
Academic Standards Committee
March 17, 2026 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
Kelly Williams-Whitt	Dean Representative
Mary-Lee Mulholland	GFC Academic Staff Member (Arts)
Sarah Hamilton	GFC Academic Staff Member (Health, Community & Education)
Jon Mee	GFC Academic Staff Member (Science & Technology)
Kalen Keavey	Academic Staff Member (University Library)
Christina Lovestone	Continuing Education Representative
Meekena Erkin	Student Representative

Resources

Gerri Lynn Gouglas	University Registrar & Associate Vice-President, Enrolment Management
Radwa Mohamed	Academic Quality Assurance Coordinator
Sheena Dyer	Assistant University Secretary, GFC, RECORDING SECRETARY

Guests

Rachael Pettigrew	Chair, General Management and Human Resource
Leda Stawnychko	Self-Study Team Lead, BBA – General Management

NOT IN ATTENDANCE:

Todd Burton	GFC Academic Staff Member (Business & Communication Studies)
Peter Ryan	MRFA Academic Policy and Governance Officer
Jelena Stojsic	Student Representative

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:00PM.

1. Approval of Agenda

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Agenda for the March 17, 2026 Academic Standards Committee meeting be approved.

Motion carried

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes

2.1. Minutes from December 2, 2025

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Minutes of the December 2, 2025 Academic Standards Committee meeting be approved.

Motion carried

- 2.2. Business Arising from the Minutes
There was no business arising from the minutes.

3. Revised Final Grade Appeals Policy Recommendation

G. Gouglas provided an overview of the proposed revision to the Final Grade Appeals Policy, explaining that it was determined the policy itself remains relevant and only minor changes were required, which are time sensitive. Comments were made in support of the minor revisions.

The review prompted further discussion about a comprehensive policy review and consideration for including due dates on assignments in course outlines. Highlights of discussion:

- It was explained that Vice-Deans were consulted about the Final Grade Appeals Policy and did not identify additional revisions at that time, so a comprehensive review was not undertaken.
- A request was discussed about adding language into the policy about putting assignment due dates on course outlines to help support students.
 - It was asked if this language could be incorporated to address a concern raised that there are final grade appeals when instructors do not meet the 50% graded-work threshold, and because this policy is the only one that references course outlines.
 - It was considered if the Grades Policy could reference this matter instead.
 - It was advised that this matter is not in scope of this or other policies based on past discussions about how prescriptive to be in course outlines.
- It was discussed if the Syllabus Guidelines document could reference best practice for including assignment due dates in course outlines as an alternative to adding language in policy, and that ASC could discuss this further in the next academic year.
 - The GFC Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) has oversight of the Syllabus Guidelines.
 - There was consensus that Karim Dharamsi, ASC Vice-Chair and TLC Vice-Chair, will bring forward a recommendation to TLC to consider including best practice guidance in the Syllabus Guidelines about putting assignment due dates on course outlines.
- Other suggestions were made for consideration during the next comprehensive review of the policy:
 - Provide additional clarification in the policy with reference to course outlines to improve clarity for final grade appeals.
 - Consideration for Continuing Education students and if they are in scope of the policy or if separate processes should be developed.
 - Members can bring forward suggestions to their Vice-Dean to be captured for the next policy review.
- ASC agreed to proceed with the current proposed changes due to their time-sensitive nature.

Moved and seconded:

THAT Academic Standards Committee recommend to GFC the proposed changes to the Final Grade Appeal policy.

Motion carried

4. Discussion of Process for Revising the Tenure, Promotion and Permanency Handbook

The ASC Chair circulated a memo to ASC members to begin a discussion on documenting a formal amendment process for the Institutional Tenure & Promotion Criteria and Handbook. The memo provided background on the development of these documents, their relationship to the Collective Agreement, and proposed an approach to addressing current and future challenges.

Members agreed for the ASC Chair and Vice-Chair first meet with the Provost and Vice-President, Academic, to help frame next steps and a scope of work before considering the establishment of an ASC working group. Preliminary discussion considered areas of the Handbook that need further clarification, such as major/substantive and minor revisions, and supported having a process for the regular review of the documents. Concern was also raised about the Collective Agreement referencing the Handbook, with a suggestion that this issue be flagged for consideration as part of this process.

Kelly Williams-Whitt left the meeting.

5. Program Review: BBA - General Management

Comments were made in support of the BBA – General Management review. Questions to ask the Program Review guests were considered, including:

- Clarity on training for contract faculty referenced in the Advancement Plan.
- Why the External Reviewers commented on more branding for the Program and potential reasons why, such as the name of the program itself.
- Clarification on the section of the Advancement Plan regarding the direction they want to go with hiring.
- Honours Program – what is their goal/how will they measure it.

Rachael Pettigrew, Leda Stawnychko and Kelly Williams-Whitt joined the meeting.

Discussion:

- Regarding the recommendation to “Improve Bench Strength in GM Contract Teaching”, it was asked to clarify where in the self-study or external reviewer’s report they learned that contract instruction is lower quality (or more lacking in academic rigour) than full-time faculty instruction? Why should contract faculty be singled out for improvement of academic rigour? Shouldn’t such training be provided to all faculty?
 - The program review guests explained that it was contract faculty who had raised concerns during faculty interviews about keeping pace with the changing business world, and requested training specific for them.
 - It was suggested that this section of the Advancement Plan be reworded more positively that Contract faculty be given additional professional development opportunities at their request.
- Regarding the Honours Program, what measurement will be used when assessing success of promoting the program?
 - It was explained that they don’t have a target, but the focus instead is to build awareness for students who meet the Honours program criteria to let them know about

the program and match them well with a faculty partner. This is also in consideration of instructor workload when considering having a target.

- With respect to the External Reviewer's guiding question about branding, could more information be provided if it's because of the use of the word "General" in the program name that may influence student's perception of the program?
 - It was acknowledged that this has come up in discussions, and a follow-up discussion about this matter and consideration of a different program name could take place within the Faculty with the aim of helping with branding.
- Clarification was provided on the reference to reliance on individual expertise within the faculty in the area of sustainability.

Rachael Pettigrew, Leda Stawnychko and Kelly Williams-Whitt left the meeting.

Discussion:

- It was suggested that the Advancement Plan replace the goal in Focus #2 that states "Work with contract faculty to improve academic rigour, instructional quality" to a statement that speaks to more professional development opportunities as identified in the contract faculty interviews.

Moved and seconded:

THAT the Academic Standards Committee approve the Bachelor of Business Administration - General Management program review, with a required change to the section in the Advancement Plan to clarify professional development opportunities as requested for contract faculty.

Motion carried

Kelly Williams-Whitt joined the meeting.

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

The General Education Steering Committee recently had a full day retreat to work on recommendations for a General Education model, and community consultations will be starting soon. The Experiential Learning Steering Committee is close to sharing a framework to collect feedback.

6.3. Committee Chair Report

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

7. For Information:

The following item was provided for information:

7.1. ASC Meeting Schedule 2026-27

8. New Business

There was no new business.

9. Adjournment 4:27PM