



GENERAL FACULTIES COUNCIL
Approved Minutes

Meeting #587

Thursday, January 17, 2019, 1:30 p.m.

Science Theatre 147

Voting Members

E. McCauley, Chair	A. Estefan	D. Moynaugh	I. Rontu
D. Marshall, Vice-Chair	E. Favaro	A. Murray	W. Rosehart
B. Adams	M. Gavrilova	S. Nazir	A. Saweczko
O. Alp	M. Gillies	G. Nelson	J. Sieppert
S. Barker	P. Gimby	M. O'Brien	D. Sinasac
M. Bauer	W. Hartwell	B. Paris	B. Singh
T. Beattie	D. Hodgins	N. Peters	D. Slater
B. Becker	I. Holloway	R. Peters	D. Sumara
J. Bergerson	M. Hynes	J. Pieper	A. Timm
I. Brodie	M. Iskander	Q. Pittman	T. Tombe
J. Brown	F. Jalilehvand	L. Radtke	J. Towers
E. Burgess	D. Kenyon	S. Raj	H. Warsame
M. Chin	J. Kortbeek	R. Ramdhaney	J. Watson Hamilton
J. Cobb	S. LeBlanc	L. Reid	S. Weaver
L. Dalgetty	J. Lock	M. Reid	P. Werthner
S. Davidson	K. Lukowiak	J. Revington	M. Whelan
J. Dewald	M. Lysack	L. Rigg	B. Wylant
R. Ellaway	B. Maini	P. Rogers	L. Young
J. Ellis	J. Meddings	M.J. Romaniuk	

Guests

D. Book, Legal Counsel – present for Items 9 and 10
J. Foster, Executive Director, Hunter Hub for Entrepreneurial Thinking – present for Item 11
K. Grant, Educational Development Consultant, Taylor Institute – present for Item 8
C. Johns, Senior Director - Academic and International Strategies – present for Item 7

Observers

S. Ally, Policy Analyst, Students' Union
K. Jackson, General Counsel
M. Hart, Vice-Provost (Indigenous Engagement)
C. McVie, Provost's office
S. Miller, Faculty Association
J. Ruwanpura, Vice-Provost (International)

Secretary

S. Belcher

Scribe

E. Sjogren

The Chair called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. and confirmed quorum.

1. Conflict of Interest Declaration

No conflicts were declared.

2. Remarks of the Chair

The Chair included the following in his remarks:

- Members were welcomed and thanked for their support during this time of presidential transition
- Lisa Young, Dean and Vice-Provost, Graduate Studies, was acknowledged on this occasion of her last General Faculties Council (GFC) meeting
- Consultations are occurring with representatives of the provincial government, including Marlon Schmidt, Minister of Advanced Education, regarding post-secondary funding and budgeting
- Meetings are occurring with Naheed Nenshi, Mayor, and Jeff Fielding, City Manager, regarding how development plans for the City can include the University
- The University is maintaining awareness of international issues, and is working with Global Affairs to ensure that activities, such as student travel to China, are being handled in a proper manner

3. Remarks of the Vice-Chair

The Vice-Chair included the following in her remarks:

- In response to the recent diplomatic machinations relating to the detention of the Huawei chief financial officer, the University has instituted an “extreme risk” rating for travel to China. Undergraduate students are not permitted to travel to China at this time, and graduate students and academic staff may travel for University business under certain conditions. Chinese nationals can continue to travel as they wish. Members of the campus community are encouraged to consult the University’s Risk Management website for information.
- *Bill 19: An Act to Improve the Affordability and Accessibility of Post-Secondary Education*, was passed by the provincial government in late December 2018. The Act includes a cap on increases to domestic student tuition by tying this to inflation, regulation of international student tuition and mandatory non-instructional fees, and gives student unions a veto on any mandatory non-instructional fees. Meetings with representatives of the Ministry of Advanced Education are taking place, as the University works to understand the Act and address concerns.
- The University’s budget roll-up meeting was held on December 10, 2018, at which decisions were made regarding budget allocations. As there may be an early provincial election, approval of the provincial budget may be delayed and the University will be prepared to make adjustments to its budget as necessary.
- The province’s Talent Advisory Council on Technology (TACT) has submitted its recommendations to the government. The recommendations relate to increasing access to a variety of technology-related educational programs, and the University is well positioned to apply for some of this funding.

4. Question Period

There were no questions.

5. Safety Moment

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda. Linda Dalgetty, Vice-President (Finance and Services), provided an overview of the “Partners in Injury Reduction” report.

In response to a question, the presenter reported that a more detailed graph of the ‘monthly lost time injury frequency rate’ can be provided.

6. Approval of the December 6, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda. One revision to the minutes was reported.

Moved/Seconded

That the Minutes of the General Faculties Council meeting held on December 6, 2018 be approved, with the reported amendment.

Carried**7. Approval of the New Quality Assurance Academic Unit Review Handbook**

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda. Dru Marshall, Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and Christine Johns, Senior Director, Academic and International Strategies, presented this item.

Highlights:

- The proponents provided an overview of the history of the Quality Assurance (QA) monitoring process, and reported that a recent Quality Assurance Process Audit by the Campus Alberta Quality Council has resulted in some recommendations for changes to the academic unit review process. These proposed changes include better alignment of the unit review process with the curriculum and accreditation review processes, providing greater guidance for unit review teams, exploring innovations in the measurement of teaching quality, and initiating mid-term cycle reports. The document has also been reformatted for clarity.
- In response to questions, the proponents reported that:
 - A QA unit review considers broad elements such as a unit’s organizational structure, budget, programs, and student complement, a QA curriculum review looks into a unit’s programs in greater detail, and an accreditation review is an external review of a specialised program to ensure standards are being met. Unit, curriculum, and accreditation reviews can inform each other but may need to be conducted separately depending on a unit’s needs. The proponents indicated that they would clarify in the document how the various review types relate to each other.
 - If the recommendations following an accreditation review were ever to contradict the recommendations following a QA review, the Provost, Dean and review team would meet to address these contradictions and ensure that accreditation would not be compromised
 - The public unit review report is submitted to GFC’s Academic Planning and Priorities Committee for feedback, and can be made available upon request. The proponents

reported that consideration would be given to posting the public unit review reports on the Provost's website.

- It was suggested that "experiential learning" be clarified, and that the spelling of "interdisciplinarity" be corrected

Moved/Seconded

That the General Faculties Council (GFC) approve the new Quality Assurance Academic Unit Review Handbook, in the form provided to the GFC, and as recommended by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, with the suggested amendments.

Carried**8. Approval of the New Quality Assurance Curriculum Review Handbook**

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda. Dru Marshall, Leslie Reid, Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning), and Kim Grant, Educational Development Consultant, Taylor Institute for Teaching and Learning, presented this item.

Highlights

- The proponents reviewed the proposed changes to the curriculum review process, including that interim and final reports will be submitted to GFC's Teaching and Learning Committee for discussion, that student consultation will be embedded in the process, and that a review team will manage the process. The document has also been reformatted for clarity.
- The proponents emphasised that the interim report is intended to track that action identified after a curriculum review is being undertaken
- In response to questions, the proponents reported that:
 - The scholarship of teaching and learning is not specifically mentioned in the curriculum review handbook, but it is expected that consideration of practices will be part of a review. The proponents indicated that they would consider adding reference to evidence-based scholarship of teaching and learning to the document.
 - It is expected that an instructor will ensure that their courses are current, meaningful and relevant
 - All Faculties were consulted on the proposed changes to the curriculum review process
 - Units are encouraged to set metrics as part of their curriculum review action plan, and if appropriate for their unit, to map expected graduate attributes and skills
- It was suggested that this document should also describe the relationships between unit, curriculum, and accreditation reviews, that reference to establishing metrics should be added to the document, and that effort should be made to ensure that persons at all of the University's campuses are aware of the supports offered by the Taylor Institute
- Discussion included that it would be beneficial to study how enhancements to teaching and learning approaches and practices benefit student learning, and that this would inform the curriculum review process, but that study of this nature is labour intensive and would require resources. It was observed that the University Teaching and Learning Grants could support this type of study, and the proponents noted that a new stream in the grants program specifically for curriculum review-related study of teaching could be considered.

Moved/Seconded

That the General Faculties Council (GFC) approve the new Quality Assurance Curriculum Review Handbook, in the form provided to the GFC, and as recommended by the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, with the suggested amendments.

Carried**9. Student Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure**

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda. Susan Barker, Vice-Provost (Student Experience), and Deborah Book, Legal Counsel, presented this item.

Highlights:

- The proponents reported that existing Calendar Regulations are being transformed into a policy and associated procedure. Once the policy and procedure are approved, educational materials will be developed and training sessions for faculty and students will be offered.
- In response to questions, the proponents reported that:
 - The policy only applies to the conduct of students
 - The reference to “First Nations, Inuit, and Métis Peoples” in the Purpose section is not meant to single out a particular group, and this wording will be reviewed
 - Applicants are not yet students of the University and so the policy will not apply to applicants’ conduct
 - A Dean may delegate some or all of their responsibilities under the procedure, such as conducting an investigation at the Department level
 - Whether an instructor needs to be further engaged in the academic misconduct process will be determined on a case by case basis, and a student must be kept informed at all times regarding who is being involved in the process. The proponents indicated that they will clarify this in the document.
 - The statement in clause 4.4 of the policy that “Instructors will confirm expected behaviour during academic assessments administered in their courses” is not meant to imply that an instructor must invigilate an exam, but it is meant to ensure that the same standard of behaviour by students is expected for all forms of assessment. The proponents indicated that they would consider rewording this for clarity.
 - The procedure now allows up to 30 business days for a Faculty to produce a decision letter because some Faculties have indicated that they cannot complete the process in five business days. It was suggested that the proponents reconsider this change, as the mental health and wellbeing of students should be considered and six weeks to receive a decision letter could put tremendous strain on a student.
 - An instructor cannot appeal a decision made under this policy
 - Restrictions on the recording of lectures by students are not covered in this policy, and this will continue to be in the Calendar Regulations for the time being
- Discussion included an expression of concern about the tone of the policy, which introduces a written warning, educational seminars, and reflection as responses to academic misconduct, and

that it does not incorporate the current Calendar language that “plagiarism is an extremely serious academic offence”. The proponents noted that the educational materials accompanying the approved policy will emphasise the seriousness of academic misconduct, and that the University is striving to promote a culture of academic integrity.

- The proponents requested that any additional feedback be sent directly to Deborah Book. The policy and procedure will return to the GFC at a future meeting for approval.

10. Revisions to the Graduate Student Supervision Policy and Procedure

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda. Lisa Young, Dean and Vice-Provost (Graduate Studies), Robin Yates, Senior Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, and Deborah Book presented this item.

Highlights:

- The proponents reviewed the history of the Graduate Student Supervision Policy and related Procedure for the Formal Evaluation of Graduate Supervisory Privileges, and reported that these are being revised primarily to add clarity
- In response to questions, the proponents reported that:
 - The Collective Agreement with the Faculty Association includes definitions for “academic staff member” and “Board appointee”. The policy provides that an emeritus faculty professor or an adjunct or clinical appointee may serve as a co-supervisor on a case by case basis.
 - Clause 4.16 of the policy states that a supervisor is making a commitment to a student for the duration of their program, and clause 4.17 of the policy sets out that a formal process must be followed if a student is not progressing. It was suggested that this section could include provision for a supervisor to withdraw commitment to supervise rather than only providing for the requirement that the student withdraw for failure to maintain progress.
 - They will consider a supervisor’s obligations towards a student who is on medical leave
- The proponents requested that any additional feedback be sent directly to Deborah Book. The policy and procedure will return to the GFC at a future meeting for approval.

11. Hunter Hub for Entrepreneurial Thinking Update

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda. Joelle Foster, Executive Director, Hunter Hub for Entrepreneurial Thinking, presented this item.

Highlights:

- The presenter reviewed the role of the Hunter Hub for Entrepreneurial Thinking, and highlighted a number of initiatives including a speaker series, workshops, experiential learning programs, the hosting of competitions and other events, and promoting partnerships
- The presenter reported that the Hunter Hub for Entrepreneurial Thinking will be housed in the MacKimmie Block once it is completed, and that there are plans to expand the Hunter Hub for Entrepreneurial Thinking to create national and international partnerships

- In response to questions, it was reported that:
 - The names of the External Advisory Board members will be made public, as will the names of the Entrepreneur-in-Residence recipients
 - The Hunter Hub for Entrepreneurial Thinking feeds into the Creative Destruction Lab - Rockies and Innovate Calgary
 - The Hunter Hub for Entrepreneurial Thinking is working towards embedding entrepreneurial thinking into the Alberta K-12 curriculum, and will achieve this in part by connecting people

12. Standing Reports

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda, for information only:

- a) Report on the December 18, 2018 GFC Executive Committee Meeting
- b) Report on the December 17, 2018 Academic Planning and Priorities Committee Meeting
- c) Report on the December 11, 2018 Research and Scholarship Committee Meeting
- d) Report on the December 13, 2018 Teaching and Learning Committee Meeting
- e) Report on the December 6, 2018 Senate Meeting
- f) Report on the December 14, 2018 Board of Governors Meeting
- g) Policy Development Update

There were no questions.

13. GFC Student Academic Appeals Committee July 2017-December 2018 Report

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda, for information only.

There were no questions.

14. Other Business

There was no other business.

15. Adjournment

Moved/Seconded

That the General Faculties Council adjourn the January 17, 2019 meeting.
--

Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 3:11 p.m.