



UNIVERSITY OF
CALGARY

General Faculties Council
ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE
Minutes for Approval

Meeting #124
October 19, 2020, 2:00 p.m.

By Zoom platform

Voting Members

Dru Marshall, Co-Chair
Tara Beattie, Academic Co-Chair
Elena Braverman
Nicole Culos-Reed
Andy Knight
Tanille Shandro
Amy Warren – arrived during Item 2
Barry Wylant

Regrets

Frank Finley
David Stewart
Penny Werthner

Non-Voting Members

Violet Baron
Florentine Strzelczyk
Melanie Zimmer

Secretary

Susan Belcher

Scribe

Jaclyn Carter

Staff

Elizabeth Sjogren

Guests

Deborah Book, Legal Counsel – present for Item 5
Richard Sigurdson, Dean, Faculty of Arts – present for Item 6

Observers

Christine Johns, Senior Director (Academic & International Strategies)

The Co-Chair called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m. and confirmed quorum.

1. Approval of the Agenda

Moved/Seconded

That the Agenda for the October 19, 2020 Academic Planning and Priorities Committee meeting be approved.

Carried

2. Remarks of the Co-Chair and Academic Co-Chair

The Co-Chair included the following in her remarks:

- An update on the York University (York) legal case regarding copyright. It was explained that over the summer, the courts ruled in favour of York regarding the mandatory nature of the tariff that Access Copyright (AC) charges, and in favour of AC in terms of how fair-dealing guidelines are interpreted. The Co-Chair noted that both parties have appealed these decisions, and last week the Supreme Court agreed to hear both appeals, though a hearing date has not yet been set.
- An update on the Alberta universities System Review, noting that it is expected that McKinsey & Company will have a report prepared by December, if not earlier. The Co-Chair explained that ongoing discussions are important for determining the University's budget and forward direction, as well as how much institutional autonomy Alberta universities will be afforded in the future.
- An update on the preparation of the 2021-2022 University budget, noting that discussions with students regarding a proposed tuition increase have begun. The Co-Chair reminded the Committee members that the University is in the second year of a three-year window where tuition increases are permitted.

The Academic Co-Chair noted that the Growth Through Focus (GTF) Plan was presented at a Town Hall last week, and highlighted the opportunity to provide feedback through the GTF website.

In response to a comment, the Co-Chair encouraged Committee members to contact the Provost's Office directly with any concerns about the online delivery of courses, and highlighted the importance of providing feedback to Faculties to ensure students are receiving the best education possible. The Co-Chair acknowledged those faculty members working hard to ensure that students have a great experience.

3. Approval of the September 28, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda.

Moved/Seconded

That the Minutes of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee meeting held on September 28, 2020 be approved.

Carried

4. Approval of the 2020-2021 Academic Program Subcommittee Work Plan

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda. The Co-Chair and Academic Co-Chair presented this item.

The proponents explained that the Academic Program Subcommittee (APS) reviews and recommends the approval of undergraduate programs to the APPC, and that the work plan presents a straightforward plan for the 2020-2021 meeting year. It is expected that the APS and Graduate Academic Program Subcommittee (GAPS) will see an increase in volume of proposals in the new year as the University actualizes elements of the GTF, which includes modularization of credentials.

Moved/Seconded

That the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee approve the Academic Program Subcommittee Work Plan for the 2020-2021 academic year, in the form provided to the Committee.

Carried

5. Revisions to the Sexual Violence Policy

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda. Deborah Book presented this item.

Highlights:

- The Co-Chair reported that revisions to the Sexual Violence Policy (the Policy) were recommended by the General Faculties Council (GFC) in June. It was explained that, following GFC, the revisions were brought to the Board of Governors, where undergraduate students expressed concern about some elements of the Policy, that these students and the Vice-Provost (Equity, Diversity and Inclusion) were consulted following this meeting, and that the concerns raised have been addressed in this new iteration of the Policy.
- The proponent provided an overview of the revisions, noting a change to the title, clarification of the Policy's philosophical underpinnings, and the shift in language away from "alleged" and "allegation"
- In response to questions, it was explained that:
 - W. A. Ranches is considered to be a facility rather than a field station, and that a building's categorization as a facility or field station is driven by the legal status of the property in question
 - The Task Force on Relationships worked to refine a statement on relationships that addresses power differentials, and the Policy's discussion of consent does address abuses of power. It was noted that there is more work to be done in this area, as the faculty-student relationship is not the only hierarchical relationship where a power differential exists.
 - The shift away from the terms "alleged" and "allegation" addresses the concern that this language suggests a foregone conclusion, and the presenter noted that terms like "report" provide impartiality. The Co-Chair noted that it is important not to re-traumatize victim-survivors through the reporting process.
 - Section 4.13 outlines best practices for keeping parties informed on the progress of an investigation. The presenter noted that there can be exceptions, and that parties will be told whether reports of sexual and gender-based violence are substantiated or unsubstantiated. The Co-Chair noted that this section of the Policy aims to improve on previous reporting standards, which were deemed too minimal.
- The Committee discussed the Graduate Students' Association's (GSA) contributions to the Policy, and it was noted that the GSA conducted a student survey and examined policies at other U15 institutions to compile a report, which was reviewed with the proponent
- The Committee provided suggested grammatical corrections under sections 3 c) and 3 v)

6. Quality Assurance Mid-Term Unit Review Report for the Faculty of Arts

Documentation for this item was circulated with the Agenda. The Co-Chair and Richard Sigurdson presented this

item.

Highlights:

- The Co-Chair provided an overview of the quality assurance (QA) review process and explained that reviews occur every five to seven years and include a self-study, a review conducted by internal and external reviewers, a report with reviewer recommendations and the unit's responses, and a final public report. The Co-Chair noted that at the mid-point, the Dean of the Faculty is invited to report on the progress made to respond to the recommendations of reviewers.
- The Co-Chair reminded Committee that the Faculty of Arts was formed by the amalgamation of four Faculties in 2010, and that the Faculty has spent the last decade developing its identity as a single unit. It was noted that the Faculty of Arts received a large number of recommendations from the reviewers, and that the Faculty has worked to identify key areas for growth from these recommendations.
- The presenters reported on the progress made on the Faculty of Arts recommendations since its 2018 Unit Review, highlighting that a last-minute change resulted in a shift in the membership of the review team that was assembled with balance in mind, that the size of the Faculty made it more difficult for reviewers to compile a clear set of recommendations, and that a total of 65 recommendations were made
- The Committee discussed the recommendations and actions, in particular:
 - It was noted that the reviewers did not provide high-level, strategic feedback to guide the forward direction of the Faculty, but rather focused on the operational elements of the Faculty, that some recommendations made were outside the control of the Faculty, and that the Faculty is not in a position to act on some of the recommendations regarding staffing changes
 - The Faculty has done a great job of transforming the numerous recommendations into a coherent and useful document
 - The Faculty has moved forward with streamlining processes in the Dean's Office and providing support to faculty members and Department Heads, as well as following the recommendation to increase staffing in the Arts' Student Centre to enhance student experience
 - The nature of interdisciplinary programs and their leadership, and why these leaders are not included on the Dean's Advisory Council
 - The Faculty's efforts to improve its recognition of staff members through an increased number of awards for excellence
 - Why funds from retiring or leaving faculty members are redirected to the Provost's Office for reallocation and how this fits into a larger strategic planning process for how the faculty complement will grow or contract. It was noted that the Faculty recently analyzed the ratio of academic and support staff and added more staff members in areas like student advising, but changes to the University budget have affected the Faculty's ability to maintain these changes.
 - The Faculty's and the University's commitment to responding to issues of equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) in a diligent and safe manner

7. Approved 2020-2021 Academic Planning and Priorities Work Plan

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

8. Calendar and Curriculum Subcommittee Reports for the June 5, 2020, August 10, 2020, September 16, 2020 and September 25, 2020 Meetings

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

9. Academic Program Subcommittee Report for the October 5, 2020 Meeting

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

10. Status of Program Approvals Report

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

11. Other Business

There was no other business.

12. Adjournment

Moved/Seconded

That the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee adjourn the October 19, 2020 meeting.

Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

Susan Belcher
University Secretary