1.0 CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m. The Chair, on behalf of AGC, welcomed new AGC faculty member, Richard Pereschitz, and the new Faculty of Health and Community Studies student member, Taylor Peters.

2.0 APPROVAL OF AGENDA/CONSENT AGENDA
The Chair presented the agenda for approval.

The following items were approved on the consent agenda:
- 2.3 Nominations Committee Report
- 2.5 Research Ethics Board Annual Report 2013-2014
- 2.7 MacEwan Sabbatical Leave Committee Annual Report 2013-2014
- 2.8 University Rank and Title Committee Annual Report 2013-2014

It was requested that the following Consent Agenda Items be discussed as part of the open agenda, to which AGC consented:
- 2.1 AGC Open Meeting Minutes: October 28, 2014
- 2.2 Executive Committee Minutes: November 4, 2014
- 2.4 Faculty Evaluation Committee Annual Report 2013-2014 (for discussion immediately before 6.3.1: Faculty Evaluation Committee Work Plan 2014-2015.)
The Chair requested that a closed session be held after item 8.0 Future Agenda/Next Meeting – January 20, 2015 to discuss a confidential item, to which AGC consented.

Moved by L. Honey, seconded by L. White-MacDonald to revise the action required for Item 6.8.2 Academic Schedule 2015-2016 from “For information” to “For decision”.  

Carried

AGC-01-11-25-2014
Moved by L. Honey, seconded by M. Milner to approve the agenda for November 25, 2014 and the items on the consent agenda, as amended.

Carried

2.1 AGC Open Meeting Minutes: October 28, 2014
David Atkinson, AGC Chair, presented the October 28, 2014 AGC open meeting minutes for approval. The following points arose during discussion:

- Will the November 25 minutes include AGC's discussion of this item?
  - The Chair suggested and AGC agreed that the discussion would be included in the November 25 open minutes to correct any misunderstandings from the October 28, 2014 open minutes.

- 5.2.1 Research Council Work Plan 2014-2015, page 4-5 regarding the Urban Spaces theme for the Strategic Research Fund: It was suggested that the essence of the discussion that the theme was not able to be defined was not adequately captured, since the Co-Chair’s comment was that it was chosen to be so broad as to encompass anything, and in that vein, is nonsensical as a research theme or at least no more sensible than a theme called "Research".
  - It was noted that no members from Research Council were currently in attendance to address the comment.
  - The Secretary to AGC reported that AGC Secretariat checked with Research Council for clarification of their comments after the November meeting, as allowed by the AGC Bylaws, which state in section 12.6.1: Between meetings, the [AGC] Secretariat may contact a member for clarification of discussion points.
  - The way that it was said at the meeting was incorrect. The way the section is written in the minutes is the way it was meant to be said at the meeting. Since it is reflective of the actual decision-making process that the Research Council went through, the minutes accurately captured what was meant, although not a verbatim recording of the exchange.
  - It was reminded that the Co-Chairs also stated during the meeting that determination of the theme was part of last year’s Work Plan, and they were uncertain of certain aspects about it.

- Clarity was requested regarding information the AGC minutes should capture; that is, what is said at the meeting or what is said after the meeting?
  - AGC requested that Executive Committee consider the purpose of the AGC minutes and make recommendations to AGC.

- It was requested that a statement be added to this discussion that there is a period of three to four months where no research funding is awarded.
  - J. Corlett noted that federal research funding agencies also have periods where no research funding is awarded.

- J. Corlett indicated that he was a member of Research Council in his role as Vice-President Research and had brought up at their recent meeting the October 28 AGC discussion (per AGC motion AGC-06-10-28-2014). The Committee will be reviewing all of AGC's discussion points, including reconsidering whether or not a theme is necessary for the Strategic Research Fund.

AGC-02-11-25-2014
Moved by M. Milner, seconded by C. Raymond-Seniuk to approve the Academic Governance Council October 28, 2014 Open Meeting Minutes, as presented in Agenda Item 2.1.

Carried
2.2 Executive Committee Minutes: November 4, 2014
Kevin Hood, Executive Committee Vice-Chair, presented the November 4, 2014 Executive Committee minutes for information. The following points arose during discussion:
- 5.2 Academic Schedule 2015-2016, page 4, first bullet regarding the ability to assign an F grade to a student in a clinical environment: Has there been a change to a policy or practice restricting giving a student an F grade in a community participation or clinical environment?
  o No, there has not been a change in policy or practice.

2.4 Faculty Evaluation Committee Annual Report 2013-2014
[Scribe’s Note: This item was discussed immediately prior to Item 6.3.1: Faculty Evaluation Committee Work Plan 2014-2015.]

Sharon Hobden, Co-Chair, Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), presented the FEC Annual Report 2013-2014 for information. The following points arose during discussion:
- Point 3c. Online student evaluations - raising response rates: Why was there no data included regarding response rates right before and right after the marketing campaign in order compare and determine whether or not the marketing campaign was successful?
  o The marketing campaign itself did not have any effect on the response rate. The Committee will be looking at other strategies to increase response rates.
    ▪ The data should be reported that shows that the marketing plan was not effective.
- It was reported that in the Faculty of Arts and Science this term, program advisors have been attending a select set of 100-level courses for 15 minutes to simulate the previous way the University used to manage paper evaluations. For students left to their own initiative, there is only a 5-12% response rate at this stage of the term versus the program advisor asking for feedback in the classroom, which generates a 70-80+% response rate. It is a simple exercise, but seems to be effective.
  o This year, the FEC is looking at strategies that engage the students more in order to increase the response rates.

AGC requested that Faculty Evaluation Committee provide an updated Annual Report 2013-2014 at the next meeting that includes statistics comparing response rates to previous years.

2.6 Student Services Policy Committee Annual Report 2013-2014
[Scribe’s Note: This item was discussed immediately prior to Item 6.5.1: Student Services Policy Committee Work Plan 2014-2015.]

Cathy Davis-Herbert, Co-Chair, Student Services Policy Committee, presented the SSPC Annual Report 2013-2014 for approval. The following points arose during discussion:
- Other Discussion and Committee Work, third bullet: Does U-Solve own the Sexual Assault Policy?
  o A Sexual Abuse Policy does not currently exist. Human Resources in consultation with others, including U-Solve, is looking at whether or not a policy should be developed. The AGC Chair confirmed that if developed, it would be a University-wide policy.
  o It was reminded that SSPC serves as a sounding board for policies with a student focus. The intent was not to imply any ownership of policy per se. If individuals have a policy with a student-centred focus, they have the opportunity to come forward when the policy is being developed or changed and offer it for the review of SSPC for feedback.

AGC-03-11-25-2014
Moved by K. Friesen, seconded by M. Milner to approve the Student Services Policy Committee Annual Report 2013-2014, as presented in Agenda Item 2.6. Carried

D. Atkinson vacated the Chair, and K. Hood presided.

3.0 BOARD OF GOVERNORS’ REPORT
David Atkinson, President of MacEwan University, noted that the Board of Governors’ Report was distributed with the meeting package.
4.0 REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT
David Atkinson, President of MacEwan University, reported on the following:

- Construction is underway on the Centre for the Arts and Culture building. A Cost Control Group has been established, with external consultants and internal Board of Governors and staff members.
- The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) reviewed 40 presentations from individual departments/units over four days. Given the limited budget available, the decision was made that the majority of funding must go toward academic programming or student services as it supports academic programming. The 2015-2016 budget was presented to the President/Vice-President (PVP) group meeting on November 10, 2014, resulting in approval of all BAC recommendations. The budget will next be presented to the Board of Governors for approval.

K. Hood vacated the Chair, and D. Atkinson presided.

5.0 REPORT OF THE PROVOST AND VICE-PRESIDENT ACADEMIC
John Corlett, Provost and Vice-President Academic, reported on the following:

- As part of the Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP), the University committed to look at creation of a co-curricular transcript for students that would list their involvement in activities outside of official coursework. Tied to that is the idea of generalized institutional learning outcomes that could relate to business ethics and behaviour in the workplace. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC) has created a working group to look at developing a co-curricular transcript that includes learning outcomes. APPC will bring the working group report to AGC for discussion and eventually approval to fulfill the commitment in the ISP.
- Kimberly Howard was hired as the Executive Director of MacEwan International, as of January 5, 2015, reporting to the Provost and Vice-President Academic. Her focus will be on creating new models for international recruitment. Prior to accepting her new role, Ms. Howard worked in the University’s School of Business.
- Regarding strategic international operations, MacEwan University now has a permanent presence in 10 countries through a contract with a new contractor for assistance with student recruitment, faculty exchanges, study abroad programs, and possible research alliances.
- J. Corlett met with Vice-Presidents of Grants and Scholarships for Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, who provided advice on how MacEwan University can continue to evolve as a research institution. The Office of Research Services will be developing processes to assist faculty and student grantees with finding reviewers for feedback, to raise the calibre of grants being submitted from MacEwan University. Deans will be apprised of the processes and will disseminate the information to faculty members.

5.1 Fall 2014 Preliminary Enrolment Survey
David McLaughlin, Executive Director, Institutional Analysis and Planning, presented the Fall 2014 Preliminary Enrolment Survey for information. He noted that this report informs questions that may arise about post-secondary education during the Fall sitting of the Legislature and in the Ministry. The following points arose during discussion:

- Section 6: Were there no programs undersubscribed during this period?
  - The report only lists those programs that have quotas. Of those quota programs, there were no programs undersubscribed. There were slight decreases in some of the open programs.
    - The most important statistics are regarding the oversubscribed programs with quotas, as the number of applicants listed in the report do not necessarily translate to enrolments at MacEwan University.
    - It was also noted that due to high demand, many of the high-demand programs closed applications as much as three months earlier than last year's closures. If the Institution had continued accepting applications, the number of applicants would have been dramatically higher in the report for the high-demand quota programs.
6.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS

6.1 ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

6.1.1 Policy C3015: Non-Baccalaureate Program Review

Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee (APC), presented the draft Policy C3015: Non-Baccalaureate Program Review for discussion. AGC considered, at the June 10, 2014 meeting, a motion to approve academic policy C3010: Baccalaureate Program Review (currently titled Academic Program Review). Concerns were raised during the discussion that the new policy would leave a gap in the program review process for non-baccalaureate programs. C3010 was referred back to APC with a request to prepare an analogous policy for non-baccalaureate programs and to present it this Fall at the same time as C3010. A new non-baccalaureate review policy, C3015, was prepared. After it was presented at the APC September meeting, input was sought from the Provost and Vice-President Academic (the Provost) and the Deans. The feedback on C3015 was largely ambivalent or negative, with the Provost stating that C3015 runs opposite to the academic direction of the University, as described in the Integrated Strategic Plan (ISP), and that he could not support a policy of this kind. At its November 4, 2014 meeting, the AGC Executive Committee heard from APC on this matter and agreed that the current draft of policy C3015: Non-Baccalaureate Program Review should be presented to AGC for its feedback and direction at the November 25 AGC meeting. The following points arose during discussion:

- What is the nature of the lack of support on the part of the Provost and Vice-President Academic?
  - Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC) only requires periodic reviews of degrees and applied degree programs. Given the obligations under the ISP where diploma and certificate programs will no longer be standalone and will be linked in some way to a degree completion strategy, the intent is to review diploma and certificate programs as part of a constellation of programs related to the degree to which they may attach.
- Since policy C3010: Baccalaureate Program Review appears to encompass non-baccalaureate reviews, there does not seem to be a need for a separate policy for non-baccalaureate degree program reviews.
- When are new degree programs going to be presented, including how diplomas and certificates are laddered into them?
  - The Chair noted the Provost has had detailed discussions with the academic deans about new degree program development. There is a process already in place, as per policy C1010, by which a new degree comes into existence.
  - New degree proposals are scheduled to be presented to the Board of Governors in the new year.
- The Chair confirmed that it would be possible for a diploma or certificate program to ladder into more than one degree.

AGC agreed that since there was no enthusiasm for developing a policy for non-baccalaureate program review at this time, Academic Policies Committee should discontinue development of policy C3015.

6.1.2 Policy C3010: Academic Program Review

Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee (APC), presented the revised policy C3010: Baccalaureate Program Review, effective July 1, 2015, for approval. It was noted that the proposed policy presents three major changes from current practice: first, only baccalaureate degrees would undergo the proposed process, as required by Alberta Innovation and Advanced Education; second, whereas the existing process is explicitly formative, the proposed process is summative, with ties to resource allocation; and third, curriculum review is no longer part of this review. The following points arose during discussion:

- Why change the name of the policy to Baccalaureate Program Review when the reviews also cover non-baccalaureate programs?
  - Even though non-baccalaureate programs may be an ancillary part of the review process, the review is ultimately of the baccalaureate degree program. The new title reflects what the reviews are about.
- It was noted that if the intent of changing the title of the policy back to Academic Program Review is to ensure the policy covers all types of program reviews, then all references to “baccalaureate” program review within the text of the policy must be changed to “academic” program review, in order for the change to carry any meaning.
- It was agreed that the title change does not make a difference to the policy.
Moved by P. Moore-Juzwishin, seconded by L. Honey to amend the title of policy C3010 to Academic Program Review rather than changing it to Baccalaureate Program Review.

Defeated

- Has a clause been included regarding aligning external accreditation requirements that mirror or are similar to internal program evaluations in order to maximize resources?
  - Yes, section 3.1.3 states: At the request of a Dean and with the approval of APPC, the content and timing of a Baccalaureate Program Review process may be adjusted for programs subject to review by external accreditation bodies, in order to avoid duplication of work.

AGC-04-11-25-2014
Moved by M. Milner, seconded by C. Hancock to approve the revisions to Policy C3010: Academic Program Review, effective July 1, 2015, as recommended by Academic Policies Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 6.1.2.

Carried

6.2 ADMISSIONS AND SELECTIONS COMMITTEE
6.2.1 Perioperative Nursing for Registered Nurses Program Admission Criteria
Mike Sekulic, Chair, Admissions and Selections Committee (ASC), presented revised Perioperative Nursing for Registered Nurses Program Admission Criteria, effective for Fall 2016 intake, for approval. The following points arose during discussion:

- Is the appropriate approval process not to come through the Faculty of Health and Community Studies (FHCS) Council? Did the program change go through a subcommittee of the FHCS Council only and do the faculty members of the FHCS Council clearly understand that they have delegated that authority to only that small committee?
  - It was noted that since the name change regarding the licensure exam was externally mandated, the change went through the FHCS Council’s Curriculum Committee.
- While this is a non-controversial change, what is the process should a more controversial change come forward? That is, what is the opportunity for all faculty members in FHCS to provide feedback on changes or to know clearly that the authority for approval has been delegated to a small committee?
  - Sharon Hobden, Associate Dean, FHCS, stated that under the FHCS Council Bylaws, authority has been delegated for approval of some items, such as legislated changes. The delegation of authority is being reviewed.

AGC-05-11-25-2014
Moved by M. Milner, seconded by C. Raymond-Seniuk to approve the change to the Perioperative Nursing for Registered Nurses program Admission Criteria, effective for Fall 2016 intake, as recommended by the Admissions and Selections Committee (November 3, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 6.2.1.

Carried

6.3 FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE
[Scribe’s Note: Item 2.4 Faculty Evaluation Committee Annual Report 2013-2014 was discussed immediately before 6.3.1.]

6.3.1 Work Plan 2014-2015
Sharon Hobden, Co-Chair, Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), presented the FEC Work Plan 2014-2015 for information. The following points arose during discussion:

- If the Annual Report 2013-2014 stated that the marketing plan did not work to increase student response rates for faculty evaluations, why does the second objective of the Work Plan 2014-2015 contain two actions referring to the marketing campaign?
  - Those action items should have been removed from the report.
- It was noted that the Work Plan looked identical to those of the last few years, and it was not clear why some of the unsuccessful strategies are still listed.
• Concern was expressed that increasing the response rate for faculty evaluations is a significant objective. It was noted that the response rate has been between 20-35% for a number of years, meaning that only about 10-12 out of 40 students complete faculty evaluations.
• The Work Plan does not appear to address this issue.

AGC requested that Faculty Evaluation Committee provide an updated Work Plan 2014-2015 at the next meeting that addresses AGC’s feedback.

6.4 RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
6.4.1 Work Plan 2014-2015
John Soroski, Chair, Research Ethics Board (REB), presented the REB Work Plan 2014-2015 for approval.

AGC-06-11-25-2014
Moved by T. Carter, seconded by L. Honey to approve the Research Ethics Board Work Plan 2014-2015, as presented in Agenda Item 6.4.1.

Carried

6.5 STUDENT SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE
[Scribe’s Note: Item 2.6 Student Service Policy Committee Annual Report 2013-2014 was discussed immediately before Item 6.5.1.]

6.5.1 Work Plan 2014-2015 and 5-Year Cycle of Review
Cathy David-Herbert, Co-Chair, Student Services Policy Committee (SSPC), presented the SSPC Work Plan 2014-2015 and 5-Year Cycle of Review for approval. The following points arose during discussion:
• It was noted that the AGC Review Report (April 2014) recommended a merger between the Student Services Policy Committee and the Student Success Committee into one Student Services Committee; therefore, the Work Plan for this academic year is in transition. The new Policy Document Framework, once approved, will also impact how policies are reviewed.
• What is the timeline and process for consultation on policy E3400: Services to Students with Disabilities?
  o SSPC has reviewed the policy, which includes faculty members on the Committee. It is now moving into a broader consultation through the usual chain of SSPC policy review.
• It was reported that some faculty members are concerned with accommodation that appears to be impinging on the academic integrity of their course or potentially doing so. It also appears there may have been unclear boundaries regarding whether the accommodation is being driven, determined, and approved by an expert related to the reason for accommodation or by a facilitator.
  o C. Davis-Herbert recommended that such issues be discussed directly with Abigail Parrish-Craig, Chair, Services to Students with Disabilities, and the SSPC Co-Chairs, as they are open to dialogue and welcome the opportunity to explain how accommodation works at MacEwan University. For example, the University has a legal obligation to provide accommodation if medical documentation is provided. The University attempts to provide accommodation in a way that works best for faculty members as well as students. It is usually handled on a case-by-case basis.

AGC-07-11-25-2014
Moved by L. White-MacDonald, seconded by C. Hancock to approve the Student Services Policy Committee Work Plan 2014-2015 and 5-Year Review Cycle, as presented in Agenda Item 6.5.1.

Carried

6.6 MACEWAN SABBATICAL LEAVE COMMITTEE
John Corlett, Chair, MacEwan Sabbatical Leave Committee (MSLC), presented the MSLC Work Plan 2014-2015 for approval. He noted that subsequent to distribution of the Work Plan, the November 14 meeting had been postponed until MSLC receives all required information for consideration.
AGC-08-11-25-2014
Moved by L. Honey, seconded by M. Milner to approve the MacEwan Sabbatical Leave Committee Work Plan 2014-2015, as presented in Agenda Item 6.6.1.

Carried

6.7 UNIVERSITY RANK AND TITLE COMMITTEE
6.7.1 Work Plan 2014-2015
John Corlett, Chair, University Rank and Title Committee (URTC), presented the URTC Work Plan 2014-2015 for approval. The following points arose during discussion:
- A question arose regarding appeals.
  - J. Corlett reminded that as Chair of URTC, he does not participate in the Rank and Title Appeals Committee process.

AGC-09-11-25-2014
Moved by L. Honey, seconded by C. Raymond-Seniuk to approve the University Rank and Title Committee Work Plan 2014-2015, as presented in Agenda Item 6.7.1.

Carried

6.8 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
6.8.1 Policy C1020: Course Approvals and Changes – Revised Implementation Date
Kevin Hood, Vice-Chair, Executive Committee, reported that Executive Committee approved at its November 4, 2014 meeting to delay implementation of policy C1020: Course Approvals and Changes from immediately to July 1, 2015, in order to accommodate completion of new course proposals and course changes currently under review for 2015-2016 by December 15, 2014. The following points arose during discussion:
- What was the impediment to the implementation of the policy during the original schedule?
  - It was a timetable issue. In order for the policy to be implemented immediately, course approvals and changes would have all had to be completed by December 2014, and the turnaround time for programs and Faculties/Schools to do that was not feasible.

6.8.2 Academic Schedule 2015-2016
[Scribe’s Note: It was agreed during approval of the agenda to change the action required on this item to “For approval”.

Kevin Hood, Vice-Chair, Executive Committee, presented the Academic Schedule 2015-2016 for information. He noted that Executive Committee, at its November 4, 2014 meeting, received and approved the Academic Schedule 2015-2016 (Executive Committee motion number EC-03-11-04-2014), as well as reviewing the new Academic Schedule Guidelines that will be used to generate future schedules. The formatting of the Academic Schedule was changed to signal the changes in the guidelines. Approval of the Academic Schedule 2015-2016 was originally deferred by Executive Committee until the changes were implemented. Mike Sekulic, University Registrar, was on hand to answer questions regarding the schedule.

The following points arose during discussion:
- Concern was expressed regarding only one business day is available for submission of grades in the Fall 2015 term if an exam lands on December 18.
- The short grading deadline contradicts the grading policy which allows grades to be submitted within five business days.
  - The schedule is also constraining the Office of the University Registrar staff.
- It is important to balance the work for both faculty and staff, as noted in the Academic Schedule Guidelines, Regular Session, point 5: A grade submission deadline will be established that balances the time for marking exams with time required to evaluate academic standing and issue notification to students as to the outcome of the evaluation, where appropriate.
- Is it absolutely necessary that academic standing be sent out before the December holiday break? Is there any reason why it couldn’t be run in the first week of January?
If academic assessments were sent in January, and if a student discovered in January they were not in good standing as a consequence of their first term grades, they would be asked to withdraw at that time.

- Is the pinch in December a result of general practice or because in this particular year, there is a late start date in the Fall term due to Labour Day being September 7?
  - Yes, it is because of where Labour Day falls. Other universities begin on September 1, 2015. MacEwan University’s traditional practice has been for the first day of Fall term to begin after Labour Day.

- The revision to the Add/Drop deadline to the end of the second week may be problematic for mandatory introductory laboratory (lab) completion.
  - The revised Add/Drop date aligns with the practice of other Alberta universities. While it is possible that a student may enroll late into a lab course, it is more likely that students are shifting between labs as opposed to not taking any lab at all.

- Regarding the change to the Payment date and the Drop date: For programs with quotas, this could be problematic.

- Is there an expectation how the three days now located between the last day of classes and the start of the exam period might not be used (e.g. labs)?

- Has there been assessment of the impact of increasing the efficiency of the exam period? For example, could three exam sessions be run per day instead of two and maybe include Saturday, which is common practice for universities?

- Regarding the discussion at Executive Committee on some programs not having a final cumulative assessment having the option to teach through the final exam period: What would keep faculty from revising their schedule to end their coursework on the last day of classes in order to avoid the short grading submission turnaround? Or, what would keep a faculty member from changing the structure of their course to have no final assessment and to teach all the way through?

- Concern was expressed that consultations were not carried out properly under policy C2025: Academic Schedule, section 4.7.

- Rebecca Taylor, Students’ Association of MacEwan University Vice-President Academic, noted the following:
  - Students will appreciate the extension of the Add/Drop deadline.
  - In the Spring session, the payment due date could be problematic for students, since they may not have time to stand in line at the registration desk in order to meet the deadline that is two days after classes begin. Extension of the payment date would be appreciated.

- Regarding moving Student Orientation to Tuesday, September 8: It was felt that dropping one instructional day from the term was not acceptable and that Student Orientation should remain the week before classes begin.

- The Withdrawal date applies to courses that run a regular session of 13 weeks. It does not apply to variable session courses.

AGC requested that the Office of the University Registrar review the Academic Schedule 2015-2016 to determine whether or not any of the following concerns can be addressed:

- Grade turnaround time must be fair to faculty members.
- Can the exam schedule be shortened?
- Reconsider when the academic standing is run (January versus December).
- Make accommodations for lab exams without removing a lab session.
- Some concerns might be addressed by moving the start date to September 1, 2015.
- Some of the other concerns, such as the Add/Drop and Payment dates, are not impacted by moving the start date.
- Look at all possible scenarios in addition to revising the start and end dates of classes to resolve the issue identified.

It was agreed that a Special Session of AGC should be held December 11, 2014 to discuss the Academic Schedule 2015-2016. If quorum is not achieved for the meeting, Executive Committee will be required to approve the schedule.
The Chair noted that if there are no obvious solutions to the issues identified, then AGC must respect the schedule.

Moved by L. Honey, seconded by M. Milner to approve the Academic Schedule 2015-2016, as presented by the Office of the University Registrar, as presented in agenda item 6.8.2.

AGC-10-11-25-2014
Moved by R. Ginther, seconded by L. Honey, to refer the Academic Schedule 2015-2016 to the Office of the University Registrar for consideration of the comments of Academic Governance Council (AGC), for approval at the AGC special session on December 11, 2014.

Carried

7.0 QUESTION PERIOD

- When, and to what extent, will practical resources of time, money, and expertise be made available, so certificate and diploma programs who have not yet done so can begin the task of modifying their curricula in order to accomplish the integration required under the Integrated Strategic Plan?
  - J. Corlett, Provost and Vice-President Academic, noted that AGC cannot provide advice on resource allocations within Faculties/Schools. It is expected that decisions around how programs and departments evolve are handled at the Faculty/School Council level.

8.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS/NEXT MEETINGS – December 11, 2014

A special session of AGC is scheduled for December 11, 2014 at 5:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m., in Room 9-323 City Centre Campus.

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

10.0 The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Approved by Academic Governance Council
January 20, 2015 (motion AGC-01-01-20-2015)