1.0 Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

2.0 Approval of Agenda/Consent Agenda
The following item was approved on the consent agenda:
- 2.1 AGC Open Meeting Minutes: May 20, 2014

It was requested that the following Consent Agenda items be discussed after Agenda Item 2.0 Approval of Agenda/Consent Agenda, to which AGC consented:
- 2.2 Executive Committee Minutes: May 23, 2014
- 2.3 Nominations Committee Report

The Chair requested that a closed session be held after item 9.0 Future Agenda/Next Meeting – September 23, 2014, to discuss a confidential item, to which AGC consented.

AGC-01-06-10-2014
Moved by R. Taylor, seconded by M. Sekulic to approve the agenda for June 10, 2014 and the item on the consent agenda, as amended. 
Carried

2.2 Executive Committee Minutes: May 23, 2014
Clarification was requested on the second paragraph under item 5.5 2014-2015 AGC Meetings: It was suggested that Question Period be reformatted, so that questions could be submitted in advance to allow time for research for an accurate response. Questions from the floor could come during the President’s Report. The AGC Chair confirmed that it would be preferred if questions for AGC could be submitted prior to the meetings, to allow time for any research required in order to answer questions accurately and fully at the meeting.
2.3 Nominations Committee Report
Concern was expressed that the slate of nominees for Rank and Title Appeals Committee (Appeals Committee) did not include a Professor or Teaching Professor member to assess possible appeals for that academic rank and title. The following points arose during discussion:

- It was suggested that if an application for Professor or Teaching Professor is submitted, the existing faculty at that level be requested to sit on the Appeals Committee.
  - If the idea is to reserve that person's expertise for the University-level review appeal committee, they would be ineligible to ensure proper adjudication at the peer or Faculty/School level.
- It is problematic that the University currently has very few faculty members at the highest rank if an appeal is filed for an application for academic rank and title of Professor or Teaching Professor.
  - It was noted that there are currently six Professors at the University, three of whom are administrators.
- Since the Appeals Committee will be dealing with applications for all academic ranks, shouldn't Assistant Professor be the minimum academic rank of faculty who are considered for membership on the Appeals Committee?
  - The Provost stated that an internal specialized process that is not the usual nominations process will need to be developed in order to ensure the Appeals Committee has the appropriate representation.
- Would utilizing external reviewers be an option for the Appeals Committee until the institution has a larger pool of Professors and Teaching Professors?
  - For the rank of Professor, the University has an obligation to have external reviewers in place for assessment of faculty accomplishments; however, the Provost stated that he would not support using external reviewers on the Appeals Committee, because an internal process should be utilized.
- The Chair clarified that if AGC was concerned about the legitimacy of the current appeal process for the academic rank and title of Professor and Teaching Professor, the fact that the initial titling process requires a recommendation to come from the Provost to the President, both of whom are Professors, may address that concern for the time being. There are a number of checks and balances to ensure the process is diligent and fair. This aligns with the intent of the University Rank and Title Committee Guidelines for the University Rank and Title Appeals Process, as approved by AGC April 23, 2013.
- Nominations Committee was requested to include in future Appeals Committee nominations calls the requirement for Professor and Teaching Professor members as well as faculty with a minimum rank of Assistant Professor.

AGC-02-06-10-2014
Moved by R. Meleshko, seconded by A. Skye to elect the slate of nominees for Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, Admissions and Selections Committee, and Rank and Title Appeals Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 2.3.

Carried

AGC-03-06-10-2014
Moved by T. Costouros, seconded by D. McFadyen to elect Melike Schalomon, Associate Dean, Administration, Faculty of Arts and Science, to Research Council, as presented in Agenda Item 2.3.

Carried

AGC-04-06-10-2014
Moved by R. Taylor, seconded by R. Alam to elect the slate of student nominees for Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, Academic Policies Committee, Faculty Evaluation Committee, Research Ethics Board, Student Services Policy Committee, and Student Success Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 2.3.

Carried

3.0 Board of Governors’ Report
David Atkinson, President of MacEwan University, noted that the Board of Governors’ Report was distributed with the AGC meeting package. The following points arose during discussion:

- Regarding the Integrated Strategic Plan approved at the May 20 AGC meeting and then at the May 22 Board of Governors’ meeting, were there any further changes made at the May 22 Board meeting than those requested by AGC on May 20?
  - No, there were no further changes than those requested by AGC on May 20.
• It was requested that any subsequent changes approved by the Board of Governors to documents that include AGC-recommended revisions be documented at the Board meetings and presented to AGC for information.

4.0 Report of the President
David Atkinson, President of MacEwan University, reported on the following items:
• The Chair, on behalf of AGC, welcomed the following new AGC student members: Brittany Pitruniak, Faculty of Fine Arts and Communications, and Ryan Roth, Faculty of Arts and Science.
• The Chair, on behalf of AGC, also welcomed incoming AGC members in attendance: Karen Heslop, Chair, Disability Studies: Leadership and Community; Lynne Honey, Associate Professor, Psychology, Faculty of Arts and Science; Tim Lade, Residence Life Coordinator; and, William Richards, Head of Piano Section, Faculty of Fine Arts and Communications.
• The Chair, on behalf of AGC, thanked the following outgoing AGC members:
  o Rafat Alam, Assistant Professor; Anthropology, Economics and Political Science, Faculty of Arts and Science (AGC member since 2009, Vice-Chair 2011-2012).
  o Teresa Costouros, Curriculum Coordinator, Insurance and Risk Management, School of Business (AGC member since 2010).
  o Debbie Couves, Manager, Domestic Admissions and Enrolment, Office of the University Registrar (AGC member since 2012).
  o Craig Gnauck, Chair, Counselling and Writing and Learning Services, Student Life (AGC member since 2009).
  o Muhammad Hossain, Assistant Professor, Bachelor of Commerce, School of Business (AGC member since 2011).
  o Lucille Mazo, Acting Chair, Bachelor of Communication Studies, Faculty of Fine Arts and Communications (AGC member since 2010).
  o Ron Meleshko, Chair, Computer Science, Faculty of Arts and Science (AGC member since 2010, Vice-Chair 2010-2011).
  o Holly Symonds-Brown, Instructor, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Faculty of Health and Community Studies (started second term as AGC member in 2012).
• Construction of the new Centre for the Arts and Culture building is scheduled to begin October 1, 2014. A proposal is being developed to accommodate the parking disruptions due to construction of the new building. Off-campus solutions are also being considered.

4.1 Budget Process
David Atkinson, President of MacEwan University, reported that a Budget Review Committee will be struck to review proposals for new spending and to review current spending, in order to make recommendations through the President to the Board of Governors for approval. Beginning September 2014, this represents a new step in the budget process, with the process beginning earlier in the year. Membership on the Committee includes faculty, students, and administrators. It was noted that this is not an AGC committee.

5.0 Report of the Provost and Vice President Academic
John Corlett, Provost and Vice President Academic, provided an update on the following items:
• All approvals for the interdisciplinary Sustainability 101 course will be completed in Fall 2014, to ensure the course will be offered through all Faculties/Schools in Winter 2015.
• Institutional Learning Outcomes will be discussed at the September AGC meeting.
• Initial discussions have been held with Faculty/Schools regarding their future academic governance structure requirements. He noted that approval from the Board of Governors will be required to change those structures. This will be discussed at a future AGC meeting.
• Three consultation processes linked to the approved Academic Plan and Integrated Strategic Plan will begin in Fall 2014:
  o consultation with Aboriginal groups to confirm whether or not they would like MacEwan University to contribute to educational outcomes for Aboriginal students;
  o community engagement consultations regarding how to connect with the communities surrounding MacEwan University; and,
  o consultation with other post-secondary institutions regarding opportunities for collaboration.
5.1 President’s Medals
It was reported that the President’s Medals will be awarded to the following students at Spring 2014 Convocation:
- Rebecca Taylor, School of Business
- Samantha Wipf, Faculty of Health and Community Studies

5.2 Deans’ Medals for Academic Excellence
It was reported that the Deans’ Medals for Academic Excellence will be awarded to the following students at Spring 2014 Convocation:
- Faculty of Arts and Science: Rebecca Brassington
- Faculty of Fine Arts and Communications: Lorelei Betke and Raquel Briggs
- Faculty of Health and Community Studies: Miriam Kluczny and Jacalyn Ryan
- School of Business: Rachel Anderson and Keely Runnals

6.0 Presentation
6.1 Report of the Chief Information Officer
6.1.1 Technology-based University Initiatives Facilitated by the Chief Information Officer
John McGrath, Chief Information Officer (CIO), presented a summary of the Information and Technology Management Committee’s technology-based programs and projects facilitated by the CIO, for information, in response to requests at the May 20 AGC meeting and May 23 Executive Committee meeting for an update. The following points arose during discussion:
- Will the Office of the CIO be conducting a faculty satisfaction survey regarding all information technology services?
  - The CIO stated that he is open to conducting a meaningful survey regarding help desk functions. If a survey is required regarding Blackboard-Learn, he preferred to conduct it in Winter 2015, to ensure the proper survey tools are utilized to solicit useful information. The survey would also have to be conducted with available resources.
- Regarding Library Technology Projects, is Library information technology intended to be permanently subsumed under the Office of the CIO?
  - Not at this point, but there is an important relationship between the two areas. The Library project cannot proceed without the assistance from Information Technology Services. It is the only remaining area of the University that has a small information technology staff.

6.1.2 Learning Systems Development: Faculty Training and Support
Lynn Feist, Acting Director, eLearning Office, presented Terms of Reference for the Learning Systems – Faculty Advisory Committee, for information, in response to a request at the May 20 AGC meeting for an update. The following points arose during discussion:
- How will the Office of the CIO evaluate the implementation of Blackboard-Learn? Will other factors be included in addition to the number of faculty trained?
  - Members of the Faculty Advisory Committee are from all Faculties/Schools. They are asked to bring issues to the Committee and share information from the Committee with their Faculties/Schools.
- Is the Kaltura solution used for the Enterprise Streaming Project a learning repository or is video embedded with a course?
  - Video is addressed as an object hosted on a separate system, and therefore, is not embedded within a course.
- Does the budget for new courses online include MacEwan University’s share of eCampus Alberta expenses or does the budget only cover the University’s migration of Blackboard-Learn?
  - It refers to both aspects of MacEwan University’s online course offerings. L. Feist is working with the deans to prioritize technology projects.
- Does the budget include enhancements for blended course delivery?
  - The process to select and set priorities will come through the deans to the Provost and should not be restricted to online distance education courses.
- It appears that the scope of the Faculty Advisory Committee is only Blackboard-Learn; however, there are other systems and equipment concerns that faculty would like addressed. It was suggested that the
scope be expanded to include all of the information technology usage, such as audiovisual equipment in classrooms, turnaround time for help desk issues, etc.

- The Terms of Reference describe a one-way flow of information, with faculty providing advice and input and a description of problems. It is important to have a reporting mechanism in place in order for faculty to learn the impact of their feedback and actions taken by the Committee.

- Are there any plans for the Committee to discuss broader questions, such as if courses are being offered online, how does that change conventional course delivery? Do we assume that a faculty member who reaches 1,000 students at a time only teaches one course and what would be the implications? What is the mix of online delivery and conventional delivery at MacEwan University?
  - The previous Distance and Distributed Education Committee that dealt with university-wide issues was subsumed by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, who will address these issues and set the academic direction on how eLearning tools will be utilized.

Faculty members interested in membership on the Learning Systems - Faculty Advisory Committee were asked to contact L. Feist directly. It was noted that this is not an AGC committee.

7.0 Committee Reports

7.1 Academic Policies Committee

7.1.1 Policy C1010: Program Approvals and Changes

Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee (APC), presented the revised policy C1010: Program Approvals and Changes, effective July 1, 2014, for approval. AGC was reminded that revisions to procedures should be requested through the Provost and Vice President Academic. The following points arose during discussion:

- Procedures, New Programs, Section 4.1.1, regarding new program development: Is it the intention that new program development will start from the department/area level and then after consultation with all stakeholder groups, the dean will write the Letter of Intent?
  - Yes, the program development process has always begun with faculty expertise. This does not exclude deans from also presenting new program ideas.

- Procedures, Program Change, Section 4.2.3: Does this point intend that deans have the authority to override a Faculty/School Council decision on a program change?
  - Yes. The deans may require this authority from time-to-time to make the best decision for MacEwan University, based on their knowledge of political and external factors, with AGC having final authority over academic programs.

- Procedures, Program Change, Section 4.2.6 regarding Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC) forwarding all changes to AGC for information annually: This is not reflected in the current APPC Terms of Reference.

AGC-05-06-10-2014

Moved by A. Skye, seconded by M. Milner to approve the revisions to C1010: Program Approvals and Changes, effective July 1, 2014, as recommended by Academic Policies Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 7.1.1.  

Carried

7.1.2 Policy C2100: Graduation and Policy C1015: Academic Residency Requirements

Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee (APC), presented the revised policy C2100: Graduation and a recommendation to retire policy C1015: Academic Residency Requirements, effective July 1, 2014, for approval. He noted that Policy C1015 contains only two significant points regarding Ministry-approved credentials: 1) The minimum percentage of MacEwan University credits students must take in order to achieve a MacEwan University credential (50%); and, 2) Exceptions are only considered on a program basis and are not influenced by individual student circumstances. Feedback from the deans indicated that they support these residency requirements and that they should be maintained. The following clause was added to C2100: Graduation to accomplish this: 3.3.6 Students must meet the academic residency requirement for their program. The normal requirement is that students complete at least 50% of program credits through MacEwan University. Exceptions are not available to students on an individual basis. However, program-by-program variances to the residency requirement may be approved by Academic Governance Council. The following points arose during discussion:
- It was confirmed that under Regulations, Section 3.3.5: The normal requirement is that students complete at least 50% of program credits through MacEwan University means students transferring into a four-year degree program at MacEwan University after two years at other institutions would be required to complete the last two years of the degree only at MacEwan University.

- Regulations, Section 3.3.5: Exceptions are not available to students on an individual basis. However, program-by-program variances to the residency requirement may be approved by Academic Governance Council. Given the movement of students and the focus on distance delivery, students may require more flexibility. Therefore, the policy should include exemptions on an individual basis.
  - Does the term “normal requirement” imply there are exceptions to the policy?
    - The policy states that exceptions are only available on a program-by-program basis.

- The Faculty of Arts and Science dean clarified that the policy is stating that for a 40-course program, students must complete 20 courses at MacEwan University in order to qualify to receive their MacEwan University parchment.

AGC-06-06-10-2014
Moved by T. Costouros, seconded by B. Pitruniak to approve the revisions to Policy C2100: Graduation, effective July 1, 2014, as recommended by Academic Policies Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 7.1.2.

Carried

AGC-07-06-10-2014
Moved by D. Couves, seconded by M. Sekulic to approve the retirement of Policy C1015: Academic Residency Requirements, effective July 1, 2014, as recommended by Academic Policies Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 7.1.2.

Carried

7.1.3 Policy C2050: Attendance
Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee (APC), presented a recommendation to retire policy C2050: Attendance, effective July 1, 2014, for approval. He noted that the notion of attendance is covered in two other policies, one academic (C1025: Course Outlines) and the other in Student Services (E3101: Student Rights and Responsibilities). C1025 looks at attendance from the faculty perspective, and the procedures for this policy require faculty to publish any attendance requirements in course outlines. E3101 looks at attendance from a student perspective, noting that students are responsible for punctuality and course attendance. A request has been made to slightly amend this policy to account for the retirement of C2050 by deleting the reference to C2050 and referring students to the course outline for attendance requirements. The following points arose during discussion:
  - What is the University's expectation of the level of enforcement of attendance requirements by faculty?
    - Courses can require that students attend, and it is acceptable for a student's grade to be attached to their attendance record.

AGC-08-06-10-2014
Moved by R. Taylor, seconded by M. Sekulic to approve the retirement of Policy C2050: Attendance, effective July 1, 2014, as recommended by Academic Policies Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 7.1.3.

Carried

7.1.4 Policy C3010: Academic Program Review
Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee (APC), presented the revised policy C3010: Academic Program Review, effective for Fall 2014, for approval. He noted that the policy was revised to focus program review on baccalaureate degrees and to meet the requirements of Alberta Innovation and Advanced Education; therefore, the policy name will change to Baccalaureate Program Review. The following points arose during discussion:
  - Why is there no mention of student participation in the Academic Program Reviews (APRs)?
    - Student input would be gathered as part of the Self-Study Committee’s consultation with focus groups. This process will be described in detail in the program manual.
    - Students also have an opportunity to meet with the external reviewers during their onsite visit.
What role will the Student Program Advisory Committees (SPACs) play in a self-study?
  o It is expected that a Self-Study Committee would consult with the appropriate SPAC.

What role does the Centre for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence (CAFÉ) have in curriculum review?
  o CAFÉ has a curriculum coordinator who would assist with development of protocols around curriculum review. Institutional Analysis and Planning (IAP) is working with CAFÉ to assist deans and Faculty/School Council chairs to present the best self-study to the external reviewers.

Currently, the APR has a fairly extensive curriculum component, and the revised policy removes that as a requirement.
  o Procedural changes to the APR include placing the program review process under the deans and program chairs.

Will the Self-Study Committee have the opportunity to request information that IAP may not have initially collected?
  o IAP will have sufficient time to gather all information required by the Committee over the course of the year in which the self-study is being completed. Also, there are a number of studies done on a routine basis by IAP for the University, which may include information requested by the Self-Study Committee.

It was reported that faculty are concerned about how APRs will be conducted for non-degree programs, and some felt it would be considered inappropriate to approve the changes to policy C3010 without first knowing that process.

Moved by M. Milner, seconded by L. White-MacDonald to approve the revisions to Policy C3010: Academic Program Review, effective for Fall 2014, as recommended by Academic Policies Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 7.1.4.

AGC-09-06-10-2014
Moved by A. Skye, seconded by R. Ginther to refer Policy C3010: Academic Program Review back to Academic Policies Committee for consideration of Academic Governance Council's comments regarding non-degree program review.

Carried

7.2 Student Success Committee

7.2.1 Revised Terms of Reference
David McLaughlin, Member, Student Success Committee (SSC), presented revised SSC Terms of Reference, effective July 1, 2014, for approval. Substantive changes included clarifying the Committee’s mandate and aligning its governance structure with AGC: The following points arose during discussion:
  • Section 1.4: revise to: To ensure that the needs of various student groups, including but not limited to Aboriginal students, international students, first-generation students, and students living with a disability are reflected in academic and student services policy, as required.
  • Section 2.3 regarding outcomes as indicators of student success: What is meant by student-intended outcomes?
    - Student retention and program completion are traditional university-defined outcomes indicating student success, but may not be student-intended outcomes. For example, students may consider their experience at MacEwan University successful, even though they may not have completed their program, because they gained the necessary skills to achieve their professional or personal development goals.

AGC-10-06-10-2014
Moved by M. Milner, seconded by B. Pitruniak to approve the changes to the Terms of Reference for the Student Success Committee, effective for Fall 2014, as recommended by the Student Success Committee (February 28 and May 29, 2014), as presented in the Agenda Item 7.2.1.

7.3 Academic Planning and Priorities Committee

7.3.1 Changes to Bachelor of Physical Education Transfer Program of Study
John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented revisions to the Bachelor of Physical Education Transfer Program of Study, effective for 2015 intake, for approval.
Moved by J. Corlett, seconded by B. Pitruniak to approve the changes to the Bachelor of Physical Education Transfer Program of Study, effective for the 2015-2016 intake, as recommended by Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (May 13, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 7.3.1.  

Carried

7.3.2 Changes to the Bachelor of Applied Human Service Administration Program of Study
John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented revisions to the Applied Human Service Administration Program of Study, effective for 2015 intake, for approval.

Moved by J. Corlett, seconded by R. Ginther to approve the changes to the Bachelor of Applied Human Service Administration Program of Study, effective for the 2015-2016 intake, as recommended by Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (May 13, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 7.3.2.  

Carried

7.3.3 Changes to Acupuncture Diploma Program of Study
John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented revisions to the Acupuncture Diploma Program of Study, effective for 2015 intake, for approval.

Moved by J. Corlett, seconded by T. Costouros to approve the changes to the Acupuncture Diploma Program of Study, effective for the 2015-2016 intake, as recommended by Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (May 13, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 7.3.3.  

Carried

7.4 Executive Committee
7.4.1 AGC Review Follow-Up
Ron Meleshko, Member, Executive Committee, presented for information the memo from the Executive Committee Chair to AGC that was also included with the AGC meeting package, outlining the next steps for the AGC Review Report. It was noted that due to the Board of Governors’ (Board’s) substantial May agenda, including the approval of the Integrated Strategic Plan and the Comprehensive Institutional Plan as well as pending Ministry decisions, the AGC Review Report will be brought to the Board’s September meeting. Therefore, the implementation of the AGC Review Report was postponed until Fall 2014. Executive Committee met on May 23 and agreed that the AGC Review Task Team had fulfilled its original mandate, and they approved the motion to dissolve the AGC Review Task Team, effective immediately. The following points arose during discussion:

- What is the membership of the AGC Review Implementation Committee?
  - The Committee has not yet been struck.

8.0 Question Period
No questions were raised.

9.0 Future Agenda Items/Next Meetings – September 23, 2014
The next meeting of AGC is September 23, 2014 at 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

It had been indicated by the agenda and agreed earlier in the meeting, that an item to come before AGC would be considered in a closed session. The Chair excused visitors from the meeting room.

11.0 The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Approved by Academic Governance Council
September 23, 2014 (Motion AGC-01-09-23-2014)