ACADEMIC
GOVERNANCE COUNCIL

APPROVED

MINUTES

Chair: David Atkinson
Vice-Chair: Kevin Hood

Members

Tom Carter  Cory McAuley  Christy Raymond-Seniuk
John Corlett  Debbie McGugan  Bill Richards
Nina Christine Delling  Heather McRae  Peter Roccia
Elsie Elford  Susan Mills  Denise Roy
Kevin Friesen  Margaret Milner  Mike Sekulic
Rose Ginther  Craig Monk  Aimee Skye
Chris Hancock  Pat Moore-Juzwishin  Kristen Stoik
Jim Head  Brian Parker  Ali Taleb
Karen Heslop  Abigail Parrish-Craig  Rebecca Taylor
Lynne Honey  Taylor Peters  Adi Tcaciuc
Norene James  Brittany Pitruniak  Liz White-MacDonald
David McFadyen  Russ Powell  Jonathan Withey
Tim Lade  Brent Quinton

Regrets:
Alan Knowles  Richard Pereschitz
Valla McLean  Ryan Roth

Presenters and Guests:
Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee
Margo Baptista, University Secretary
Daniel Braun, Curriculum Coordinator, Centre for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence
Paul Martin, Chair, Faculty Development Committee
Michelle Plouffe, Vice-President, General Counsel and Compliance Officer
Michael Roberts, Co-Chair, Research Council
Kevin Shufflebotham, Director, Office of the President
Tara Stieglitz, Co-Chair, Research Council

AGC Secretariat:
Kim Warkentine  Donna Harbeck (Scribe)  David Epp

1.0 CALL TO ORDER
The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

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

The following items were approved on the consent agenda:

- 2.1 AGC Open Meeting Minutes: November 25, 2014
- 2.2 AGC Special Session Minutes: December 11, 2014
- 2.4 AGC By-elections Report
- 2.5 Nominations Committee Report
- 2.6 Faculty Development Committee Annual Report 2013-2014

It was requested that the following Consent Agenda Item be discussed as part of the agenda, to which AGC consented:

- 2.3 Executive Committee Minutes: December 9, 2014

The Chair requested that Item 7.3.1 Research Council Revised Work Plan 2014-2015 be discussed after Item 5.1 Research Funding, to which AGC agreed.
Moved by M. Milner, seconded by P. Roccia to approve the agenda for January 20, 2015 and the items on the consent agenda, as amended. Carried

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

2.3 Executive Committee Minutes: December 9, 2014
D. Atkinson, Chair, Executive Committee, presented the Executive Committee minutes of December 9, 2014 for information. The following points arose during discussion:

- Regarding 6.5 Procedure for AGC Agenda Revisions: Clarification was requested regarding the 48-hour deadline for major changes to AGC agendas before distribution with the meeting package, except for an emergency. Who determines the definition of an emergency or major change? Will the procedure undermine AGC’s ability to make changes to or amend motions or make changes to the agenda?
  - D. Atkinson noted that the procedure addresses two items: the AGC agenda is circulated well in advance of the AGC meeting, providing the opportunity for AGC members to identify any major changes that should be added; and, it will enable the AGC Secretariat to manage the agenda efficiently by knowing if there is going to be a change to the agenda 48 hours in advance. That does not prevent discussion of a change at an AGC meeting, since AGC can discuss any topic by virtue of a majority vote.
  - It is not about curtailing discussion, it is a matter of attempting to run things in an effective way.
- What is a major change, and what is an emergency?
  - That will be defined in the draft procedures for AGC Agenda Revisions.
- Once the draft procedure for AGC Agenda Revisions is completed, it will be presented to AGC for approval.
- Regarding 6.1 AGC Draft Agenda: Will Executive Committee create a process for adopting the AGC agenda? Will that be Executive Committee’s decision?
  - AGC requested that Executive Committee discuss this topic further at an upcoming meeting.

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. The following points arose during discussion:

- Regarding 2015-16 Tuition and Service Fees: Is it common for universities to charge a fee for deferred final exams?
  - The Provost and Vice President Academic stated that it is typical for universities to charge such a fee.

4.0 REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT
David Atkinson, President of MacEwan University, reported on the following:

- The President noted that his January 2015 newsletter discussed the impact of the Provincial Government finances on the University budget.
- The new Centre for the Arts and Culture building project is underway. Construction of the above-ground structure is expected to begin by March.

4.1 MacEwan University Status Update: Business Case
Margo Baptista, University Secretary, presented the draft MacEwan University Status Business Case for recommendation to the Board of Governors for approval. The following points arose during discussion:

- Regarding Impacts and Risks: There is a sense that if there is no risk to the Ministry identified for not revising MacEwan University’s status, then that may give the Ministry a reason to not update MacEwan University’s status, as described in the Business Case.
- Regarding Alternatives: How would the University operationalize the responsibility of student discipline under a General Faculties Council?
  - It is enshrined in legislation that a General Faculties Council has authority over student discipline. The Board of Governors and AGC will need to decide the appropriate system (centralized or decentralized) if the status change is approved.
Regarding Alternatives: Are there any substantial differences in authority of the current Academic Governance Council (AGC) versus a General Faculties Council (GFC)?

- Currently, AGC’s authority is provided in a letter of permission from the Minister, and that authority can be rescinded at any time by the Minister. The Minister also must approve any recommended changes and has the authority to make changes himself. A GFC’s responsibility and authority is enshrined in the Post-secondary Learning Act.
- Changing to a GFC would allow the Institution to have a governance structure that is typical of universities.

Regarding Alternatives: Perhaps the Business Case could expand on why the other three options are not being pursued, in order to strengthen the request for the status change.

Regarding Cost Benefit Analysis: Will MacEwan University remain with the Local Authorities Pension Plan (LAPP) if the status change is approved?

- Yes, the University has explored alternatives and is requesting that it remain with the LAPP.

Regarding The Change: What are the advantages of adding a Senate and a Chancellor to the University?

- A Senate will allow deeper connection to the community, by providing better coordination of community engagement activities. Senates provide valuable insights into the community, about the perception of a university within the community, and identifies matters that a university should focus on.
- A Senate also provides another opportunity for faculty involvement in governance.
- MacEwan University and Mount Royal University are the only universities in Canada without a Chancellor. The University will determine how to operationalize the Chancellor’s role.

Should the University’s plan for future degrees also be included?

- No, the document refers to current degrees and those for which we have already applied, such as Social Work.

R. Taylor, Vice-President Academic, Students’ Association of MacEwan University (SAMU), reported that SAMU supports the Business Case.

Will AGC receive a copy of the final document for approval?

- AGC will receive the final version of the Business Case for information and will be informed of any substantive changes from the one presented at this meeting.

The Chair, on behalf of AGC, thanked M. Baptista and Kevin Shufflebotham, Director, Office of the President, for their work on the Business Case.

AGC-02-01-20-2015
Moved by A. Skye, seconded by T. Carter to recommend that the Board of Governors approve, and submit to the Minister, the Business Case supporting MacEwan University moving from Part 2 to Part 1 of the Post-secondary Learning Act, as described in Agenda Item 4.1.

Carried

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

5.0 REPORT OF THE PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT ACADEMIC

5.1 Research Funding

John Corlett, Provost and Vice President Academic (the Provost), provided an update on his November meeting with Vice-Presidents of Grants and Scholarships for Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), who provided advice on how MacEwan University can continue to evolve as a research institution. He noted that they were impressed by the University’s commitment to scholarship, research, and creative activity and suggested that MacEwan University should further develop the following areas within their grant applications in order to be competitive: ask the right research question; identify existing and develop new community involvement/partnerships to support research projects; and, foster and identify student involvement in research.
The Provost suggested that it would be advantageous for the University to first focus on developing deeper community involvement and partnerships, in order to be able to include that information in SSHRC and NSERC grant applications. As mentioned at the November 25, 2014 AGC meeting, the Office of Research Services will be developing processes to assist faculty and student grantees with finding reviewers for feedback, in order 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. The following points arose during discussion:

- What can faculty learn from those who have been successful in obtaining research grants?
  - The Provost noted that the Mathematics department has three NSERC grant holders. It would appear that those grant applications benefitted from having a small cohort of colleagues who understood the granting procedures and provided critical review of each application.
  - There is a need for more discussion on the research culture at the University. The Centre for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence will organize forums in order for past grant applicants to share their knowledge.
  - It was suggested that it would also be helpful for adjudicators to participate in the forums, in order to describe what the adjudicating committees are looking for.

- It may be beneficial for faculty new to research to first work as a co-investigator on a research project that has a lead investigator from another institution, in order to develop the necessary skills before applying for research grants as the lead investigator.

- J. Corlett noted that there is value in faculty collaborating with Research Services to ensure grant applications meet the standards required for consideration by the adjudicating committees of the granting agencies, in order for MacEwan University’s success rate to be as high as it can be. This may mean that some grant applications will not be supported by the Provost, because they do not represent the standard required for MacEwan University to be successful in obtaining the grant.

- It was suggested that the internal deadlines (e.g., for preparing the external funding form for grants six weeks in advance) do not seem reasonable. It seems like a one-size-fits-all approach.
  - The Provost cautioned that other universities should not be used as a model for grant application processes internal to MacEwan University. For example, in order to receive comments back from external reviewers to ensure submission by the grant deadline, the internal deadline is reasonable.

- One reviewer from outside the discipline is also required. Would it actually be useful to have an external reviewer with limited knowledge of Mathematics, for example, to review a grant application from the Mathematics department?
  - For most disciplines, having someone who is not a specialist in that area review a grant has some value in the granting process, because not every adjudicator will be an expert.
  - C. Monk, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science, reported that he had previously participated on a SSHRC adjudication panel for three years and agreed that the value of having a reviewer outside of the grant applicant’s discipline should not be underestimated.

**6.0 PRESENTATION**
**6.1 Policy Document Framework**

Michelle Plouffe, Vice-President, General Counsel and Compliance Officer, presented the revised draft Policy Document Framework for adoption and implementation, effective March 1, 2015. The following points arose during discussion:

- It was suggested that the Policy Sponsor appears to be a gatekeeper. How will it be ensured that the Policy Sponsor will not hold back a policy that they do not want to change?
  - Because the Policy Sponsor is ultimately responsible for a policy, they should not be put in a position where they have to sign off on a policy regardless of whether or not they agree with it.

- Regarding the first bullet on page 4 of the Executive Summary: “Internal Review Groups may include, for example, Faculty/School Councils, …”: C. Monk, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science, noted that the Institution seems reticent in acknowledging that approval may occur at multiple levels of a collegial governance structure. It appears to be getting away from the use of the word “approval” by subsidiary bodies, because the word “approval” seems to taken as always meaning “final approval”. He suggested, for example, that the first sentence at the top of page 3 of the Executive Summary be revised to: “The AGC will maintain all authority with respect to final approval of all Academic Policy Documents.” This would acknowledge that there are other bodies that review and approve items that
are then recommended for approval at the subsequent and more appropriate higher level. Other institutions use the phrase “approve and recommend” at the subsidiary body level. C. Monk expressed concern the Policy Document Framework Executive Summary goes further towards eroding the idea that other subsidiary bodies can approve, without it being final approval. For example, AGC no longer uses the term “endorse” nor “approves and recommends” when reviewing and approving items to be recommended to the Board of Governors for approval.

- M. Plouffe explained that the document is attempting to provide as much clarity and consistency across the University as possible; however, if the concept described by the Dean is used more widely on the academic side, it would be considered for the final version of the Policy Document Framework.
- M. Plouffe will update the definitions in the document to address C. Monk’s concern.
- Under the Hierarchy of documents, does employee code of conduct include faculty?
  - Yes, faculty are included under the employee code of conduct.
    - It was requested that mechanisms be in place for consultation with faculty on the development of such policies (e.g. regarding academic freedom, etc.)
    - M. Plouffe noted that an employee code of conduct is not yet developed, but acted as a placeholder in the document for all codes of conduct under development.
- What is the constitution of the President’s Policy Committee (PPC)?
  - PPC has the same composition as the President/Vice-President’s group. The role of PPC with administrative policies is comparable to the AGC Executive Committee’s role on the academic side.
- Will PAG have an opportunity to comment on all policies regardless of which stream they are in?
  - B. Quinton, Vice-President Finance and Administration, clarified that PAG would not have the opportunity to comment on policies in terms of content. PAG’s role is to ensure the correct process has been followed in the development of the policies (e.g. determine whether or not all stakeholders were consulted, etc.)
- Is the role of AGC Executive Committee to look at the content of academic policies?
  - Yes, AGC Executive Committee would recommend whether or not AGC should approve the policy based on its content. AGC could then decide that a policy should be referred back for revision.

AGC-03-01-20-2015
Moved by C. Hancock, seconded by T. Lade to approve the adoption and implementation of the Policy Document Framework, as summarized in the attached Executive Summary, effective March 1, 2015, as presented in Agenda Item 6.1.

Carried

7.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS

7.1 ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
7.1.1 Policy C2000: Subsequent Baccalaureate Credential
Mark Arnison, Chair, Academic Policies Committee (APC), presented revised policy C2000: Subsequent Baccalaureate Credential for approval. The following points arose during discussion:
- Regarding section 4.7: Why was section 4.7: “Students may hold no more than two degrees from the same baccalaureate program.” deleted from the policy?
  - APC felt that two was an arbitrary number and did not want to restrict the number of degrees.

AGC-04-01-20-2015
Moved by K. Heslop, seconded by D. Roy to approve the revisions to policy C2000: Subsequent Baccalaureate Credential, effective July 1, 2015, as recommended by Academic Policies Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 7.1.1.

Carried

Academic Governance Council Meeting Minutes: January 20, 2015
7.2 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
7.2.1 Work Plan 2014-2015
Paul Martin, Chair, Faculty Development Committee (FDC), presented the FDC Work Plan 2014-2015 for information. The following points arose during discussion:

- Regarding the first goal, second objective: Does creating a standalone Terms of Reference for FDC refer to removing the FDC Terms of Reference as an AGC committee from administrative policy D2090: Faculty Development?
  - Yes, FDC is attempting to separate its Terms of Reference from the policy.
- What is the timeframe for approval of the Terms of Reference?
  - FDC determined that the policy must first be approved before the Terms of Reference can be presented to AGC for approval. The policy is scheduled to be presented to Academic Policies Committee in February, with anticipated completion by June 2015.

7.3 RESEARCH COUNCIL
7.3.1 Revised Work Plan 2014-2015
[Scribe’s Note: As agreed during approval of the agenda, this item was discussed after 5.1 Research Funding.]

Michael Roberts and Tara Stieglitz, Co-Chairs, Research Council (RC), presented the RC Work Plan 2014-2015 for approval. Based on feedback from the October 28 and November 25, 2014 AGC meetings, the Work Plan was revised, and an Appendix was added to provide more information and clarification regarding the Strategic Research Fund. The following points arose during discussion:

- Research Council agreed to rename the fund Strategic Research Fund in order to align with the Integrated Research Plan.
- Regarding discussion at the October 28 AGC meeting regarding the two grant application deadlines: for the Strategic Research Fund, did Research Council reconsider the October deadline?
  - Research Council (RC) was informed by Research Services staff that there appears to be a perception that more grant applications are received in March than in October. There are no statistics to support that assertion.
  - The October deadline was originally implemented to allow new faculty the opportunity to apply for funding.
  - RC will continue to monitor the number of applications received for research funding for both deadline dates and report the statistics in their Annual Reports. If it seems like the October grant is undersubscribed, RC will make changes to the deadline date.
    - It was requested that RC also monitor feedback from new faculty on whether or not it is feasible for them to meet the October deadline.
- Regarding Eligibility: it states that the applicant must propose: “… an internal or external collaboration between a senior researcher and a new researcher…” How does RC define “senior” researcher?
  - RC would like to see one researcher on the team with an established research record, as outlined in their curriculum vitae, to address where are they in the project and where they are in this program of research.
- Are statistics provided in the RC Annual Report regarding how many applications were received and how many grants were awarded?
  - Yes, the Annual Report includes that information.
    [Scribe’s Note: The Research Council Annual Report 2013-2014 was approved at the October 28, 2014 AGC meeting.]
- Regarding the March 1 deadline for project and dissemination grants, do researchers still have to spend the grant money by the end of June of the same year?
  - No, RC has fixed that issue, and there is now an extended period of time in which to use up the funds.
Moved by N. James, seconded by D. McGugan to approve the revised Research Council Work Plan 2014-2015, as presented in Agenda Item 7.3.1.

Carried

7.4 ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE

7.4.1 Academic Curriculum Review Proposal

Daniel Braun, Curriculum Coordinator, Centre for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence (CAFÉ), on behalf of Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC), presented an academic curriculum review proposal for approval. He noted that the Academic Curriculum Review Proposal proposes a model of curriculum review that combines the best practices of Canadian post-secondary institutions with attention to the interests and needs of MacEwan University faculty members. Once approved by AGC, CAFÉ staff will begin working with those academic units that have already expressed interest in engaging in the proposed process, while also communicating with academic Chairs and Deans around the University to seek future collaborators. The following points arose during discussion:

- K. Heslop, AGC and APPC faculty member, commented that a very good consultative process occurred in development of this proposal. She appreciated the extent of the consultations and reflection of the feedback received.
- If academic curriculum review will not have a periodic review requirement like program reviews, and if it is not enshrined in policy, what is binding about this proposal as it is triggered by a Program Chair or faculty member to review their own curriculum? The proposal seems like a resource document rather than a binding process.
  - The document is not intended to be binding; rather, it is intended as a best practices document for use by departments to review their curriculum, with support available from the Centre for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence and Institutional Analysis and Planning.
- J. Corlett stated that it was felt that it would be useful if the academic curriculum review process was endorsed by AGC, to encourage academic reviews to be conducted consistently across the University by utilizing this best practices document. By having this document endorsed by AGC, it also assists faculty in knowing how to move forward.

The Chair, on behalf of AGC, thanked Daniel Braun for his work on the proposal.

Moved by J. Corlett, seconded by B. Pitruniak to approve the Academic Curriculum Review Proposal (December 2014), as recommended by Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 7.4.1.

Moved by A. Skye, seconded by K. Heslop to amend the motion by replacing the word “approve” with “endorse”.

Carried

AGC-06-01-20-2015

Moved by B. Pitruniak, seconded by J. Corlett to endorse the Academic Curriculum Review Proposal (December 2014), as recommended by Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, as presented in Agenda Item 7.4.1.

Carried

7.4.2 Statements of Intent for New Program Proposals

John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented a report regarding the Deans’ statements of intent for new program proposals, as aligned with the MacEwan University Integrated Strategic Plan, for discussion. The report was created with data provided by the Deans, following consultation about program development from the Faculty/School Councils, and provides listings of proposals for new academic programs and the creation of pathways that establish clear and transparent relationships among degree and diploma credentials. He noted the report had also been presented to the Board of Governors, who were impressed by the quality of the degree proposals. He emphasized that the
Academic Program Development 2014-2019 document is a living document, and the Board of Governors would likely consider other degree proposals that reflect similar thinking. The following points arose during discussion:

- The Art/Music Therapy stream is proposed under a Bachelor of Health Promotion degree, when it could also be included under the Bachelor of Fine Arts or Bachelor of Arts. How will it be determined under which Faculty/School a new degree or stream will reside?
  - The document does not recommend any structural assumptions around which Faculty/School would own the degrees. It could very well be included under more than one degree, and the easiest solution would be for students to initially be admitted concurrently into both degrees.

- J. Corlett noted that the proposed new degrees listed create a niche market for MacEwan University. Some degree proposals were not recommended by the Provost, especially if a similar degree was already offered at another university.

- Regarding Related Program Development Initiatives, third paragraph, second sentence: “All students will, by the end of our five-year strategic planning period, be admitted to degree programs only.” What happens if diploma or certificate programs cannot align with degrees?
  - The Provost stated that there needs to be a willingness to align the diplomas and certificates to degrees and it should be achievable. He is confident that the Deans and the Faculty/School Councils have the ability to resolve that issue. He clarified that the degree and the diploma or certificate programs must accommodate each other where there are difficult decisions to be made.

- Will the University be marketing the diploma streams to students at the degree level, rather than promoting the diploma stream?
  - What the University communicates will be very important. In the ISP, it is clear that degrees are the way the University is moving forward. It is important for the University to communicate that if a student is admitted to a degree, there may be an early exit point.

- The Provost reminded that MacEwan University is not abandoning its diploma and certificate programs in order to create degree structures. It is very important how this is communicated by recruiters through the marketing and communications strategy.

- What is the strategy for dealing with enrolment data if all students are admitted into degrees, but the majority choose the early exit option and it looks like withdrawals from the degrees?
  - While the question is important, it is not the intention of this document to address that.
  - The communications strategy and managing of enrolment data will be addressed in the fullness of time.

- Are consultations still occurring with Deans regarding proposing new degrees? What about plans that are not included in this document?
  - If there are still decisions to be made, the decisions of the Deans and Faculty/School Councils will need to be communicated to the Provost.

- When will the School of Continuing Education’s strategic plan be presented?
  - Heather McRae, Dean, School of Continuing Education, reported that she is currently working on the strategic plan. A School of Continuing Education Council is also being established. The strategic plan should be available by April 2015.

- The Provost noted that the proposed degrees need to be prioritized by the Provost and the Deans for the benefit of students. He also stated that if a degree is not included in the proposed degree list, it was the decision of the Provost, not the Deans, to exclude it.

7.4.3 Design Foundations Certificate Termination

John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented a proposal for termination of the Design Foundations Certificate program, effective July 1, 2015, for recommendation for approval by the Board of Governors. He noted that the suspension and termination of this credential happened as a result of the launching of the newly redesigned three-year Design Studies diploma, which is now currently on its second year of implementation. The approved program suspension came with a program termination target date of July 1, 2015.
Moved by D. Roy, seconded by R. Ginther to recommend to the Board of Governors approval of the program termination of the Design Foundations Certificate, effective July 1, 2015, as recommended by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (November 24, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 7.4.3.

Carried

7.4.4 Design Studies (Design and Exhibit Presentation; Design and Motion Image) Diploma Program Terminations

John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented a proposal for termination of the Design Studies (Design and Exhibit Presentation) and Design Studies (Design and Motion Image) diploma programs, effective July 1, 2015, for recommendation for approval by the Board of Governors. The suspension and proposed termination of these credentials happened as a result of the launching of the newly-redesigned three-year Design Studies diploma, which is now currently on its second year of implementation. The approved program suspension came with a program termination target date of July 1, 2015.

Moved by D. Roy, seconded by B. Richards to recommend to the Board of Governors the program terminations of the following diploma credentials: Design and Exhibit Presentation, as well as Design and Motion Image, effective July 1, 2015, as recommended by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (November 24, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 7.4.4.

Carried

7.4.5 Professional Writing Applied Degree Suspension Extension

John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented a recommendation to extend the suspension of the Bachelor of Applied Communications in Professional Writing (PROW) program to June 30, 2016, for recommendation for approval by the Board of Governors. He noted that the Ministry granted the suspension of the PROW applied degree on July 1, 2011, with an original termination date of June 30, 2015; however, there are still 14 students in various stages of completing the last requirement of the degree: Directed Workplace Learning.

Moved by D. Roy, seconded by A. Skye to extend suspension of the Bachelor of Applied Communications in Professional Writing for one additional year ending June 30, 2016, as recommended by Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (November 24, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 7.4.5.

Carried

(1 Abstention)

7.4.6 Professional Writing Diploma Program Termination

John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented a recommendation to terminate the Professional Writing diploma program, effective July 1, 2015, for recommendation for approval by the Board of Governors.

Moved by D. Roy, seconded by E. Elford to recommend to the Board of Governors the termination of the Professional Writing Diploma credential, effective July 1, 2015, as recommended by Academic Planning and Priorities (November 24, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 7.4.6.

Carried

(1 Abstention)

7.4.7 Disability Studies: Leadership and Community Program Suspension

John Corlett, Chair, Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, presented a recommendation to suspend the Disability Studies: Leadership and Community (DSLC) diploma program, effective immediately, for
approval. He noted that the DSLC program was initially suspended in Fall 2012 due to declining enrolment. The Program was then redesigned as a 35-credit diploma with the Special Needs Educational Assistant Program (30-credit certificate) as admission into this diploma. The first intake of the redesigned 35-credit diploma was offered in Fall 2013. A suspension of this redesigned program is now sought.

AGC-11-01-20-2015
Moved by D. McGugan, seconded by K. Heslop to approve the suspension of the Disability Studies: Leadership and Community Diploma Program, effective immediately, as recommended by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (December 9, 2014), as presented in Agenda Item 7.4.7. Carried

8.0 QUESTION PERIOD
No questions were raised.

9.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS/NEXT MEETINGS – March 17, 2015
The next meeting of AGC is scheduled for March 17, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m. in Room 9-102 City Centre Campus. AGC agreed that the February 24, 2015 contingency meeting was not required.

10.0 The meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Approved by Academic Governance Council
March 17, 2015 (motion AGC-01-03-17-2015)