

MINUTES – draft
COLLEGE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
November 7, 2022

Chair	Kim Bosch	Present
Academic Staff		
Algonquin Centre for Construction Excellence	Ken Hill	Present
School of Advanced Technology	Elisabeth Von Moos	Present
School of Business	James Halls	Present
School of Health and Community Studies	Jennifer Liberty	Present
School of Hospitality and Tourism	TBC	
School of Media and Design	Brian Asselin	Regrets
General Arts and Science	Leslie Wyman	Present
Academic Access Centre	Melanie Farquhar	Present
Language Institute	Chinedu Ihuoma Mba	Present
Police and Public Safety Institute	Lisa Roots	Present
Pembroke Campus	Barb Clarke	Present
Perth Campus	TBC	
Counsellors	Heather Bailey	Present
Librarians	TBC	
Support Staff	TBC	
Students		
President, Students' Association	Bolu Olutunda	Present
Vice President, Students' Association	Daniel Larente	Regrets
Director, Students' Association	Gwyneth Jones	Regrets
Learning and Teaching Services	Jessica Brown	Present
Past Chair	Martin Lee	Present
Dean		
Faculty of Health, Safety, and Community Studies	Jane Trakalo	Present
Chair		
Business Administration Core & Service Courses	Katherine Root	Regrets
Ex. Officio Members		
Senior Vice President, Academic	Chris Janzen	Regrets
Vice President, Student Services	Laura Stanbra	Present
Registrar	Krista Pearson	Present
AC Online Representative	Lindsay Hinds	Present

Associate Vice President, Experiential Learning and Innovation/Cooperative Education Representative	Kristine Dawson	Present
Centre for Organizational Learning Representative	Rebecca Volk	Present

1. Welcome from the Chair

Chair Bosch constituted the meeting at 4:30 pm. She noted that College Academic Council meetings were converted to a virtual format to accommodate different schedules, recognizing that the meeting time extends beyond normal working hours.

2. Approval of Agenda: November 7, 2022

Leslie Wyman suggested that the Council discuss “reviewing missing grades” dating back to 2015. The Council unanimously approved the agenda, as amended.

2.1 Approval of Minutes – September 26, 2022

The Council unanimously approved the meeting minutes of September 26, 2022.

3. CAC Business

3.1 New Members/Council Membership 2022/23

Chair Bosch noted that the Council continues to search for a support staff representative as well as a librarian representative.

ACTION: Martin Lee to follow up regarding the recruitment of new Council members.

4. New Business

4.1 Update on 2021-22 Carryover Priorities

Adam Shane joined the Council to provide an update on the carryover priority: “Communication Skills in Students.” He noted that a Communication Skills Working Group has been established led by Katherine Root and himself. The purpose of the Working Group is to explore issues related to communication skills that are taught at the College and determine ways to address skills gaps as more than 90% of Program Quality Reviews (PQRs) noted poor communication skills as “gaps.” The Working Group examines learner writing skills upon entry into the College through to graduation and develop recommendations based on findings. The Group has been in touch with other Colleges across Canada to discuss different approaches

and responses. The Working Group's findings have been distilled into five different themes that will be presented to the Deans and Directors Council (DDC) within the coming weeks for endorsement to proceed to the next phase of action. He spoke to the development of sub-groups, noting that diversity will be imperative among the sub-group memberships.

4.2 [New Proposed CAC Priorities, 2022-2023](#)

Chair Bosch spoke briefly to the suggested CAC Priorities for 2022-23 noting that comments feedback on each priority could be found in the [shared document](#).

4.3 **Vote on Proposed CAC Priorities, 2022-23**

Council members were provided with a link to a live survey. It was requested that members eligible to vote rank proposed CAC priorities for 2022-23.

The following two priorities were selected to proceed for 2022-23:

- Professional Development Opportunities (Processes) - faculty teaching "silos" - not allowing cross-pollination (41.67%)
- APA Standardization (i.e. faculty not adequately trained on this) (42.86%)

Due to a tie on the third priority, Chair Bosch noted that a second survey would be sent to eligible voting members offline.

ACTION: Samantha Flynn to circulate survey to eligible voting members regarding third priority for 2022-23.

4.4 [Policy AA02 – College Academic Council; Proposed Amendment](#)

Speaking to the proposed amendment, Chair Bosch highlighted the importance of ensuring that meeting materials and transmittals are circulated to the membership with time for advanced review from the membership.

Martin Lee suggested that the proposed amendment be implemented first through practice prior to requesting an official change to the Policy. Leslie Wyman reminded members that there is no requirement to make quick decisions on items; members should feel welcome to request more time for discussion/review on any items brought forward to the Council.

Members unanimously agreed to support the amendment in practice only moving forward.

4.5 [Policy AA13 – Evaluation of Learning](#)

Maggie Cusson joined the Committee seeking endorsement of Policy AA13 – Evaluation of Learning. She noted that the Students’ Association was consulted with regard to the proposed language in an effort to ensure a balanced workload for all learners. During discussion, and in response to inquiries, the following points were noted:

- James Halls noted a discrepancy between Policy AA13 and Policy AA42 regarding the posting of due dates to Brightspace calendar;
- Maggie Cusson noted that the previous version of the policy did not speak to the mid-term break period at all;
- Leslie Wyman highlighted that there may be only one or two individuals experiencing heavy workloads that request a change in the scheduling of assessment(s). Maggie Cusson noted that a request for a change in the scheduling of an assessment could present as a class request or individual student request;
- Martin Lee suggested that the procedure be expanded to ensure clarity around flexibility for faculty;
- Jane Trakalo commented that faculty regularly face situations with individual learners and must make a determination on how best to proceed based on their own discretion. She suggested that the final sentence be removed: “Learners may request that assessments be held or due in the week following a mid-term break due to program assessment workload concerns.”

4.6 [Policy AA06 – Prior Learning Assessment & Recognition](#)

Jessica Brown reminded members that discussion regarding the policy began at the previous CAC meeting, adding that she received offline comments from some members with feedback. She noted that a suggestion was made to use two appeal processes but begin with one.

During discussion, and in response to queries, the following points were noted:

- Barb Clarke noted that faculty is not responsible for grading the PLAR and therefore there is a pedagogical question of an advantage on that PLAR. She noted that she was uncomfortable with the idea of a student remaining in the course during a PLAR challenge;
- Leslie Wyman drew attention to the scope of the Policy;

- Kristine Dawson commented that, ultimately, the student is demonstrating competence in a course that they have paid for. Additionally, the student has paid for the PLAR. The student is seeking a safety net; and
- Chinedu Ihuoma Mba commented that it's a backwards system to have students PLAR while remaining in the course. If a student PLARs and is successful, a progression through the program can be planned.

Jessica Brown welcomed further comments offline from members.

4.7 Policy AA37 – Review of Grade

James Halls requested that section 3.4 be revised to read: *“Academic Administrator assigns a Subject Matter Expert/Reviewer who is not involved in a course under dispute.”* He noted that it is not appropriately “arms length” to have a SME responsible who is also involved in a course under dispute. Speaking to James Halls’ suggestion, Jane Trakalo suggested that *“if available”* be added to the section. Julia Huckle agreed to incorporate this language.

4.8 Policy AA21 – Deferred Evaluation

Julia Huckle noted that there will be accompanying guides for students in filling out the request form. Leslie Wyman suggested that some students confuse the meaning of the terms “retroactive accommodation” and “deferred evaluation.” Julia Huckle noted that it is imperative that policies AA37 and AA21 work cohesively together in support of equal treatment for all students.

Chair Bosch recommended that in-class presentations and/or group projects be referred to in the policy. Julia Huckle agreed to add language that speaks to this.

Julia Huckle highlighted that, in the request form, it was clarified that if an LOA was not on file, faculty may still contact CAL.

4.9.1 RE08 – Student Course-based Research Projects Involving Human Participants

Kristine Dawson highlighted that the limitation is for course-based research defined as “minimal risk.” She highlighted that the policy has/is being implemented at multiple other postsecondary institutions.

Martin Lee highlighted the importance of the Policy noting that the process associated with human research is equally imperative to the work itself. He expressed concern that, sometimes unintended “loopholes” can become hidden.

Kristine Dawson suggested that perhaps a random “spot check/audit” would be a welcome mechanism to ensure the policy is being rolled out appropriately.

Krista Pearson highlighted that, as it is a new policy, it will require review within one year, allowing for an earlier opportunity to check-in on its progress once again.

In response to queries from Bolu Olutunda, Kristine Dawson noted that the policy would apply to any course-based applied research involving human subjects. Currently, the research ethics procedure should be utilized when a research project is deemed “minimal risk.”

Heather Bailey queried whether an expedited process is available. Kristine Dawson noted that she has upcoming meetings to discuss the policy’s approach.

ACTION: Policy RE08 to return to College Academic Council (CAC) for further discussion at next meeting (November 28, 2022).

4.9.2 [RE09 Commercialization & RE05 IP](#)

Kristine Dawson and Kevin Holmes noted that Policy RE09 Commercialization will result in required updates to Policy RE05, Intellectual Property. They noted that Colleges and Universities are required to adopt the policy and associated updates as they are closely based on a policy developed by Colleges Ontario. The draft policy has been vetted by Colleges Ontario lawyers to ensure the appropriateness of draft language.

Leslie Wyman expressed concern with the number of policies being brought to the Committee for discussion/endorsement in a short timeframe. She suggested that the policy be brought forward for further discussion at the next College Academic Council meeting. Kristine Dawson welcomed offline feedback via email from the membership.

ACTION: Policies RE09 and RE05 to return to College Academic Council (CAC) for further discussion at next meeting (November 28, 2022).

5. Adjournment

Jane Trakalo queried whether the Council would be amendable to offline feedback/endorsements via email given the time sensitivity associated with the policies brought forward for discussion. Martin Lee suggested that a sub-committee could be formed for further policy review, if needed.

Due to time constraints, Kim Bosch moved the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded by Jane Trakalo. All members were in favour. The Committee was adjourned at 6:32 pm.