study will eventually be aligned will depend on how Faculties/Schools, programs, and departments decide these issues. Clarity is also required from the strategic plan to determine how programs should align.
  - Areas that are contemplating moving to a degree can request Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC) to engage in such a study.

- Under roles and responsibilities, it states that recommendations that come out of the academic program reviews will be presented to APPC and that members of APPC who participate in the review will abstain from voting any motions that come forward in relation to their program. How will this be enforced?
  - Committee Terms of Reference should reflect how to deal with conflict of interest. AGC should define that for all of its committees in the same way.

- Regarding establishment of the Self-Study Committee, the document states that Faculty/School Councils determine and approve the composition of the Self-Study Committee, and then it states, that the Provost approves sessional instructor participation, so is one recommending and the other approving?
  - The Provost clarified that it was not his role to approve Self-Study Committees, because that is the responsibility of the Faculty/School Councils; however, approval of external reviewers is typically the role of the Provost.

- Some programs currently undergo rigorous external reviews. Is there any way to avoid duplicating that process within the internal academic program review, in order to have only one review process?
  - The Provost stated that if a program is subject to external accreditation, the University will look to harmonize that process with internal processes, in order to include, preferably in the same year, the information from the external accreditation body review as an addendum to the internal academic program review, since the external review alone will not always meet the needs of the internal process.

- A concern was raised that the Self-Study Report should go to Faculty/School Councils first before Academic Planning and Priorities Committee.
  - The reason the Self-Study Report does not go through Faculty/School Councils is because the Action Plan of the academic program review does. The Self-Study Report is simply sent to APPC for a recommendation as to institutional issues and then that comes back to the Self-Study Committee and with the cooperation of the Deans, creates the Action Plan, which is ultimately approved by the Faculty/School Councils.

- Regarding footnote 6, what are “Deans with standing”? 
  - If you have an aggregated program review, there is potential for diplomas and certificates from a different Faculty/School to be linked in, and their comments could be included in an addendum to the degree
program dean’s response. Deans whose programs are under evaluation would be able to speak in the
degree program dean’s response by either adding their name as an endorsement, or by adding their own
response in an addendum.
- Regarding (2) g., for an institution whose core mandate is teaching, there is a lot of focus on research and
  scholarship and less of a focus on things like teaching excellence. There are also some characteristics of
  faculty that might be interesting or relevant to a program that are not included, like the diversity of the faculty
  body. Similarly, (2) h. regarding student experience and outcomes, the items listed are not unrelated and are
  relatively easy to measure compared to the kinds of things a student would get working in some of the clubs
  and relating that to areas of study. Some other things are relevant and hard to measure, but that does not
  mean that we should not do the work. How do we ensure that such things receive attention?
  o They can be added to the lists in the final document. A handbook will also be created and will be
    presented to AGC.
- It was noted that the list of items under (2) Self-Study Report prepared by the Self-Study Committee
  (Assessment Phase) should have begun with item “a.” instead of “f”. This will be corrected in the final
document.

6.0 Committee Reports
6.1 Information and Technology Management Committee
6.1.1 Work Plan 2014
John McGrath, Chair, Information and Technology Management Committee (ITMC), presented the Work Plan
2014 for information. The following points arose during discussion:
- Where is academic computing included in the ITMC Work Plan?
  o Many of the deliverables in terms of the technology standards apply to academic systems that
    support instruction, because they are University-wide standards, not administrative standards. There
    is opportunity at the next ITMC meeting for the Committee to consider technology standards that
    apply to instructional spaces, general computing devices, and those used in computer labs, etc.
    Therefore, faculty will have direct input into the technology standards development. The intent is to
    consult broadly with faculty on, for example, the foundation plan, which has considerable content
    related to instructional technology.
- It was suggested that a satisfaction survey of faculty regarding academic technology delivery systems
  may be useful to consider in development of future ITMC Work Plans.
- Is it the responsibility of ITMC to collect, track, and publish ongoing academic computing issues and their
  resolution?
  o Specific operational and individual issues are not discussed at ITMC; however, ITMC ensures a
    process is in place, through the development of a standards framework, to track and resolve issues,
    including establishment of an operational framework to ensure stability in the University’s systems
    that is based on Ministry and post-secondary institution input and best practices.

6.2 Academic Policies Committee
6.2.1 Policy C3020: Program Advisory Committees and Deans Advisory Councils
Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee, presented revised policy C3020: Program Advisory
Committees and Deans Advisory Councils, effective July 1, 2014, for approval. The following points arose
during discussion:
- Deleted section 4.9.4 (d) and (e) regarding field placement, scholarship, and bursary opportunities: are
  these addressed in the revised document?
  o The points are encapsulated in section 2.1 (d) and (g) of the revised document.
- Is there a mechanism for faculty input into the Academic Advisory Councils?
  o Faculty members can provide input to their dean. The intent is for the deans to have more latitude
    for constructing the membership. The dean would be expected to work with the programs and the
    departments to create the committees in the appropriate way.
    - Will that collaboration be written into the composition of the Academic Advisory Councils?
      - The preamble in 1.0 and section 4.2 of the revised policy addresses collaboration between
        all areas of the University.
- M. Arnison noted that under the revised policy, implementation of a Program Advisory Committee is not
  mandatory.
Moved by K. Hood, seconded by R. Powell to approve the revisions to Policy C3020: Program Advisory Committees and Deans’ Advisory Councils, effective July 1, 2014, as recommended by Academic Policies Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 6.2.1.  

Carried  
(1 Opposed)

6.2.2 Policy C6002: Dr. Sherrill Brown Distinguished Research Award  
Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee, presented revised policy C6002: Dr. Sherrill Brown Distinguished Research Award, effective July 1, 2014, for approval.

Moved by R. Taylor, seconded by A. Skye to approve the revisions to Policy C6002: Dr. Sherrill Brown Distinguished Research Award, effective July 1, 2014, as recommended by Academic Policies Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 6.2.2.  

Carried

6.3 Academic Planning and Priorities Committee  
6.3.1 Extend Suspension of Professional Writing (PROW) Diploma  
John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented a request that the PROW Diploma suspension deadline be extended for one year to June 30, 2015, for approval.

Moved by D. Roy, seconded by B. Parker to approve the one-year extension of the Professional Writing Diploma program suspension, ending June 30, 2015, as recommended by Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (February 11, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 6.3.1.  

Carried  
(1 Abstention)

6.3.2 Extend Suspension of Holistic Health Practitioner Program  
John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented a request that the Holistic Health Practitioner Program suspension deadline be extended for two years to September 1, 2016, with the intention of reopening the program, for approval. The following points arose during discussion:

• What has been done over the past two years to redevelop the Program?
  o Gail Couch, Chair of the Holistic Health Practitioner Program, stated that over the past two years, the new Program of study was developed and is very different from the existing Program. It went through external review and was accepted, and the Divisional Curriculum Committee also reviewed and accepted the new Program. The Program also considered alignment with the MacEwan University Strategic Plan.

Moved by M. Milner, seconded by D. Couves to approve the two-year extension of the Holistic Health Practitioner program suspension to September 1, 2016, with the intention of reopening the program, as recommended by Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (February 11, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 6.3.2.  

Carried

6.3.3 Academic Residency Requirement for Perioperative Nursing for RNs Post-Basic Certificate  
John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC), presented a recommendation that the exemption to the 50% academic residency requirement to 44% for the Perioperative Nursing for Registered Nurses Post Basic Certificate program, effective for the Fall 2014 intake, for approval.
AGC-07-03-18-2014
Moved by R. Alam, seconded by M. Milner to approve the exemption to the 50% academic residency requirement to 44% for the Perioperative Nursing for Registered Nurses Post Basic Certificate program, effective for the Fall 2014 intake, as presented in Agenda Item 6.3.3.

Carried

6.3.4 MacEwan University Official Calendar
Mike Sekulic, University Registrar, on behalf of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented a recommendation that the official MacEwan University Calendar be an electronic, online document, effective for the 2016-2017 academic year, for approval. The following points arose during discussion:

• Could implementation occur prior to 2016-2017?
  o No, because the scope of the project is larger than uploading an Adobe Acrobat document onto the MacEwan University website. The online calendar is a fundamentally new electronic document with new features, and it will take two years to implement.

AGC-08-03-18-2014
Moved by K. Friesen, seconded by J. Withey to approve in principle that the official MacEwan University Calendar be an electronic, online document, effective for the academic year 2016-2017, as recommended by Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 6.3.4.

Carried

Regarding the Provost appointing a working group to examine the function and structure of a MacEwan University online calendar, the following points arose during discussion:

• Is membership for the Working Group being determined by Nominations Committee?
  o No, since this is an administrative committee, it will not be populated through Nominations Committee. Members will be chosen that have a high degree of expertise in this area.
• Is there a reason the Working Group is restricted to only AGC members?
  o The Provost will add other resource staff to the Working Group, as necessary. Students will also be considered.

AGC-09-03-18-2014
Moved by R. Ginther, seconded by K. Hood that the Provost appoint a Working Group of Academic Governance Council members and resource staff, chaired by the University Registrar, to examine the function and structure of a MacEwan University online calendar and report back to Academic Governance Council prior to September 30, 2014.

Carried

6.4 Admissions and Selections Committee
6.4.1 Bachelor of Music in Jazz and Contemporary Music 2014-2015 Admission Criteria
Mike Sekulic, Chair, Admissions and Selections Committee, presented revised Admission Criteria for the Bachelor of Music in Jazz and Contemporary Music, effective for Fall 2014 intake, for approval.

AGC-10-03-18-2014
Moved by M. Milner, seconded by L. White-MacDonald to approve the changes to the Bachelor of Music in Jazz and Contemporary Popular Music Admission Criteria, effective for Fall 2014 intake, as recommended by the Admissions and Selections Committee (February 5, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 6.4.1.

Carried

6.4.2 Bachelor of Arts 2014-2015 Admission Criteria
Mike Sekulic, Chair, Admissions and Selections Committee, presented revised Admission Criteria for the Bachelor of Arts, effective immediately, for approval. The following points arose during discussion:

• Since it is not possible to graduate with a Graduation Grade Point Average below 2.0 in a diploma program, then that point seems redundant.
• It was noted that the Admission Criteria was not first reviewed by the Faculty of Arts and Science Council before submission to Admissions and Selections Committee (ASC). It was previously suggested that the process should be revisited.
• Craig Monk, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, clarified that the Bachelor of Science plans to parallel the Admissions Criteria of the Bachelor of Arts.

**AGC-11-03-18-2014**

**Moved by C. Monk, seconded by D. Couves to approve the changes to the Bachelor of Arts Admission Criteria, effective immediately, as recommended by the Admissions and Selections Committee (February 5, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 6.4.2.**

Carried

6.5 Faculty Evaluation Committee

Peter Roccia, Co-Chair, Faculty Evaluation Committee, presented the revised Work Plan 2013-2014, incorporating AGC’s comments from the November 26, 2013 meeting, for information. The following points arose during discussion:
• Objective 3, point 3: is Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) reviewing the actual evaluation survey?
  o This item is directly related to the FEC Terms of Reference review and the faculty evaluation policy review, where the Committee will look at expanding its scope to include evaluation of surveys.

7.0 Presentation

7.1 University Archives

Valla McLean, University Archivist and Humanities Librarian, presented information on the establishment of the University Archives. The Archives will be set up to preserve information that deals with the following six core functions of MacEwan University: conferring credentials, conveying knowledge, fostering socialization (outside the classroom), conducting research, sustaining the institution, and providing public service (continuing education). A Special Collection will be developed for Dr. Grant MacEwan. The University Archives will be located in Room 7-305E, accessible from the University Library. An email has been set up for any questions regarding the University Archives, at archives@macewan.ca. The following points arose during discussion:
• It was suggested that students in the Library and Information Technology program at MacEwan University should be encouraged to volunteer to assist with the accessioning process.
• Has there been any staffing or funding put in place to set up the University Archives?
  o Library Technicians will be taking specialized archives training through the Archives Society of Alberta.
• Will the archival records be digitized for viewing on the University Archives website?
  o No, records will need to be reviewed in the University Archives reading room due to restrictions of the Freedom of Information and Privacy Act.
• Where would we find the minutes from tonight’s AGC meeting in 30 years’ time, in the University Archives or in the AGC Secretariat office?
  o The minutes would be in the University Archives.
• When does a current document become subject to archiving?
  o It will be dependent upon an area’s records retention schedule. A records manager will decide that area’s records retention schedule that will indicate if and when records can be donated to the University Archives. The current MacEwan University records retention policy will be reviewed in 2015. Some records would be deemed permanent and would reside in the University Archives.
• Is there a plan to interview past and current employees who were or have been part of MacEwan University since its inception?
  o Yes, that has been considered, including alumni, and will be part of the plan.
• Would unpublished student work, such as departmental best student essay contest winners, go into the University Archives, and if so, what is the process?
  o It will have to be determined which records are included in the University Library’s Institutional Repository and the University Archives when it comes to student output, especially when they have collaborated with faculty.
• How will publications such as Confluence and Muse be handled?
  o They will either be stored in the University Archives or the University Library's Institutional Repository.

AGC thanked V. McLean for her presentation.

8.0 Question Period
• Academic policies use poorly understood and defined terms such as the term “senior administrator”. It was requested that the term be defined in a policy glossary.
• Who is the contact regarding the previous Community Service Learning Working Group?
  o Cathryn Heslep, Chair of the Student Participation Working Group, is the new contact. The work of that committee has been incorporated into the Student Participation Working Group's report. Their recommendations are being presented to AGC Executive Committee on April 10, 2014.
• Program changes do not always go to Faculty/School Councils for review. Is there an opportunity to address this?
  o The AGC Review Report includes a recommendation regarding the relationship between Faculty/School Councils and AGC.

9.0 Future Agenda Items/Next Meetings –April 29, 2014
The next meeting of AGC is April 29, 2014 at 5:45 p.m. to 8:45 p.m. in Room 9-202 City Centre Campus.

10.0 The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Approved by Academic Governance Council
April 29, 2014 (motion AGC-01-04-29-2014)