

**Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee
November 14, 2022 at 3pm – 5pm
University Boardroom A341**

IN ATTENDANCE:

Peter Choate, GFC Academic Staff Member, CHAIR
Phil Warsaba, Vice-President, Students, VICE-CHAIR
Evan Cortens (Interim), Dean, Faculty of Continuing Education & Extension
Stephen Price, Dean Representative
Shane Gannon, Academic Staff Member - Faculty Curriculum Committee (Arts)
Tanya Stogre, Academic Staff Member - Faculty Curriculum Committee (Health, Community and Education) (*via Google Meet*)
Melanie Rathburn, Academic Staff Member - Faculty Curriculum Committee (Science and Technology)
David Clemis, Academic Staff Member - Faculty Curriculum Committee (Teaching & Learning)
Gaye Warthe, Chair of a Faculty Curriculum Committee
Yasmin Ahmed, Student Representative

Resources

Nicole Cross, Designate for University Registrar
Sheena Jensen, Assistant University Secretary, GFC, RECORDING SECRETARY

Guests

Cheryl Melatdoost, Academic Quality Assurance Coordinator
dr. linda manguns, Associate Vice-President, Indigenization and Decolonization

NOT IN ATTENDANCE:

Adam Cave, Academic Staff Member - Faculty Curriculum Committee (Business and Communication Studies)
Peter Houston, Academic Staff Member - Faculty Curriculum Committee (University Library)
Joseph Nguyen, Student Representative

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:01pm and confirmed quorum.

1. Approval of Agenda (*motion*)

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Agenda for the November 14, 2022 Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee meeting be approved, as presented.

Motion carried

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes

2.1. Minutes from October 4, 2022 (*motion*)

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Minutes of the October 4, 2022 Academic Programs and Curriculum Committee meeting be approved, as presented.

Motion carried

2.2. Business Arising from the Minutes

2.2.1. Curriculum Changes: Course Content

As a follow-up to the previous meeting and to continue the discussion, examples of past curriculum submissions that were originally submitted as editorial, but had to be resubmitted as a course change due to the level of content changing were presented. Also included in the document to assist with discussions were scenarios, a recommendation to align requirements for change to course outcomes (regardless of Academic calendar description update), and questions to consider.

Discussion focused on the scenarios presented, the difference between editorial and course content changes, and whether the Curriculum Committee oversight is enough to determine the level of course change required (editorial or changes to course content).

With an intention of achieving a balance between editorial and course changes, there was consensus that the Faculty Curriculum Committees have the right level of expertise with their membership representation to make the determination of whether a submission is an editorial or course change. It was agreed that clarifying the expectation for this role of FCC's needs to be well communicated within departments, with a suggestion to add a check-box to submissions in Curriculog that an FCC decision was discussed with the department and/or department Chair. Clarifying the roles for the Registrar and APCC also need to be communicated, where the Registrar has the last approval and works with Associate Dean's if any dispute arises, and that unresolved disputes will be forwarded to APCC. It was noted that submissions should be addressed early on in the process to allow time for these discussions and determinations to be made. Suggestions about ways to communicate these expectations to departments were shared, such as part of Curriculog training or scheduling roadshows to FCC's.

3. **Three-Credit Indigenous Component** *(for discussion)*

Members were provided with a document compiling extracts from APCC, Executive Committee, and GFC meeting minutes related to motions, recommendations, and discussions about a three-Credit Indigenous component.

The Chair summarized recent discussions with I. manguns, S. Price, Y. Ahmed and N. Cross to set the stage for APCC's discussion. Items for consideration they had raised related the potential establishment of an Academic Indigenization Committee of GFC to have these conversations with GFC, the original request for 3-credits or equivalent, requesting further direction from the Executive Committee (EC), and an expectation for APCC to report back to GFC soon. Concerns were raised about the amount of time that has passed since APCC made a recommendation to explore an "Indigenous Designation" option that allowed the greatest flexibility within programs (November 2020), also referred to as the "three feather" model, noting that their recommendation to GFC was put on hold by EC.

Discussions took place on the following:

- That APCC's mandate was to revise policy (explore amendments to the Program Definitions Policy)
- Pros and cons of various approaches, including a three-feather model or a General Education foundations option, and where students would get the most benefit (e.g. between classroom content and student experiences); various perspectives for incorporating a model were considered, including students, faculty and the Registrar
- I. manyguns comments on the complexity of this work and challenges other institutions are having with a credit model
- I. manyguns work on developing components for Indigenous content (e.g. 10-minute modules), and the transferred teachings as another option, noting that upcoming changes to the *Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria* acknowledging Indigenous Peoples ways of knowing and doing would help encourage instructors to support this
- Tracking the requirements for any of the approaches considered, and how/who would be assessing and validating Indigenous content
- Comments were shared that at this point where Indigenization is ongoing and is never done, and providing many options that are growing, an approach based on a three-feather model may be the way forward

The Chair summarized the discussion points raised recognizing that various programs across the university are incorporating options that work best for their students, and there does not seem to be a single solution that would be accepted universally across the institution. As APCC thinks through the Indigenization piece, EDI will need to be addressed, as well. What has been raised in discussions is that multiple options are being made available and continuing to be developed, and those could be developed into a "menu" that programs can select from to incorporate Indigenous knowledge for their students.

Next steps:

- In terms of making a recommendation to GFC, P. Choate, I. manyguns, S. Gannon, D. Clemis and N. Cross will draft a recommendation of what a "menu" approach looks like, focusing on a pathway for curriculum, and request feedback from APCC at the next meeting
- The aim is to present a recommendation to GFC in January 2023; the previously drafted recommendation from November 2020 will be reviewed in conjunction with the development of a forthcoming recommendation

4. Work Integrated Learning (for discussion)

The working group's report on the "*Inclusion of Work-Integrated Learning into Program Definitions Policy (May 16, 2022)*" was provided in the meeting package. It was explained that the draft policy brief was a starting point for areas for APCC to consider. Discussion took place on having a broad definition of Work Integrated Learning for MRU, and how this would be included and moved through the policy process in the Program Definitions Policy.

It was agreed that the three areas identified in the report for further work move forward, and then be transitioned to the Program Definitions Policy working group:

- 1) Developing the language of the terminology so that they better capture the MRU context;*
- 2) Consider the range of topics raised [in the report] in "Concerns in Integrating WIL into Program Definitions Policy"; and,*
- 3) Consult with different areas to confirm that the policy framework is sufficient to cover their work experience elements. For example, HPED and ENVS have work experience components to their programs that the subcommittee was not certain would be captured in the proposed organization.*

5. Program Definitions Policy – Working Group Update *(for discussion)*

A written update from the working group was provided in the package and highlighted at the meeting. Discussion focused on addressing accreditation requirements as an exemption from Program Definitions, specifically on the recommendation to create an "Accreditation Verification Committee" (name TBD) and how that could help the process. Support for this recommendation was shared, and the working group anticipates bringing a subsequent update to APCC in January 2023.

6. Draft Annual Plan for GFC *(for review)*

The draft APCC 2022-23 Annual Plan for GFC was reviewed.

7. Committee Chair Report

No report.

8. Report from Senior Administrator to the Committee

No report.

9. Faculty Council Approved Curriculum *(for information)*

The Faculty Council Approved Curriculum was provided for information.

10. New Business

No new business.

11. Adjournment 5:00PM