
Academic Standards Committee
December 2, 2025 at 3pm – 5pm
University Boardroom A341

IN ATTENDANCE:

Lee Easton	GFC Academic Staff Member, CHAIR
Karim Dharamsi	Vice-Provost, Academic, VICE-CHAIR
Phil Warsaba	Vice-President, Students
Peter Ryan	MRFA Academic Policy and Governance Officer
Kelly Williams-Whitt	Dean Representative
Mary-Lee Mulholland	GFC Academic Staff Member (Arts)
Jon Mee	GFC Academic Staff Member (Science & Technology)
Kalen Keavey	Academic Staff Member (University Library)
Christina Lovestone	Continuing Education Representative
Meekena Erkin	Student Representative
Jelena Stojsic	Student Representative

Resources

Gerri Lynn Gouglas	University Registrar & Associate Vice-President, Enrolment Management
Sheena Dyer	Assistant University Secretary, GFC, RECORDING SECRETARY

Guests

Mark Lafave	Associate Dean of Research, Scholarship, & Community Engagement, Faculty of Health, Community and Education
Christina Tortorelli	Academic Director, Faculty of Health, Community & Education
Gaye Warthe	Interim Dean, Faculty of Health, Community & Education

NOT IN ATTENDANCE:

Todd Burton	GFC Academic Staff Member (Business & Communication Studies)
Joyce Totton	GFC Academic Staff Member (Health, Community & Education)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:03PM.

1. Approval of Agenda***Moved and seconded:***

THAT the Agenda for the December 2, 2025 Academic Standards Committee meeting be approved.

Motion carried**2. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

2.1. Minutes from October 28, 2025

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Minutes of the October 28, 2025 Academic Standards Committee meeting be approved.

Motion carried

2.2. Business Arising from the Minutes

The business arising from the previous minutes were addressed as follows:

- Included as Agenda Item 4 – Revised *Research and Scholarship Criteria, Evidence and Standards for Tenure and Promotion for Health, Community and Education*
- Included as Agenda Item 5 – Discussion of ASC’s Role for mid-term reports on Advancement Plan implementation

3. Program Review: Bachelor of Social Work

A preliminary discussion took place about how the accreditation process fits with the program review process. It was explained that this is the first time a program review is being done primarily for accreditation, with the goal of being more efficient and learning from the process for future reviews. Some broader issues raised in the review and external feedback were acknowledged for discussion with the program review guests, including:

- practicum concerns from the SWOT analysis
- class size constraints
- program autonomy considerations
- scope of external reviewer recommendations
- some areas of the Advancement Plan

C. Tortorelli and G. Warthe joined the meeting.

Discussion with the program review guests focused on clarifying the following questions and areas raised during the preliminary discussion:

- Clarification was provided on where Item 10. *Students* in the Advancement Plan came from, noting it was informed by several parts of the accreditation process, including student input.
- The autonomy considerations throughout the review were addressed and how the accrediting body’s expectations fit within MRU’s context.
- Practicum issues were discussed, including how they show up in the SWOT analysis and how they could be more clearly addressed through the Advancement Plan and ongoing work.
- Existing practicum appeals processes and how this information is shared with students were noted.

C. Tortorelli and G. Warthe left the meeting.

Based on the discussion, it was agreed that no changes were needed related to program autonomy, as the clarification provided was sufficient. It was suggested, as a recommended (but not required) change, expanding the Advancement Plan at a high level to better reflect ongoing efforts to improve the practicum experience for students.

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Academic Standards Committee approve the Bachelor of Social Work program review, with a recommended change to the Advancement Plan to address future directions of practicums.

Motion carried

4. Revised Research and Scholarship Criteria, Evidence and Standards for Tenure and Promotion for the Faculty of Health, Community and Education

A revised version of the document was submitted to address concerns raised at the October 17, 2025 GFC meeting.

M. Lafave and G. Warthe joined the meeting.

Discussion:

- Discussion took place on the “normally present one to two examples every two years...” guideline for progress towards promotion to full professor.
- Concerns were raised that the 2-year target and its placement under Level 2 could discourage some faculty or create barriers.
- It was clarified that the guideline is flexible, aligns with other similar guidelines/processes, recognizes sustained achievement, and was added in response to faculty requesting guidance.
- Based on discussion, it was proposed that this guidance link to the context provided in section 1.3 of the Guiding Principles in the document to address the concerns raised.
- The committee agreed that they do not need to see that revision before it proceeds to GFC next.

M. Lafave and G. Warthe left the meeting.

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Academic Standards Committee recommend to GFC the proposed revisions to the *Research and Scholarship Criteria, Evidence and Standards for Tenure and Promotion for the Faculty of Health, Community and Education* for recommendation to the Board of Governors for approval, contingent upon receiving the revision to add the reference to *Guiding Principle 1.3.* to the following statement: *“As part of demonstrating progress toward promotion to full professor, an Associate Professor (Level 2) would normally present one to two examples every two years from the matrix below, ensuring at least one contribution aligns with Column 2B within that period.”*

Motion carried

5. Discussion of ASC’s Role for mid-term reports on Advancement Plan implementation

Discussion focused on clarifying ASC’s role in receiving, rather than requesting, mid-cycle updates on Advancement Plans following Program Review approvals. Members considered the original intent of the Academic Program Review Procedures language (section 6.1., under 6. Communication) and how the program review process has improved since that language was first proposed. There was agreement that ongoing monitoring is with Deans rather than ASC and clarified that receiving communications is different from requesting updates.

Moved and seconded:

THAT it be affirmed that ASC does not request mid-term updates on the Final Advancement Plan.

Discussion:

- It was clarified that it is at the discretion of the Dean to bring forward updates to ASC.

Motion carried

6. Reports

6.1. Update on Academic Program Reviews

A written update was provided on current, upcoming and in progress program reviews.

6.2. Report from the Senior Administrator to the Committee

K. Dharamsi shared that the General Education Steering Committee recently had a retreat to discuss General Education models, and are aiming to provide a report by the end of this term.

6.3. Committee Chair Report

A copy of the most recent Committee Chair's Report to GFC was provided for information.

7. New Business

There was no new business.

8. Adjournment 4:40PM