Arts and Science Faculty Council

Minutes of Council

Meeting #: 25
Date: Wednesday, February 8, 2017
Time: 4:00 p.m.
Location: Room 5-142 (CN Theatre)
Initial Motion #: 225

Present:
Monk, C (Chair)  Deline, T  Jeffrey, L  Norrad, T for M.
Snefjella, B  Digdon, N  Jyoti, R  Sekulic
(Secretary)  Eberhart, J  Knos, R  Ohki, T
Aaquist, O  Einarsson, R  Lawry-Batty, K  Olchowy-
Bailey, C  Elliott, C  Lee, R  Rozeboom, G
Beauclair, A  Falconer, R  Lepp, R  Overend, A
Bernstein, N  Farvolden, P  Llano, J  Panasiuk, E
Bica, I  Franczak, B  Lorimer, S  Panjvani, C
Blatz, C  Franke, E  Lorkovic, E  Penney, A
Braun, D  Friesen, K  MacDonald, C  Pienkowski, A
Brouwer, D  Furze, M  Mark, M  Pollard, M
Buro, K  Gelmini, L  McFadyen, D  Pollock, C
Cartledge, S  Grewal, S  McGugan, D  Powell, R
Christensen-  Hackett, E  McKeeown, N  Prince, P
Dalsgaard, K  Hohn, T  McLaughlin, D  Robinson, J
Copland, S  Honey, L  McMann, D  Ruiz Serrano, C
Corrigall, K  Howell, A  Mewhort, R  Sander, B
Couthard, R  Hu, R  Minaker, J  Sayed, A
Das, M  Indratmo  Moon, S  Schalomon, M
Davis, J  Irwin, B  Nelund, A  Shulist, S
De Graaf, J  Islam, S  Norman, J  Skeffington, J

Members of the
Public

Regrets:
Angus, F  Degner, M  McKenzie, H  Schmaltz, R  Toth, J
Beke, N  Flaherty, L  Mensah, C  Seredycz, M  Vongpaisal, T
Bereska, T  Gulayets, M  Mills, S  Shaw, R  Walton, E
Boers, N  Hills, M  O’Connor, J  Sibley, L  Wiznura, R
Cameron, K  Jarick, M  Osborn, T  Sinclair, K  Youzwyshyn, G
Davies, K  Krys, S  Peace, K  Skye, A
Davis, M  Lakowski, R  Pulpampu, K  Smith, M
Dawson, L  Legge, E  Ravagnolo, K  Su, W

Move into Session: The meeting was called to order by Craig Monk at 4:00 pm
Adoption of Agenda

Motion # 225
Move that the Agenda be approved as amended (correction of date).
Motion: carried

Approval of Minutes of Faculty Council #24, December 6, 2016

Motion #226
Move to approve the Minutes of Faculty Council #24 December 6, 2016 as amended (correction to attendance).
Motion: carried

Items Arising from the Minutes

- None

Dean’s Report

- Regretfully, Richard Haigh, who taught in Sociology, has passed away.
- Please note recent University directive regarding travel to or through the US.
- The review of some 165 performance evaluations will be complete by February 15. There are 17 meritorious colleagues, and funds from the Faculty’s carry forward will cover the $50,000 needed for awards. The main issues this year, were Type 1 faculty not clearly demonstrating a scholarly plan, and Type 3 faculty not documenting effective teaching.
- Regarding Faculty Governance, there have been a couple of issues where members have made suggestions that go against the Collective Agreement. Please be mindful, of where/how issues are governed.
- The search for the new president is ongoing. The opportunity has attracted high quality candidates who understand our BASI mandate.
- Regarding institutional governance, the Board has moved to delegate responsibility as best it can under our mandate, but unfilled Board positions are impacting the conduct of business.
- We are still awaiting information from this year’s Budget Advisory Committee process about our requests.
- Negotiations between the Faculty Association and the University have started. I am the lead negotiator for University. I have an ongoing duty to you, but will have to be mindful in balancing transparency about faculty business with the confidentiality of bargaining positions.
- AGC has changed it’s nomination process for standing committee. The Nominations Committee has been dissolved, so that nominations are through an open process.
- We have five recruitment processes just finished, or ongoing. Dr. Jeff Davis has been appointed for Engineering and Dr. Erin Cowling will be joining the Department of Humanities, to teach Spanish. All eight of Arts and Science’s Sabbatical applications have been approved.
- Three Chair appointment committees will meet this term, in Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Computer Sciences.
- There will be reappointment processes for Dr. Ed Lorkovic, Humanities; and, for Dr. Melike Schalom, Associate Dean, Administration.
- The Faculty level Appointment Review and Promotion Committee will hear the last four promotion cases in the next couple of weeks. Final recommendations from University Promotion Committee will take place in March and April, and we will announce promotions effective July 1 at the first Faculty Council next fall.
- The Physical Sciences major was brought to Faculty Council in December but was withdrawn in order to make some corrections. There is some additional
unforeseen work required. It will return to Council in fall 2017.

- In March, vacation hours will be removed from PeopleSoft. Faculty members should manage their own vacation schedules.
- Arts and Science convocation is during the last day of ceremonies, on June 22.
- A reminder, this Council can discuss any matter that members wish to bring forward, by contacting Executive Committee to Faculty Council.
- Question: regarding performance evaluation, are there any plans to publish who is meritorious for transparency? (for example, if the Chair recommends one thing, and Dean finds another).
- Answer: no. The Dean must tell the member and Chair their finding, but there’s an intermediate step where the member can talk with Chairs about it. Promotion is a different process. It was a conscious decision to not have detailed promotion standards so there is flexibility and reliance on the Committee to make the recommendation. The intent is that people become more comfortable with people outside their field reviewing and making decisions. In performance evaluation, this requires check-ins with people and allowing for feedback, and communication with Chairs as well. Performance Evaluation is an unfunded program here, unlike other places. All evaluations are a conversation back and forth.

**Item V**

**Items for Discussion**

a) Presentation - Dr. Nancy McKeown - Institutional Learning Outcomes (Encl. 2)

- Dr. McKeown presented on behalf of the ILO Working Group draft outcomes for discussion and feedback. The Working Group was struck by APPC to work on the co-curricular record and ILOs.
- The ILOs are being widely consulted in different venues to make sure they reflect MacEwan. As framed, they build on the pillars, and are intended to capture the experience students will get at MacEwan and what they will take away. They are intended to be relevant across programs.

**Questions/Comments**

- Have you consulted students yet? (Not yet). The ILOs are great, see them as aspirational, but hope students would see themselves and be able to describe themselves.
- Surprised there isn’t an ILO about the ability to write. A: there is one on communication, it was intentionally stated broadly so as to not be restrictive. But agree, writing is important.
- The document says ILOs won’t have an effect on program outcomes, why is this? Normally we think of this as built at the institutional level, and then filtering down to programs. A: it was framed this way out of caution, as we didn’t want to imply any program changes would be required based on this document.
- These will have an impact - we thought the pillars would not have impact, and now they’re used to measure. It is likely the ILOs will impact programs over time - and that should be the goal. ILOs need to be measurable to be successful. Once they are established, they won’t be changed again in six months.
- Regarding institution wide outcomes, in what way can you measure them? A: the implementation of ILOs is currently out of scope for the Working Group, however, the final report may include recommendations on this. Some potential ideas include using existing data. Response: would IAP take on the work of evaluating these? They may be unmeasurable.
- How does this relate to academic freedom? If you craft this, How does that fit how individual professors craft their courses?
At what level does the idea of sustainability need to be addressed if it is added? Agree that eventually they would have impact, like the pillars have. While it might not be integrated in detail, they might effect to the degree that one might have to demonstrate how a course meets the ILOs, but I feel it would lead to major conflict. Will perhaps affect Deans and Chairs maybe at program level. Agree ILOs are best used best where they are descriptive and informative so students understand at high level what they get from a degree. But they should be derived from the bottom up. Programs shouldn’t change due to them, and we (faculty) have mechanisms to fight this. (Nancy) The hope is that the ILOs will be assessed, but it’s not clear how. These will ladder up to provide university-wide guideline, but we have nothing that says that now. Could see potential conflict with academic freedom, for example when a teaching and research agenda conflict. There might be values for example, that don’t align with one’s disciplinary perspective. Anti-globalists, for example, might not fit. Potential to bring the final draft back for endorsement by Council. (Nancy) Please take time to look them over, and send comments to Kim Warkentine and take into consideration by **February 24**.

**Item VI**

**Items for Information**

**a)** *Arts & Science Budget Advisory Committee submission*

- Craig Monk provided an overview of the Arts and Science submission to the Budget Advisory Committee. Arts and Science requested approximately 40% of the available funds, in proportion to our size within the institution. The presentation provided an overview of salary spending, and a proportional breakdown by discipline of continuing and sessional faculty. Growing class sizes to meet budget requirements has meant more sessionals are needed, which in turn has made the continuing-to-sessional teaching ratio worse. In terms of discretionary spending in the Faculty, ¾ of it is in the departments, managed by Chairs. Arts and Science has a lean budget, the budget presentation illustrates how challenging it would be to cut anything. Unfortunately, Academic Affairs effectively must compete with non-academic areas for money. The Budget Advisory Committee presentation included a sample proposal, for discussion, on how much it would cost to implement eight Research Chairs in-line with MacEwan’s mandate (about $800,000 as proposed). Question: there seems to be an ongoing financial struggle but trouble changing the model (i.e. tuition does not translate into money in operations). Is there resistance at senior levels to take approaches like e-learning? Answer: No there isn’t resistance to e-Learning. The Faculty supports the development of e-campus courses. On the main issue of financial allocation - one upside to the approach here is that Faculties and Schools don’t need to be as competitive amongst each other. On the other side, a basic problem is that there is not “zero-based” budgeting at the institutional level. Non-academic areas are not asked what they would do if there was a reduction as the Faculties and Schools are. There’s less incentive to be efficient on the non-academic side.
b) **Budget Update** (Josh Eberhard)
   - A brief overview of the current budget picture was provided. The most important note is that the Faculty is projected to overspend significantly on sessional hiring.
   - Question: is the overspending on sessionals over the whole year?
   - Answer: it appears to be in the spring and summer terms. Also, last year, the way it was budgeted had several positions in “other instructional” which won’t be accounted for the same way this year.

c) **AGC Update – New Elections Process** (Bronwyn Snefjella)
   - AGC Executive has revised the nominations process for AGC Standing Committees, so that it is a much simpler process. The intent is that members will have more opportunity to participate.
   - Changes include the removal of the requirement for three supporting signatures, a simplified nominations form, and no need for biographies.
   - These changes are effective this year, and AGC standing committee nominations will take place February 27 to March 16.

d) **Minutes Executive Committee #15**
   - No comments.

**Item VII**  
**Other Business**
   - Update on Student Research Day: posters are being being put up now, to encourage student registration. The important thing for Faculty to know is that any student who wants to participate - honours, independent studies, USRI, student Research Assistants, etc., all need to register. February 27 is the deadline. It’s estimated there may be up 150 participants - split between presentations and posters. Please spread the word.
   - Question: will students be judged?
   - Answer: no, it won’t be the same as Research Week, which has been discontinued and rolled in to this event. It’s too difficult to coordinate judging unless a single department wants to do all theirs.
   - An email went to Chairs with a link to forms and general information.

**Item VIII**  
**Motion #227**  
Move that the Faculty Council adjourn.  
Honey/Skeffington  
Motion: **carried**

**Item IX**  
**Question Period** – Not minuted

Future meeting dates: April 26, 2016 at 2:30pm