UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

General Faculties Council
ACADEMIC PLANNING AND PRIORITIES COMMITTEE
APPROVED MINUTES

September 25, 2023, 2:00 - 4:00 pm   AD 167 (Governors Boardroom)

Voting Members
Robin Yates (Co-Chair)
Dawn Johnston (Academic Co-Chair)
Marjan Eggermont*
Cydnee Seneviratne
Barbara Brown
Sheri Madigan
Kristin Baetz
Shaziah Jinnah Morsette* – arrived during item 2
Shawna Cunningham*
Malinda Smith*

Regrets
Mark Bauer
Melanie Zimmer
Kirsten Neprily

Non-Voting Members
Leighton Wilks
Stefanie Hassel

Secretary
Courtney McVie

Scribe
Michelle Speta*

Meeting Support
Holly Lywin

Resource Personnel
Christine Johns – left during item 4

Invited Guests
Todd Anderson (Dean, Cumming School of Medicine) – for item 5
Amy Dambrowitz (Registrar) – for item 9
Kimberley McLeod (Associate Registrar and Director, Systems and Policy) – for item 9

*Attended virtually

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

1.   **Approval of the Agenda & Territorial Acknowledgement**

The Co-Chair provided the territorial acknowledgement.

> **Moved/Seconded**
>
> That the Agenda for the September 25, 2023 Academic Planning and Priorities Committee meeting be approved.
>
> **Carried**

2.   Remarks of the Co-Chairs

The Co-Chair introduced himself in his new role of Deputy Provost, designated by the Provost to be the Co-Chair of the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee (APPC). He welcomed the following new members to their first APPC meeting:

- Cydnee Seneviratne, General Faculties Council (GFC) Member appointed by GFC Executive Committee

- Sheri Madigan, Academic Co-Chair of the Research and Scholarship Committee (RSC)

- Shawna Cunningham, Acting Vice-Provost (Indigenous Engagement)

- Leighton Wilks, The Faculty Association of the University of Calgary (TUCFA) representative

- Stefanie Hassel, Management and Professional Staff (MaPS) representative (in place of Hannah Ashton)

The Academic Co-Chair introduced herself as the Associate Dean, Teaching, Learning and Student Engagement in the Faculty of Arts who has previously served as a member of APPC for four years. She included the following in her remarks:

- It is appreciated if minor editorial changes to minutes or agenda items are forwarded to the Secretariat for correction

- Members need not abstain from voting on approving minutes for a prior meeting if they did not attend that meeting. Voting to approve minutes indicates trust that due process was followed.

The Co-Chair further noted that:

- APPC is a critical step in the University's governance as this is the body of final approval for programs before implementation or forwarding to the Ministry of Advanced Education.

- Members are asked to keep in mind the time and effort proponents have put into proposals that will be brought to the Committee, as well as the fact that it can be an intense environment for those who may not be accustomed to governance committees.

3.   Committee Specific Orientation

Courtney McVie, Robin Yates, and Dawn Johnston presented this item.

Highlights:

- The University Secretary gave a presentation orienting the members to the APPC, including a description of the authority framework for collegial governance at the University of Calgary, the GFC standing committees structure, the APPC membership, and the role and responsibilities of the APPC as the GFC's primary advisory group on institutional planning and priorities.

- Collegial governance depends on the members of the Committee to make decisions that are in the best interest of the institution as a whole, not just for the group that they are representing.

- Because of the importance of the decisions being made, members are asked to make every attempt to attend all meetings, and to take the time to read all materials in advance of the meeting. The Secretariat posts materials on D2L one week in advance.

- The Senior Director, Program Innovation and Planning noted that program proposals that come to APPC are highly templated due to requirements from the Ministry of Advanced Education.

- Members are advised to refer to the briefing note for program proposals to review the governance routing. Understanding which committees have already reviewed the proposal will inform what to focus on in this Committee.

- The Co-Chair invited every member to raise questions or ideas as all voices are welcome at the table. The Committee was also asked to consider implementation when reviewing new programs.

- In response to questions, it was explained that:

  o Proposals to suspend programs start at the Decision Support Team (DST) and end at APPC. If the proposal is for a program that will ultimately be terminated, two proposals come to APPC (suspension followed by termination once all students have graduated). If it is a program that a faculty needs time to revise, then it would be just a suspension proposal, with a subsequent reactivation proposal. There were few or no suspension proposals at APPC last year because a clean-up of low or no enrolment programs was completed the year prior. It is expected there will be terminations brought forward to the Committee this year.

  o The purpose of APPC, coming after many other committees in the governance process, is to ensure we have a balance of initiatives that are aligned with our institutional strategic plan and academic plan. While the fact that many committees have come before APPC does not preclude the Committee from being critical of the small details, the hope is that most problems are caught at the early stages of the approval cycle (i.e., at DST). The Committee has a broad range of representatives that allow it to bring a big picture view that not all other committees have.

  o Information and feedback from APPC are brought back to DST to ensure that anything caught at the end of the governance cycle can be considered at the beginning for future proposals. It was also noted that DST considers the financial sustainability of proposals.

4.   Cumming School of Medicine (CSM) Unit Review

Robin Yates, Courtney McVie, and Christine Johns provided introductory context on Quality Assurance Unit Reviews before the presenter joined the meeting.

Highlights:

- The Deputy Provost provided an overview of the Quality Assurance Unit Review process. Unit reviews are typically carried out every five to seven years for every academic unit as mandated by the Post-secondary Learning Act (PSLA). External reviewers visit the unit and make recommendations for how the unit can improve its efficiency and impact.

- Unit reviews come to APPC for discussion. The General Faculties Council (GFC) approved the Handbook for Quality Assurance, which states the requirements for a robust unit review. The Provost's Office is responsible for ensuring the reviews happen and that recommendations are acted upon. There is also mid-cycle follow-up reporting.

- In response to concerns regarding awareness of this process for new Deans, it was noted that the Provost's Office typically provides one-year notice before a unit is due for a review.

Documentation for the unit review was circulated with the Agenda. Todd Anderson presented this item.

Highlights:

- The Dean noted that it had been more than six years since the Cumming School of Medicine's (CSM's) last unit review, the delay being requested due to the previous Dean's term ending

- The Committee learned that the CSM's Postgraduate Medical Education (PGME) program, which has approximately 950 medical residents, received full accreditation this year. The Undergraduate Medical Education (UME) program, which has approximately 480 students, is expecting to obtain renewed accreditation one year from now.

- The Dean noted that there were no major surprises in the reviewers' report and that the key points from the report were needs for:

  o Culture change (enhancing equity, diversity, inclusion, and accessibility (EDIA); Indigenous ways of knowing; wellness; improving harassment reporting)

  o Reinvigorating the school in light of post-pandemic burn-out amongst clinical faculty and residents

  o Growth (increasing number of staff and faculty, new infrastructure)

- The Dean described the CSM's Strategic Plan and it's five priority pillars of research, education, social justice through health equity, Indigenous ways, and learning the health care system, and noted that this plan was designed with culture change in mind

- Budgetary restrictions may preclude a new building at this time despite the need for more space. While the CSM has soft money, limited base funding is a challenge that also impacts their ability to hire more faculty members.

- The Acting Vice-Provost (Indigenous Engagement) commended the recommendations in the report regarding Indigenous matters. She invited the CSM to start utilizing the visionary circles conceptual model to ensure alignment with *ii'taa'poh'to'p*. She noted that:

  o Embedding reconciliation work in budgets is critical for sustainability

  o Understanding the relationship between the treaties, Indigenous people, and health care professionals is critical to have as part of curriculum

  o A key question is how the CSM and the University can be of service in addressing the disparity in health care for indigenous communities

  o Page 2 of the report should read "First Nations/Métis/Inuit", instead of "First Nations", and page 4 of the report should read "Circle of Advisors", not "Circle of Elders".

- The Academic Co-Chair noted that the review panel identified a need to clarify roles and responsibilities of the large leadership structure. The Dean explained that CSM may consider consolidating their four basic science departments as well as their Continuing Medical Education program. The Dean also gave two reasons for the large number of leadership positions: recruiting new clinicians and administrative succession planning.

- In response to questions, it was explained that:

  o Growing research while addressing burn-out can be seen as paradoxical but the CSM's aim is to manage both together

- o CSM will look to the Vice-Provost (Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion) for leadership and guidance to ensure that their research institutes and departments, each of which has their own EDIA lead, are aligned and synergistic with the University's central vision

- o CSM is supportive of parallel paths for EDIA and Indigenous ways. The Indigenous Office was grouped with the Local and Global Health Office due to capacity limitations for the clinicians involved, but may be separated if capacity increases.

- o CSM is considering a distributed education model in Lethbridge where they can leverage the close relationship between the University of Lethbridge and indigenous communities in southern Alberta, which could facilitate increasing both rural and indigenous student enrolment

- The Co-Chair noted that, overall, the unit review report was very complimentary and commended CSM for their excellent work

5. Approval of the June 5, 2023 and June 16, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Documentation was circulated with the Agenda.

Moved/Seconded

That the Minutes from the June 5, 2023 and June 16, 2023 Academic Planning and Priorities Committee meetings be approved.

Carried

Shaziah Jinnah Morsette abstained.

6. Appointment of One Academic Staff Member to the Calendar and Curriculum Subcommittee (CCS)

Documentation was circulated with the Agenda.

The Committee named, in rank order, three academic staff members to be approached by the University Secretariat to serve on the CCS until June 30, 2024, in place of Shawna Cunningham who is not able to hold this role while she is Acting Vice-Provost. If none of the three rank-ordered individuals agree to serve, the matter will return to the Committee for further discussion.

Secretary's Note: Deanna Burgart, Schulich School of Engineering, agreed to serve.

7. Operational Plan – Academic Plan

Robin Yates presented this item.

Highlights:

- The institutional strategic plan, *Ahead of Tomorrow*, was approved by the Board of Governors in June 2023, which takes us forward to 2030. Unlike with *Eyes High,* the academic and research plans will not be for the full seven years. These plans will be for 2024–2027, which allows the ability to reflect and update in 2027.

- The Interim Provost and Vice-President Academic is overseeing the academic plan. All plans have been submitted to the Executive Leadership Team (ELT), in the coming weeks there will be a period of intensive consultation including focus groups, committees, and electronic suggestion boxes.

- When the academic plan comes to this Committee, the objective will be to discuss how to operationalize the strategy.

8. University Calendar Update (Coursedog)

Documentation was circulated with the Agenda. Kimberley McLeod and Amy Dambrowitz presented this item.

Highlights:

- Launch was originally planned for August 2023, but has been delayed due to an issue with the vendor (Coursedog). Consultation was completed to determine what would be the least disruptive time to launch new Calendar software in the middle of the academic year.

- There will now be a soft launch on December 8, 2023, with the official launch happening in early March 2024 when the next year's Calendar is published. The current Calendar will continue to be the official Calendar of record for 2023–2024 even once new Calendar is soft launched.

- The project team is consulting with students to get feedback on how they wish to receive communications regarding the new Calendar launch.

- In response to questions, it was reported that:

  o Coursedog meets American accessibility standards, and the project team has worked closely with Student Accessibility Services to ensure the new Calendar will meet accessibility requirements

  o Our current Calendar's search engine is run by Google and that caused some issues for students outside of Canada. Coursedog has a proprietary search engine, which should alleviate this issue.

9. Status of Program Approvals

Documentation was circulated with the Agenda for information only. It was noted that questions can be directed to the Program Innovation Hub.

10. Adjournment

Moved/Seconded

That the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee adjourn the September 25, 2023 meeting.

Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 4:02 pm.

Courtney McVie
Secretary