

Academic Standards Committee
April 5, 2023 at 3pm – 5pm
University Boardroom A341

IN ATTENDANCE:

Lee Easton, GFC Academic Staff Member, CHAIR
Gaye Warthe, Designate for Vice-Provost, Academic, VICE-CHAIR
Phil Warsaba, Vice-President, Students
Peter Ryan, MRFA Academic Liaison Officer
Kelly Williams-Whitt, Dean Representative
Mary-Lee Mulholland , GFC Academic Staff Member (Arts)
Sally Haney, GFC Academic Staff Member (Business & Communication Studies)
Deep Upadhyaya, GFC Academic Staff Member (Health, Community & Education)
Erik Christiansen, Academic Staff Member (University Library)

Resources

Gerl Lynn Gouglas, University Registrar (*via Google Meet*)
Cheryl Melatdoost, Academic Quality Assurance Coordinator
Sheena Jensen, Assistant University Secretary, GFC, RECORDING SECRETARY

Guests

Alana Gieck, Associate Professor – Broadcast Media Studies

NOT IN ATTENDANCE:

Tala Abu Hayyaneh, Student Representative
Cynthia Gallop, Academic Staff Member (Teaching & Learning)
Rusna Mahoon, Student Representative

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:03pm

1. Approval of Agenda (*motion*)

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Agenda for the April 5, 2023 Academic Standards Committee meeting be approved.

Motion carried

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes

2.1. Minutes from March 15, 2023 (*motion*)

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Minutes of the March 15, 2023 Academic Standards Committee meeting be approved.

Motion carried

2.2. Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

S. Haney and K. Williams-Whitt not in attendance for preliminary discussion of item 3.

3. Program Review: Bachelor of Communications – Broadcast Media Studies (motion)

A preliminary discussion took place about the Broadcast Media Studies program review to identify areas of the review they wanted to hear more about and questions to ask the Dean and Program Review team leads.

A. Gieck, S. Haney and K. Williams-Whitt joined the meeting.

Questions and discussion with the Program Review team focused on the following areas:

- Why the external reviewers and virtual site visit option was selected
 - Logistical reasons and selected reviewers already familiar with the facilities and similar programs
- Response to feedback from the external reviewers' about the internship experience
 - Discussions are underway with Career Services for creating opportunities and more flexibility to students
- Differentiation between journalism and broadcast media studies students, as it related to a tension between the two in the external reviewers' assessment
 - Additional information was shared about the cohort structure utilized within the program and how the program is creating more flexibility for students within the cohort model
- Considerations being made for internationalizing the program, where this review has prompted more of these discussions to happen
- Further information about the inclusion of the CSL (community service learning) designation and the work that is underway to make it official
- Program fee considerations that are being discussed, including how those fees are communicated to students, concern with the program fees and equitability, understanding of program fees and tuition at MRU and how this program's fees are similar to those at other institutions

A. Gieck, S. Haney and K. Williams-Whitt left the meeting.

ASC discussed the responses to their questions and discussions above. It was agreed to suggest that further elaboration in response to the external reviewers' recommendations be incorporated about the work and discussions underway about the cohort model, more flexibility in the program for students, the Internship opportunities, community service learning, and internationalization. As well, it was suggested to comment in the Executive Summary about the program fee considerations.

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Academic Standards Committee approves the Bachelor of Communication – Broadcast Media Studies program review, contingent upon further elaboration in response to the External Reviewers' recommendations.

Motion carried

The ASC Chair will provide the feedback to the Program about the areas to elaborate on in response to the external reviewer comments.

K. Williams-Whitt rejoined the meeting.

4. Quality Assurance Policy/Procedure documents for Feedback

Initial feedback was collected on the draft quality assurance policy and procedures documents prior to the broader consultation process. The documents reviewed were the draft Cyclical Review of Academic Programs Policy, draft Cyclical Review of Academic Programs Procedure and draft Academic Program Quality Assurance Policy. The revisions are in consideration of the pending approval from CAQC to move to audit status. The following feedback was discussed:

- Use of the word “program areas” to allow flexibility to be applied to units outside of a Faculty
- If programs should provide a mid-term summary of progress of their advancement plan.
Considerations for this included:
 - What the purpose and outcome would be if this requirement is made, while recognizing the operational responsibility of Deans
 - Whether ASC would be involved in the process in terms of their governance oversight
- Connecting with the Student Affairs division earlier on in the program review process

5. Reports

5.1. Update on Cyclical Reviews – C. Melatdoost

A written update was shared with members and highlighted at the meeting on current, upcoming and in progress reviews.

5.2. Committee Chair Report

A meeting is scheduled on April 18, 2023 for the ASC Working Group and the Indigenous Faculty Collective to discuss how to move forward with changes to the *Institutional Tenure and Promotion Criteria* to recognize Indigenous ways of knowing and doing.

5.3. Report from the Senior Administrator to the Committee

No report.

6. New Business

There was no new business.

7. Adjournment 5:00PM