



**ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
13 May 2021**

Members:

<u>Council Chair:</u>	Dr. Julia Dutove	
<u>Council Vice-Chair:</u>	Ms. Emma Doris	Notice of Absence

<u>President:</u>	Dr. Glenn Feltham	Notice of Absence
-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

<u>Vice-President Academics and Research:</u>	Dr. Vanessa Sheane	
---	--------------------	--

<u>Deans:</u>	Mr. Mark Heartt	
	Dr. Brian Redmond	
	Dr. Carly McLeod	

<u>Director:</u>	Ms. Aman Litt	
------------------	---------------	--

<u>Academic Staff Association:</u>	Dr. Julia Dutove	
	Ms. Lesley Brazier	
	Mr. Jeremy Parker	Notice of Absence
	Ms. Breianne Renyk	Notice of Absence
	Dr. Craig Smith	
	Mr. Misha Albert	
	Dr. Kieren Bailey	Notice of Absence
	Ms. Deena Honan	Notice of Absence
	Mr. Myles Mintzler	Notice of Absence
	Dr. Elena Voskovskaia	

<u>Alternates</u>	Mr. Peter Sellers	
	Ms. Tamara Van Tassell	
	Mr. Riley Buker	
	Ms. Mandy Pollock	
	Dr. Shawn Morton	

<u>Students' Association:</u>	Mr. John Tiede	
	Mr. Devansh Kapoor	Notice of Absence
	Ms. Brooklyn Broaders	
	Mr. Tallon Jebb	
	Ms. Hailey Hayter	Notice of Absence
	Mr. Jasmeet Minhas	Notice of Absence
	Ms. Danielle Laurin	Notice of Absence
	Ms. Julie Siemens	Notice of Absence

<u>Employees' Association:</u>	Ms. Lana Bennett	
	Mr. Chad Boone	Notice of Absence

<u>Alternate</u>	Ms. Lisa Hollis	
------------------	-----------------	--

Alberta Union of Provincial Employees: Ms. Stacey Basnett | **Notice of Absence**
Ms. Lynette Tye

Community Members: Mr. Nick Radujko
Ms. Sasha Dorscheid | **Notice of Absence**

Guest: Ms. Tanya Lopez

4133 CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the ZOOM Academic Council meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

4134 AGENDA

MOVED by Mr. Nick Radujko, **SECONDED** by Dr. Vanessa Sheane that the agenda be approved as presented.

CARRIED

4135 MINUTES OF 8 APRIL 2021

MOVED by Dr. Craig Smith, **SECONDED** by Ms. Brooklyn Broaders that the Minutes of 8 April 2021 be approved as presented. Noted to that member titles are to be corrected on membership list.

CARRIED

4136 NEW BUSINESS

No New Business was brought forward.

4137 COMMITTEE REPORTS

No committee reports submitted.

4138 CONVOCATION POST-EVENT UPDATE

Dr. Vanessa Sheane shared that the original convocation video did not have the complete list of graduates, apology emails were sent out that day to all graduates affected and video was updated by the next day.

4139 FUTURE DIRECTION OF ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Dr. Vanessa Sheane brought forward the idea of Academic Council and sub committees having fewer meetings, possibility of four times a year. By-laws will be reviewed over the summer with recommendations being brought back to council when meetings resume in the Fall. If interested in helping with the review process, please contact Dr. Vanessa Sheane.

4140 NEW COMMUNITY MEMBER

Council thanked Mr. Nick Radujko for his contributions as community member for the last four years.

New community member Ms. Dianne McWatt of Fairview, AB will be submitted for approval by the Board.

MOVED by Dr. Vanessa Sheane, **SECONDED** by Dr. Craig Smith that Academic Council recommend to the Board of Directors that Ms. Dianne McWatt be approved as new community member for the term of May 25, 2021 to May 24, 2023.

4141 OPEN DISCUSSION

Mr. John Tiede, newly elected SA President introduced new SA VP External Mr. Tallon Jebb.

4142 ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned by consensus at 4:16 pm.

Dr. Julia Dutove, Chair

Ms. Terri Kettner, Records

4133 CALL TO ORDER 3210
4134 Agenda..... 3210
4135 Minutes of 8 April 2021..... 3210
4136 NEW BUSINESS 3210
4137 Committee reports 3210
4138 Convocation Post-Event Update 3210
4139 Future direction of academic council 3210
4140 New community member 3210
4141 Open discussion..... 3211
4142 Adjournment 3211



Minutes

FAST TRACK MEETING

Agenda Item 4.7.1

Date: June 9, 2021

Location(s) Via Zoom

CHAIR:

Vanessa Sheane Interim Vice-President Academic and Research

RECORDS:

Shawwna Boyd

MEMBERS:

Julia Dutove	Academic Council Chair
Carly McLeod	Interim Dean, School of Health, Wellness and Career Studies
Mark Heartt	Dean, School of Trades, Agriculture and Environment
Lori Bombier	Chair, Business and Office Administration
Tony Shmyruk	Chair, Automotive, Motorcycle, and Powersports
Tanya Ray	Chair, Human Services
Marissa Rocca	Librarian
John Tiede	President, Students Association

1. Approval of agenda by consensus adding 7.0 Course Outline Template.

2. Fast Track Terms of Reference – For information only

3. Business and Office Administration

3.1. OA1440 QuickBooks

TABLED

3.2 OA1155 Access and PowerPoint Expert

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track committee approve a change to OA1155 changing the course name to “PowerPoint, Advanced Outlook, and Remote Working Technologies” and the course description to “This course covers expert level concepts and techniques of PowerPoint and Outlook through lectures, demonstrations, and hands on practical applications. Students will master the software concepts required to gain the Microsoft Office Certification in PowerPoint and in Outlook. This course will also provide training in remote working technologies such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, SharePoint, OneDrive and Adobe Acrobat.”

Moved: L. Bombier

Second: C. McLeod

CARRIED

3.3 Business Administration

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track committee approve a change to the Business Administration program progression criteria as presented.

Moved: L. Bombier

Second: C. McLeod

Discussion: The new Progression Criteria will read:

Progression Criteria

Full-time students in either the Certificate or Diploma program:

A student who fails a required first year course(s) will be expected to re-enrol in the failed course(s) at the next available option.

A student who fails two or more courses in any semester will be placed on contractual departmental probation for the following semester. Failure to meet probationary requirements, as outlined in the probation contract, in each registered course may result in being disbarred from the final exam in any course in which probationary requirements are not met.

Contractual departmental probationary recommendations include:

- Students on probation who failed **2** courses will be limited to a maximum of five courses per semester, in any semester, until the student has removed themselves from probationary status.
- Students on probation who failed **3 or more** courses will be limited to a maximum of three Business Administration (BA) courses per semester, in any semester, until the student has removed themselves from probationary status.
- If a student is on probation, the number of second year BA courses that can be taken will be limited to two per semester until the student has completed their BA certificate requirements.

Withdraw from Program

A student who fails the same first year required course three times will be required to withdraw from the program. There will be no readmission to the program for one academic year.

A student who is full time and on probation for two consecutive semesters in an academic year will be required to withdraw from the program for one semester.

Full-time students with a grade point average of 1.0 or less for the academic year as specified by curriculum for each program will normally be required to withdraw and expected to sit out of College for one academic year.

CARRIED

- 3.4 to 3.16 BA2010 Advertising and Sales Promotion
 - BA2040 Investment Fundamentals
 - BA2060 Statistics for Business
 - BA2070 Personal Selling
 - BA2100 Not-for-Profit Marketing and Public Relations
 - BA2160 Taxation
 - BA2190 Consumer Behavior
 - BA2200 Marketing Research
 - BA2500 Computer Applications for Accounting
 - BA2550 Computer Applications for Marketing
 - BA2700 Fundamentals of Personal Finance
 - BA2730 Personal Investing
 - BA2740 Insurance and Retirement

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the removal of “or consent of instructor” from the prerequisites for BA2010 Advertising and Sales Promotion, BA2040 Investment Fundamentals, BA2060 Statistics for Business, BA2070 Personal Selling, BA2100 Not-for-Profit Marketing and Public Relations, BA2160 Taxation, BA2190 Consumer Behavior, BA2200 Marketing Research, BA2500 Computer Applications for Accounting, BA2550 Computer Applications for Marketing, BA2700 Fundamentals of Personal Finance, BA2730 Personal Investing, and BA2740 Insurance and Retirement.

Moved: L. Bombier **Second:** J. Tiede

CARRIED

4. Early Learning and Child Care

4.1 CD1050 Art, Music and Story

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve a change in the course name from “Art, Literature and Music” to “Art, Music and Story”.

Moved: T. Ray **Second:** C. McLeod

CARRIED

5. Educational Assistant

5.1 TA1232 Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve a change in the course name from “Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder” to “Exploring the Fetal Alcohol Spectrum”.

Moved: T. Ray **Second:** T. Shmyruk

CARRIED

5.2 TA1237 Autism Spectrum Disorder

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve a change in the course name from “Autism Spectrum Disorder” to “Exploring the Autism Spectrum”.

Moved: T. Ray

Second: C. McLeod

CARRIED

6. Automotive Certificate Program

6.1 AM1000 Automotive Welding

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve changes to AM1000 Automotive Welding from 2(10-0-20) 30 Hours 1 Week to 2(8-0-16) 24 Hours 1 Week.

Moved: T. Shmyruk

Second: M. Heartt

CARRIED

6.2 AM1010 Automotive Workshop Practices I

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve changes to AM1010 Automotive Workshop Practices I from 3(0-0-27) 107 Hours 4 Weeks to 2(0-0-30) 90 Hours 3 Weeks.

Moved: T. Shmyruk

Second: C. McLeod

CARRIED

6.3 AM1020 Automotive Steering, Suspension and Driveshafts

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve changes to AM1020 Automotive Steering, Suspension and Driveshafts from 4(24-0-0) 72 Hours 3 Weeks to 2(30-0-0) 60 Hours 2 Weeks.

Moved: T. Shmyruk

Second: M. Heartt

CARRIED

6.4 AM1030 Automotive Basic Materials, Tools, and Skill

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve changes to AM1030 Automotive Basic Materials, Tools, and skill from 1(16.5-0-0) 16.5 Hours 1 Week to 1(16-0-0) 16.5 Hours .5 Week.

Moved: T. Shmyruk

Second: M. Heartt

CARRIED

6.5 AM1210 Automotive Hydraulic Brake Systems and Basic Maintenance

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve changes to AM1210 Automotive Hydraulic Brake Systems and Basic Maintenance from 3(24-0-0) 48 Hours 2 Weeks to 3(30-0-0) 45 Hours 1.5 Weeks.

Moved: T. Shmyruk

Second: M. Heartt

CARRIED

6.6 AM1220 Automotive Public Relations, Work Habits, Ethics, and Related Subjects

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve changes to AM1220 Automotive Public Relations, Work Habits, Ethics, and Related Subjects from 4(29.5-0-0) 59 Hours 2 Weeks to 3(30-0-0) 45 Hours 1.5 Weeks.

Moved: T. Shmyruk

Second: M. Heartt

CARRIED

6.7 AM1230 Automotive Administration

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve changes to AM1230 Automotive Administration from 2(29-0-0) 29 Hours 1 Week to 2(21-0-0) 42 Hours 2 Weeks.

Moved: T. Shmyruk

Second: M. Heartt

CARRIED

6.8 AM1250 Automotive Workshop Practices II

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve changes to AM1250 Automotive Workshop Practices II from 3(0-0-28) 112 Hours 4 Weeks to 2(0-0-30) 60 Hours 2 Weeks.

Moved: T. Shmyruk

Second: M. Heartt

CARRIED

6.9 AM1260 Automotive Electrical I, HVAC Repair

No Changes. Received for information only.

6.10 AM2000 Automotive Work Experience

No Changes. Received for information only.

6.11 Automotive Certificate Program

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the changes to the Automotive Certificate Program as presented, changing total program hours from 580 to 574, total program credits from 21 to 20, and total weeks from 18 to 19.5 pending Ministry approval.

Moved: T. Shmyruk

Second: M. Heartt

CARRIED

7.0 Course Outline Template

7.1 Course Outline Template

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve a change to the Indigenous Land Acknowledgement on the course outline template to “Grande Prairie Regional College respectfully acknowledges that we are located on Treaty 8 territory, the traditional homeland and gathering place for many diverse Indigenous peoples. We are honoured to be on the ancestral lands of the Cree, Dene/Beaver and Métis, whose histories, languages, and cultures continue to influence our vibrant community. We are grateful to have the opportunity to work, learn, and live on this land.”

Moved: C. McLeod

Second: M. Heartt

CARRIED

8.0 Adjournment.

NOTE: *It was discovered after this meeting that with the above changes to the Automotive Certificate Program that the Automotive Certificate Program is 19.5 weeks. The department will bring this program back to a future Curriculum Committee meeting for adjustment.*

FAST TRACK MEETING

Agenda Item 4.7.2

Date: June 24, 2021

Location(s) Via Zoom

CHAIR:

Aman Litt Director, Student Experience

RECORDS:

Shawwna Boyd

MEMBERS:

Vanessa Sheane	Interim Vice President, Academic and Research
Julia Dutove	Academic Council Chair
Carly McLeod	Interim Dean, School of Health, Wellness and Career Studies
Amanda Wills	Librarian
John Tiede	President, Students Association

1. Approval of agenda by consensus.

2. Fast Track Terms of Reference

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve a change to the Fast Track Process for Credit Programs and Courses adding the Registrar to committee membership.

Moved: V. Sheane **Second:** A. Wills

CARRIED

3. Business and Office Administration

3.1 BA3120 Operations and Supply Chain Management

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the addition of BA3120 Operations and Supply Chain Management to course offerings for the Bachelor of Business Administration program as presented.

Moved: C. McLeod **Second:** V. Sheane

Discussion: Transfer for this course and all other BBA courses presented today will be reviewed at a later date. The intent at this time is for these courses and the BBA program to receive College approval so that the proposal for the new program can be submitted to CAQC for review.

CARRIED

3.2 BA3150 Management Information Systems

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the addition of BA3150 Management Information Systems to course offerings for the Bachelor of Business Administration program as presented.

Moved: C. McLeod **Second:** A. Wills

CARRIED

3.3 BA3500 Rural, Northern, and Indigenous Business Analysis

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the addition of BA3500 Rural, Northern, and Indigenous Business Analysis to course offerings for the Bachelor of Business Administration program as presented.

Moved: C. McLeod **Second:** A. Wills

CARRIED

3.4 BA4000 Strategic Management

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the addition of BA4000 Strategic Management to course offerings for the Bachelor of Business Administration program as presented.

Moved: C. McLeod **Second:** A. Wills

CARRIED

3.5 BA4010 Creativity, Innovation, and New Product Development

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the addition of BA4010 Creativity, Innovation and New Product Development to course offerings for the Bachelor of Business Administration program as presented.

Moved: C. McLeod **Second:** A. Wills

CARRIED

3.6 BA4240 Strategic Human Resources Planning

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the addition of BA4240 Strategic Human Resources Planning to course offerings for the Bachelor of Business Administration program as presented.

Moved: C. McLeod

Second: A. Wills

CARRIED

3.7 BA4500 Advanced Research Methodologies

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the addition of BA4500 Advanced Research Methodologies to course offerings for the Bachelor of Business Administration program as presented.

Moved: C. McLeod

Second: A. Wills

CARRIED

3.8 BA4920 Business Administration Co-Op II

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the addition of BA4920 Business Administration Co-Op II to course offerings for the Bachelor of Business Administration program as presented.

Moved: C. McLeod

Second: A. Wills

CARRIED

3.9 BA4950 Management Capstone Course

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the addition of BA4950 Management Capstone Course to course offerings for the Bachelor of Business Administration program as presented.

Moved: C. McLeod

Second: A. Wills

CARRIED

3.10 Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA)

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve the addition of the Bachelor of Business Administration program as presented.

Moved: C. McLeod

Second: J. Dutove

CARRIED

3.11 OA1440 QuickBooks

Motion: Recommend that the Fast Track Committee approve a change to the course description for OA1440 QuickBooks to "This is a comprehensive course teaching accounting

concepts in a software environment. Students will use QuickBooks to go through step-by-step basics to complex tasks for service and merchandising businesses. Students will be exposed to subsidiary journals, accounting ledgers, and audit trail concepts. You will know QuickBooks and be able to use it in the workplace including advanced features such as year-end procedures, tracking time, job costing, integration with Excel and Outlook and other.”

Moved: C. McLeod

Second: J. Dutove

CARRIED

4.0 Adjournment

ACADEMIC COUNCIL AUTHORITY AND BYLAWS



ACADEMIC COUNCIL AUTHORITY AND BYLAWS			
Effective Date	Date the Policy is approved	Policy Type	Academic
Responsibility	Board of Governors President and CEO Vice-President Academic and Research	Cross-Reference	Post-Secondary Learning Act
Approver	Board of Governors	Appendices	Appendix 1: Co-Curricular Committee Terms of Reference Appendix 2: Curriculum Committee Terms of Reference Appendix 3: Nominating Committee Terms of Reference Appendix 4: Program Review Committee Terms of Reference
Review Schedule	Yearly in October		

1. Academic Council Statement

1.1. The composition, powers, and duties of Academic Council (“the Council”) are established by the Alberta Post-Secondary Learning Act (2003, current as of December 9, 2020). The Act empowers the College Board of Governors (“the Board”) to oversee the Council. Unless otherwise stated in the Act, the Council reports and makes recommendations to the Board. The Board is the final authority for acceptance or rejection of the Council’s recommendations.

2. Post Secondary Learning Act

- 2.1. Academic Council, Section 46.
 - 2.1.1. For each comprehensive community college and polytechnic institution there is to be an academic council consisting of
 - 2.1.1.1. the president, who is the chair unless a chair is elected under subsection (5);
 - 2.1.1.2. not more than 4 senior officials, appointed as members of the council by the board;
 - 2.1.1.3. subject to subsection (2), not more than 10 academic staff members, elected by the academic staff association of the comprehensive community college or polytechnic institution;
 - 2.1.1.4. not more than 10 students, appointed by the council of the students’ association;
 - 2.1.1.5. not more than 5 additional members, appointed by the board.
 - 2.1.2. The number of academic staff members elected to the academic council under subsection (1) (c) shall in no case be less than 1/3 of the total number of members of the academic council.
 - 2.1.3. The term of office of members of the academic council shall be determined by the board.
 - 2.1.4. Where any question arises as to the composition of the academic council or any matter concerning the election of academic staff members or students to an academic council, the question shall be decided by the board and the board’s decision is final.
 - 2.1.5. The academic council may elect a chair from among its members.

2.2. Powers and Duties, Section 47

2.2.1. An academic council

2.2.1.1. shall make recommendations or reports to the board with respect to any matter that the board refers to the academic council, including academic policy related to the following matters:

2.2.1.1.1. Standards and policy respecting the selection and admission of students other than students in apprenticeship technical training under the Apprenticeship and Industry Training Act;

2.2.1.1.2. Courses and programs of instruction or training provided or to be provided by the board;

2.2.1.1.3. Academic awards,

2.2.1.2. Shall, in accordance with the process established under section 45(3), review proposed programs of study to be offered by the comprehensive community college or polytechnic institution, and make a report respecting that review, and

2.2.1.3. May make recommendations or reports to the board on any other matter the academic council considers advisable.

2.2.2. A recommendation or report of an academic council under subsection (1) must be in writing and must be transmitted to the board through the president for consideration at its next meeting.

3. Academic Council Objective

3.1. The mandate of Academic Council is to provide a forum for College constituents to debate ideas and concepts leading to the development of Academic Policies. In addition to policy development and review, the Council monitors the implementation of Academic Policies, recommending the future direction of College programming and identifying significant trends in education and society and their implications for the College.

4. Scope of Academic Council

4.1. Provide recommendations or reports to the Board with respect to any matter that the Board refers to the Council. Including but not limited to

4.1.1. Academic Policies

4.1.2. Program Review

4.1.3. Program/Course Changes

4.1.4. Academic Standards and Requirements for Admission, Progression, and Completion of programs and courses

4.1.5. New Program Proposals

4.1.6. Academic Schedule

4.2. Identify significant issues in education and society and discuss the implications for Grande Prairie Regional College.

5. Definitions

5.1. Academic Awards

5.2. Academic Policies

5.3. Academic Schedule

5.4. College Community

5.5. Program Review

5.6. Recommendations to the Board

5.7. Reports to the Board

6. Guiding Principles

- 6.1. Membership on GPRC's Academic Council shall be:
 - 6.1.1. The President
 - 6.1.2. Four other senior administrators as appointed by the Board yearly in May.
 - 6.1.2.1. Vice President Academic and Research,
 - 6.1.2.2. Registrar, and
 - 6.1.2.3. Two academic Deans (Appointment shall rotate at the discretion of the Vice President Academic and Research).
 - 6.1.3. Ten Academic Staff Association (ASA) members elected by the ASA. There shall be no more than two members from a department where possible.
 - 6.1.3.1. Except for the Chair and Vice Chair, elected members will serve a two-year term beginning May 25 . In the event that the Chair or Vice Chair of Academic Council is an elected member of the ASA then their terms on Academic Council end 12 months after their election to the office or until a new Chair or Vice Chair is elected, respectively.
 - 6.1.3.2. Members elected to fill a vacancy will serve from the date of election until May 24 of the following academic year.
 - 6.1.4. Ten students appointed by the Students' Association of Grande Prairie Regional College (SAGPRC).
 - 6.1.4.1. Elected students will serve a one-year term from the date of approval by the Council until the end of the academic year.
 - 6.1.5. Two Employees' Association members elected by the Employees' Association and appointed by the Board.
 - 6.1.5.1. The members must be from different departments where possible. The Employees' Association must submit the names of the elected members to the Vice-President Academic and Research for formal appointment by the Board.
 - 6.1.5.2. The appointed members will serve a two-year term beginning May 25 and ending May 24.
 - 6.1.6. One member of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees Local 071 Chapter 007 elected by the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees Local 071 Chapter 007 and appointed by the Board.
 - 6.1.6.1. The Alberta Union of Provincial Employees Local 071 Chapter 007 must submit the name of the elected member to the Vice-President Academic and Research for formal appointment by the Board.
 - 6.1.6.2. The appointed member will serve a two-year term beginning May 25 and ending May 24.
 - 6.1.7. Two members of the general public appointed by the Board. The appointed members will serve a two-year term beginning May 25 and ending May 24 but may not serve more than two consecutive terms.
 - 6.1.8. Council Secretary, non-voting, to record recommendations and minutes.
 - 6.1.9. Elected members shall be eligible for re-election every two years, but may not serve more than two consecutive terms. Elected students shall be eligible for re-election every year.
 - 6.1.10. Alternate Members
 - 6.1.10.1. The Vice-President Academic and Research may appoint an alternate from Senior Administration to attend an Academic Council meeting in the event of the appointed senior administrator's absence.
 - 6.1.10.2. The Academic Staff Association may elect up to five alternate members from any department to attend in the absence of elected members.
 - 6.1.10.3. The Students' Association may elect up to five alternate members to attend in the absence of elected members.
 - 6.1.10.4. The Employees' Association may elect up to two alternate members. The names of these alternate members must be submitted to the Vice-President Academic and Research for formal appointment by the Board.
 - 6.1.10.5. The Alberta Union of Provincial Employees Local 071 Chapter 007 may elect up to two alternate members. The names of this alternate members must

be submitted to the Vice-President Academic and Research for formal appointment by the Board

6.2. Standing Committees

6.2.1. Standing committees of Academic Council shall have their terms of reference, nominated members, and reporting structure approved by the Council.

6.2.1.1. Co-Curricular Committee

6.2.1.1.1. The co-curricular committee shall make recommendations to Academic Council reading co-curricular transcripts that provide students with recorded evidence of progress and developmental accomplishments.

6.2.1.1.2. Terms of Reference included in Appendix 1.

6.2.1.2. Curriculum Committee

6.2.1.2.1. The curriculum committee debates course and program changes from a philosophical, androgogical, and polytechnical perspective and brings recommendations to Academic Council.

6.2.1.2.2. Terms of Reference included in Appendix 2.

6.2.1.2.3. Academic Council shall make recommendations for course and program changes to the Board of Governors.

6.2.1.3. Nominating Committee

6.2.1.3.1. The nominating committee ensures that the slate of nominees for all standing committees is ready for submission to Academic Council by September 30th.

6.2.1.3.2. Terms of Reference included in Appendix 3.

6.2.1.3.3. Academic Council shall approve membership for all standing committees.

6.2.1.4. Program Review Committee

6.2.1.4.1. The program review committee reviews the annual and comprehensive program review templates and updated program action plans and makes recommendations to Academic Council. It also monitors the rolling schedule of reviews and makes provisions for linked and/or similar programs to be reviewed together.

6.2.1.4.2. Terms of Reference included in Appendix 4.

6.2.1.4.3. Academic Council shall make recommendations to the Board of Governors based on the annual and comprehensive program review templates and updated program action plans.

6.2.2. Normally, committee members shall be approved at the October meeting each year.

6.3. Operational Procedures of Academic Council

6.3.1. In order to assure full student representation, the Council shall elect its Chair at the October meeting. The Chair will remain in office for twelve months from the time of the election of the Chair or until a new Chair is elected, whichever comes first. In the event that the elected Chair is not a member of the Council on May 25, the Vice Chair will assume the role until the Council elects a chair.

6.3.2. The Council shall elect a Vice Chair at the October meeting. The Vice Chair shall preside over meetings in the absence of the Chair or assume the role of Chair in the event of a long-term absence. Unless the elected Vice Chair is a student member of Academic Council, the Vice Chair will remain in office for 12 months from the time of the election of the Vice Chair or until a new Vice Chair is elected, whichever comes first. If the Vice Chair is a student member of Council, the Vice Chair will remain in office until May 24.

6.3.3. In the absence of the elected Chair and the elected Vice Chair or in the event that the Chair and the Vice Chair cannot perform their duties, the Vice-President Academic and Research, or designate, may assume the role of the Chair of the Council until a new Chair is elected.

6.3.4. In the event that the elected Chair is not a member of the Council on May 25, the Chair shall remain the Chair for the purpose of fast tracking over the spring and summer months

and shall remain the Chair of the Nominating Committee until the slate of nominees is submitted by the October meeting.

- 6.3.5. The Chair of the Council shall:
 - 6.3.5.1. Preside over all meetings of the Council according to the principles of Robert’s Rules of Order;
 - 6.3.5.2. Prepare correspondence as necessary on behalf of the Council;
 - 6.3.5.3. Prepare the meeting agenda in consultation with the Vice President Academic and Research, and the Council Secretary.
- 6.3.6. Regular meetings of the Council will normally be held four (4) times during the academic year.
 - 6.3.6.1. Typically in October, December, February, and May.
 - 6.3.6.2. Meetings will normally be scheduled on the second Thursday of the month in which there is a meeting.
 - 6.3.6.3. The agenda and supporting documents shall be distributed to the Council members no fewer than four days prior to the meeting.
- 6.3.7. Quorum of the Council shall consist of a majority of the voting members. Members who intend to be absent from a scheduled meeting of the Council are expected to give notice to either the Chair or the Secretary. Any member who is absent without notice from two meetings during the year will forfeit their membership on the Council and the nominating body will be so informed and asked for a replacement.
- 6.3.8. Any member of the College community may refer a matter to the attention of the Council by presenting in writing a submission to the Chair no less than ten days prior to any meeting of the Council.
- 6.3.9. All submissions to the Council will be considered for the agenda of the next regular meeting of the Council. Submissions may be returned to the originator only:
 - 6.3.9.1. If there is insufficient information for the Council to make an informed decision;
 - 6.3.9.2. If the submission would be better served in a different forum;
 - 6.3.9.3. If prescribed College procedure has not been followed.
- 6.3.10. The President may call special meetings as necessary to conduct the Council business. Notice of a special meeting shall be given to the Council members no fewer than three working days prior to the meeting

7. Roles and Responsibilities

Stakeholder	Responsibilities
Board of Governors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and formally approve these Bylaws. • Fulfill duties of Board of Governors outlined in these Bylaws.
President and CEO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review, present recommendations to the Board of Governors, and formally support these Bylaws. • Communicate approval status of recommendations from the Board of Governors to Academic Council. • Fulfill duties of President and CEO outlined in these Bylaws.
Academic Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review, recommend revisions, and formally support these Bylaws.
Vice-President, Academic and Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and formally support this policy. • Ensure these Bylaws are reviewed by Academic Council yearly. • Ensure these Bylaws align with the Post-Secondary Learning Act. • Fulfill duties of Vice President Academic and Research outlined in these Bylaws.
College Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and support these Bylaws.

8. Exceptions to these Bylaws

- 8.1. Any exceptions to these Bylaws must be approved by the President and CEO. Requests for exceptions must be submitted through the Vice President Academic and Research Office.

9. Inquiries

- 9.1. All inquiries about these Bylaws are handled by the Vice President Academic and Research Office.

10. Amendments (Revision History)

Repatriated from the Board of Governors: April 27, 1999
Reviewed and revised by Academic Council: January 11 & February 8, 2001
Updated to include PWAC Committee: April 12, 2001
Updated by Board of Governors: September 25, 2001
Reviewed and revised by Academic Council: April 10, 2003
Reviewed and approved by Board of Governors: May 22, 2003
Review and revised by Academic Council: November 18, 2004 & April 21, 2005
Reviewed and approved by Board of Governors: May 26, 2005
Reviewed and revised by Academic Council: April 27, 2006
Reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors: September 21, 2006
Reviewed and revised by Academic Council: October 11, 2007
Reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors: December 13, 2007
Reviewed and revised by Academic Council: November 13, 2008
Reviewed and revised by Academic Council: November 13, 2008
Reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors: December 11, 2008
Reviewed and revised by Academic Council: April 16, 2009
Reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors: June 17, 2009
Reviewed and revised by Academic Council: April 12, 2012
Reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors: January 24, 2013
Reviewed and approved by Academic Council: October 13, 2016
Reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors: November 24, 2016.
Reviewed and recommended by Academic Council: DATE
Reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors: DATE

Appendix 1 – Co-Curricular Committee Terms of Reference

1. The co-curricular committee is a standing committee of Academic Council and reports to Academic Council.
 - 1.1. Academic Council approves and reviews the Terms of Reference for this Committee.
2. Committee Composition:
 - 2.1. The Registrar normally serves as Chair
 - 2.2. President of the Students' Association (or designee)
 - 2.3. Representative from Student Experience
 - 2.4. Three Academic Staff members (one from each school)
 - 2.5. Unique representative from Academic Council
3. Membership:
 - 3.1. Membership nominated by Academic Council Nominating Committee and the Students' Association.
 - 3.2. Membership approved by Academic Council
 - 3.3. The members of the committee will be elected at the October meeting of Academic Council. Members will typically serve a two-year term.
4. Responsibilities:
 - 4.1. The Committee will oversee the administration of co-curricular transcripts which includes:
 - 4.1.1. review and approve student applications for co-curricular recognition,
 - 4.1.2. review and make recommendation to Academic Council regarding activities eligible for co-curricular recognition.
5. Procedures for Student Recognition
 - 5.1. Application
 - 5.1.1. Applications may be submitted by students and/or faculty/staff members by completing co-curricular application forms provided through the offices of the Registrar and the Students' Association.
 - 5.1.2. Students may initiate the process by completing the student application form for co-curricular recognition.
 - 5.1.3. Student initiated application must include all validating signatures in order to be considered.
 - 5.1.4. Faculty/staff may initiate the process on behalf of students by completing the faculty/staff application form for co-curricular recognition.
 - 5.1.5. Students and/or faculty/staff must return the completed application forms to the Registrar's Office where they will be reviewed by the Committee for inclusion in the students' records.
 - 5.1.6. The deadline for application will be February 1 in any academic year.
 - 5.1.7. Application may be made for students to receive co-curricular recognition for activities that were undertaken no more than two years from date of application.
 - 5.2. Approval
 - 5.2.1. Activities authorized by Academic Council are the only eligible activities that the Co-curricular Committee can process as approved on a student's application.
 - 5.2.2. The Committee will ensure that the validating signatures are original and by authorized College representatives as per the activity approval.
6. Procedures for Activity Recognition
 - 6.1. Applications for Activity Approval of Co-curricular Recognition must include the following information:
 - 6.1.1. title and brief description of the activity;
 - 6.1.2. rationale for consideration as an alternate learning activity including the contribution to college and/or student life at Grande Prairie Regional College;

- 6.1.3. minimum requirements for a student to be considered eligible to receive recognition for the activity;
- 6.1.4. administrative unit (Students' association, Academic Department, etc.) that hosts the activity;
- 6.1.5. the personnel/position responsible for validating student applications for recognition.
- 6.2. Applications for Co-curricular Activity Recognition Approval form must be submitted no later than February 1 in the year the activity is to be considered.
- 6.3. Applications for Activity Recognition will normally receive committee approval:
 - 6.3.1. if, in the case of a student group, that group is recognized by the Students' Association Executive;
 - 6.3.2. if an administrative unit is prepared to host the activity and designates a validating signature required to acknowledge that the student has performed the function for the minimum duration defined for approval;
 - 6.3.3. if academic credit is not currently awarded for the same activity.
- 7. The Co-curricular Committee will review the application and make a recommendation to Academic Council.

DRAFT

Appendix 2 – Curriculum Committee Terms of Reference

1. The curriculum committee is a standing committee of Academic Council and reports to Academic Council.
 - 1.1. Academic Council approves and reviews the Terms of Reference for this Committee.
2. Committee Composition:
 - 2.1. Vice-President Academic and Research normally serves as Chair
 - 2.2. Deans
 - 2.3. Registrar
 - 2.4. Two students appointed by the Students' Association
 - 2.5. Chairperson(s) bringing items forward
 - 2.6. Four (4) Faculty members from Academic Council with no more than two (2) from one School.
 - 2.7. Faculty member from the Centre for Teaching and Learning
3. Membership:
 - 3.1. Membership nominated by Academic Council Nominating Committee and the Students' Association.
 - 3.2. The members of the committee will be elected at the October meeting of Academic Council.
 - 3.3. Membership approved by Academic Council
4. Responsibilities:
 - 4.1.1. To review and debate all proposals for new credit programs.
 - 4.1.2. To review and debate all proposals for changes to existing credit courses and programs.
 - 4.1.3. To make recommendations to Academic Council on proposals for new courses/programs and changes to existing courses/programs.
5. Procedures
 - 5.1. For New Credit Programs/Courses Proposals
 - 5.1.1. Proposals for new credit programs and new credit courses must be endorsed by a Dean.
 - 5.1.2. Prior to new credit courses/programs being introduced at the Curriculum Committee they must be endorsed by the Registrar to ensure they are compliant with policy/regulation regarding:
 - 5.1.2.1. course/program titles,
 - 5.1.2.2. course hours,
 - 5.1.2.3. course content,
 - 5.1.2.4. credit allowances,
 - 5.1.2.5. advanced placement/credit,
 - 5.1.2.6. additions or deletions of courses and/or duplication of courses,
 - 5.1.2.7. prerequisites and co-requisites, and
 - 5.1.2.8. admission requirements.
 - 5.1.3. Prior to new credit courses/programs being introduced at the Curriculum Committee they must be endorsed by the Vice-President Academic and Research to ensure they can be supported financially, by student demand, by the labour market, and within the provincial sector.
 - 5.2. For Changes to Existing Courses and Programs
 - 5.2.1. Proposals for changes to existing credit courses and existing credit programs must be endorsed by the Department and the Dean.
 - 5.2.2. Prior to changes to existing credit courses/programs being introduced at the Curriculum Committee they must be endorsed by the Registrar to ensure they are compliant with policy/regulation regarding:
 - 5.2.2.1. course/program titles,

- 5.2.2.2. course hours,
 - 5.2.2.3. course content,
 - 5.2.2.4. credit allowances,
 - 5.2.2.5. advanced placement/credit,
 - 5.2.2.6. additions or deletions of courses and/or duplication of courses,
 - 5.2.2.7. prerequisites and co-requisites, and
 - 5.2.2.8. admission requirements.
- 5.2.3. Prior to changes in existing credit courses/programs being introduced at the Curriculum Committee they must be endorsed by the Vice-President Academic and Research to ensure they can be supported financially, by student demand, by the labour market, faculty expertise, and within the provincial sector.
6. Forms
- 6.1. Forms for a new course/program or a change to an existing course/program are available from the Deans' Office, the Registrar's Office, or the College Curriculum shared site.
 - 6.2. Forms Available:
 - 6.2.1. Form A: New Program Proposal
 - 6.2.2. Form B: New Course Proposal
 - 6.2.3. Form C: Change to Existing Course Proposal
 - 6.2.4. Form D: Change to Existing Program Proposal

Appendix 3 – Nominating Committee Terms of Reference

1. The nominating committee is a standing committee of Academic Council and reports to Academic Council.
 - 1.1. Academic Council approves and reviews the Terms of Reference for this Committee.
2. Committee Composition:
 - 2.1. The Chair of Academic Council normally serves as Chair
 - 2.2. Two members from the Academic Staff Association, two-year term (elected in alternating years)
 - 2.3. One member from the Employees' Association, two-year term
 - 2.4. One member from the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, two-year term.
3. Membership:
 - 3.1. Membership nominated by Academic Council Nominating Committee (as per recommendation by each Association).
 - 3.2. Membership approved by Academic Council
4. Responsibilities:
 - 4.1.1. The Nominating Committee prepares a slate of executive officers and representatives to Academic Council's standing committees, with the exception of students who are selected by the Students' Association.
 - 4.1.2. Duties normally begin in April when preparation for committee elections begins. However, throughout the year, the Committee may be asked to make a nomination to fill a vacancy on a committee if it is required.
 - 4.1.3. The Chair and members of the nominating committee ensure that the slate of nominees is prepared between April 25th and September 25th and is ready for submission to the Council by September 30th.

Appendix 4 – Program Review Committee Terms of Reference

1. The Program Review Committee is a standing committee of Academic Council and reports to Academic Council.
 - 1.1. Academic Council approves and reviews the Terms of Reference for this Committee.
2. Committee Composition:
 - 2.1. VP Academic and Research (ex officio and chair)
 - 2.2. One academic Dean (nominated by Deans)
 - 2.3. Five academic members (nominated by and from Academic Council with at least one from each academic school and one from a degree program)
 - 2.4. One non-academic staff member (nominated by and from Academic Council).
 - 2.5. One member of the CTL Steering Committee (nominated by the CTL Steering Committee)
 - 2.6. One Students' Association representative (nominated by the Students' Association)
 - 2.7. One Indigenous Knowledge Keeper (nominated by Indigenous Services)
 - 2.8. Registrar (ex officio)
 - 2.9. Director of Student Experience or designate (Non-voting resource)
 - 2.10. Manager, Institutional Planning and Research or designate (Non-voting resource)
3. Membership:
 - 3.1. Members of the committee will be approved at the October meeting of Academic Council and will serve a two-year term.
 - 3.2. The intention is that members will serve staggered terms to allow for greater continuity and knowledge transfer.
4. Meetings:
 - 4.1. Meetings will be held to orient the committee members to the process and to receive and discuss annual and comprehensive review materials.
 - 4.1.1. Normally in August, October, and April each academic year.
5. Responsibilities:
 - 5.1. The responsibilities of the Program Review Committee include, but are not limited to:
 - 5.1.1. Providing oversight for both the annual and comprehensive program review processes.
 - 5.1.2. Confirming that the program review criteria and processes are aligned with Campus Alberta Quality Council expectations and institutional priorities.
 - 5.1.3. Approving combinations of like, linked, and/or related programs to undertake a common review.
 - 5.1.4. Maintaining a rolling five-year schedule of comprehensive reviews that will be forwarded to Academic Council for Approval.
 - 5.1.5. Providing feedback on the relevance, clarity, and consistency of the qualitative and quantitative data used to inform the review process.
 - 5.1.6. Receiving Annual Program review summaries and updated program action plans for information purposes.
 - 5.1.7. Calling for a comprehensive review to be initiated and adjusting the rolling schedule of reviews accordingly, where warranted from the annual review process.
 - 5.1.8. Receiving the self study, external review, and approved recommendations for each Comprehensive Review for information purposes.
 - 5.1.9. Identifying and investigating common themes that may arise from the reviews and making recommendations for follow-up.
 - 5.1.10. Proposing the criteria through which programs should be expanded, continued, suspended, terminated, or reactivated.

- 5.1.11. Applying the criteria for the curriculum alignment and renewal process to make recommendations to Academic Council regarding the overall program mix and the expansion, continuation, suspension, termination, or reactivation of programs.
- 5.1.12. Recommending improvements to the program review processes including updating the forms and procedures for the review process.
- 6. Voting:
 - 6.1. Recommendations made by the committee will be determined by majority vote.
 - 6.1.1. Committee members with a direct interest in the program under consideration must recuse themselves from the vote.
 - 6.1.2. In the event of a tie, the Vice President Academic and Research shall have the deciding vote.
 - 6.1.3. While final decisions will normally be made in camera, it is expected that Deans and Department Chairs attend as guests when comprehensive reviews and/or action plan updates are presented.
- 7. Annual Review Procedures
 - 7.1. Purpose:
 - 7.1.1. Annual program reviews are conducted to ensure that the content and delivery of credit programs continues to be responsive, current, and relevant in meeting learner, community, and employer needs.
 - 7.1.2. The review is an evidence informed process that helps programs maintain their alignment with the institution’s mission, mandate, strategic initiatives, and priorities.
 - 7.2. Principles:
 - 7.2.1. Program review and renewal is a collaborative process whereby data informs meaningful discussions to build on a program’s strengths and successes through clear action plans.
 - 7.2.2. The review processes provide an opportunity for the program to learn more about itself by engaging with Stakeholders.
 - 7.2.3. The process should be flexible enough to accommodate the diverse program offerings of the institution. This includes allowing linked credentials and/or common disciplines to be grouped together for reviews with the expectation that any divergent trends will be analyzed.
 - 7.2.4. Annual program reviews are formative, not summative, in nature but results may indicate a more comprehensive review is required.
 - 7.2.5. Program Review is not intended to evaluate performance of individual faculty, staff, or administrators.
 - 7.3. Definitions:

Term	Definition
Credit Programs	A program of study that is approved by Alberta Advanced Education and leads to a credential defined in Alberta’s Credential Framework.
Action Plan	An action plan is the outcome the comprehensive review process. It documents the steps needed to reach established goals. Action plans clarify the timelines, tasks, and investments needed to respond to approved recommendations received during the comprehensive review process and annually affirmed and prioritized by the program Chair and Dean.
Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan	An ongoing process through which faculty members can assure that senior students are demonstrating expected knowledge, skills, and abilities (graduate attributes). These rolling multi-year plans identify the

	outcomes to be examined, specific targets, results, and the department's response to the assessment.
Challenge questions	Questions designed to elicit an analytic response that engages with relevant data.
Program Profile Data	A common set of quantitative measures used as evidence in the analysis of program effectiveness. Trends in program demand, student success, and the use of resources will be tracked along with other key performance indicators. Each data element in the program profile will be clearly defined.

7.4. Roles and Responsibilities

7.4.1. Academic Council:

7.4.1.1. Has the overall responsibility for regulating program offerings and ensuring effective processes are in place for continuous quality improvements to the curriculum in order to promote student success.

7.4.2. Vice President Academic and Research:

7.4.2.1. In consultation with the Deans and Program Chairs, will monitor the operational requirements for the review processes and allocate necessary resources to support the annual and comprehensive program reviews including sponsoring relevant faculty development workshops.

7.4.2.2. In collaboration with the Deans, the Vice President Academic and Research will confirm the institutional priorities and the related challenge questions to be included on the annual form.

7.4.2.3. The Vice President Academic and Research will approve the program action plan updates and provide them to the Program Review Committee for information.

7.4.3. Deans:

7.4.3.1. Will review all the annual program review reports for their area and may make suggestions for revisions prior to forwarding the reports to the Vice President Academic and Research for approval.

7.4.3.2. The Deans may use the annual program updates to inform business cases for resource allocation/re-allocation. Deans monitor the activities of the Program Advisory Councils and the involvement of other relevant stakeholders in the quality assurance processes.

7.4.4. Program Chairs:

7.4.4.1. Are primarily responsible for engaging colleagues in the review of the evidence provided from learning outcomes assessments and the program profile data to respond to the challenge questions in the review form.

7.4.4.2. Program Chairs are also responsible for managing stakeholder engagement, including Program Advisory Council meetings.

7.4.4.3. Program Chairs will submit their program review reports on the required forms at the end of term and will respond to suggestions and recommendations from the relevant Dean.

7.4.5. Program Faculty Members and Staff:

7.4.5.1. Actively participate in review activities including providing access course materials to assist with curriculum review and mapping, examining trends in the profile data, championing recommendations for improving student success, and contributing to action plans.

7.4.6. Program Review Committee:

- 7.4.6.1. Is a standing committee of Academic Council that reviews the completed annual program review forms and updated program actions plans and makes recommendations to Academic Council.
- 7.4.6.2. It also monitors the rolling schedule of reviews and makes provisions for linked and/or similar programs to be reviewed together.
- 7.4.6.3. Will assess the annual review forms and data elements. The committee will make recommendations on forms and dashboard organization as well as the combination of programs that can be reviewed together. They may also identify common themes from the Action Plan updates which require further investigation.
- 7.4.7. Institutional Planning and Research (IPR):
 - 7.4.7.1. Will work with members of Academic and Research Council to develop standard data packages for program profiles that are clearly defined, timely, accurate, and relevant.
 - 7.4.7.2. IPR staff will provide training for academic staff on the uses of dashboards and/or forms and identify limitations of available data.
 - 7.4.7.3. IPR will also make relevant comparator data available including the institutional completion rates, labour force demand metrics, and institutional enrolment projections.
- 7.5. Procedures:
 - 7.5.1. Annual Program Review Form
 - 7.5.1.1. This program summary should be a succinct (4 to 5 page) analysis of the standard program profile data package, ongoing learning outcomes assessments, stakeholder feedback, student and faculty achievements, and the implementation of the program action plan.
 - 7.5.1.2. Form A: Annual Program Review includes a program description section along with questions on relevance and currency, student success, faculty qualifications and workloads, program resources, institutional priorities, changes in the operating environment, and recommendations for the coming year. Suggested evidence is listed for each section.
 - 7.5.2. Timing of Reports:
 - 7.5.2.1. Annual Program Review Reports should be compiled by the designated program chair and submitted to the relevant Dean for review within six weeks of the end of the spring term.
 - 7.5.2.2. The reports should reflect on activities, including curriculum mapping, course outline audits, learning outcomes assessments, and any stakeholder engagements that have taken place through out the year.
 - 7.5.3. Program profile data:
 - 7.5.3.1. A standard data package Form B: Program Profile Data will include tracking of program demand, student success, and use of resources.
 - 7.5.3.2. This will be made available by Institutional Planning and Research at the end of the spring term.
 - 7.5.3.3. The data elements will include key performance indicators for the institution and other identified priorities.
 - 7.5.4. Learning Outcome Assessment Plans:
 - 7.5.4.1. Each year Form C: Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan should be appended as evidence that the curriculum is up-to-date, and that due consideration has been given to student achievement on selected attributes.
 - 7.5.4.2. Discipline-specific and credential-level knowledge and skills should be tracked using predominantly direct evidence. Providing the crossovers with the Alberta Credential Framework are well documented, externally accredited programs can

substitute their discipline-specific assurances of learning and/or demonstrations of required competencies.

7.5.5. Institutional priorities and challenge questions:

7.5.5.1. The annual program review process provides opportunities for programs to demonstrate their alignment to institutional priorities. This gives the Deans and Vice President Academic and Research insight to how different program initiatives contribute to the overall success of the institution.

7.5.5.2. Each January, the Deans and Vice President Academic and Research should discuss the challenge questions to be placed in the institutional priority section of the form and, in consultation with the Chairs and Institutional Planning and Research, determine available sources of evidence. Results of these consultations should be shared widely with faculty members so they can contribute to data collection and analysis.

7.5.6. Stakeholder engagement:

7.5.6.1. The quality assurance process relies on input from both internal and external stakeholders.

7.5.6.2. Faculty and staff should be given opportunities to contribute to the analysis and priority setting activities that are summarized in the review.

7.5.6.3. Recent graduates and/or students may also contribute insights from their experience in the program. Short surveys can be used but focus groups often provide for more dynamic engagement.

7.5.6.4. External community and industry representatives should have experience and/or credentials that will allow them to comment on the relevance of the program. Feedback can be gathered through facilitated meetings or virtual focus group sessions that can take place at any point during the year. The question prompts should be designed to encourage a solutions-focused discussion.

7.5.7. Action Plan Updates:

7.5.7.1. Implementation of the program action plans are fundamental for continuous quality improvement. The action plan may include changes such as the introduction, revision, or removal of a course; calendar changes; or adjustments to administrative practices.

7.5.7.2. Major program changes may need additional approvals and be subject to other external review processes. Any additional approvals should be noted in the action plan.

7.5.7.3. If a current program action plan is not available, the program chair should draw on the most recent curriculum mapping/course outline audits, learning outcomes assessments, previous annual reviews, and resource plan proposals to determine if there are outstanding issues and priority actions to be tracked.

7.6. Exceptions:

7.6.1. Programs that have completed comprehensive reviews during the current academic year do not complete an Annual Program Review until the following spring.

8. Comprehensive Review Procedures

8.1. Purpose:

8.1.1. Comprehensive program reviews are conducted every five years to assess the overall quality and effectiveness of a credit program including the currency of the curriculum, expected outcomes, and methods of delivery.

8.1.2. External feedback is an essential step in validating the curriculum and demonstrating accountability. This can be gathered through a team visit from external peer reviewers for degree programs or a desk review by qualified industry representatives for certificates and diplomas.

8.2. Principles:

- 8.2.1. Comprehensive program review is a collaborative process whereby data informs meaningful discussions to build on a program’s strengths and successes through clear action plans.
- 8.2.2. The program review methodology is comprehensive, well communicated, and understood by all the stakeholders.
- 8.2.3. The process should be flexible enough to accommodate the diverse program offerings of the institution. This includes allowing linked credentials and/or common disciplines to be grouped together for reviews with the expectation that any divergent trends will be analyzed.
- 8.2.4. The comprehensive program review should integrate external and internal accreditation and/or certification processes.
- 8.2.5. The review processes provide an opportunity for the program to learn more about itself by engaging with stakeholders.
- 8.2.6. Implementing changes to respond to findings during the comprehensive review does not have to wait until the completion of the review. The program may wish to begin implementation while the review is in progress if additional approvals have been obtained.
- 8.2.7. Program Review is not intended to evaluate performance of individual faculty, staff, or administrators.

8.3. Definitions:

Term	Definition
Credit Programs	A program of study that is approved by Alberta Advanced Education and leads to a credential defined in Alberta’s Credential Framework.
Degree Program	Any Ministerial approved program that meets the criteria for baccalaureate level, or higher, studies in Alberta’s Credential Framework.
Desk Review	An examination of relevant data and reports to provide an understanding of program operations and outcomes and the evidence underpinning the recommendations in the self-study. An orientation meeting and/or debriefing may be facilitated remotely, but the primary analysis explores available documentation.
Action Plan	An action plan is the one of the main outcomes of the comprehensive review process. It documents the steps needed to reach established goals. Action plans clarify the timelines, tasks, and investments needed to respond to approved recommendations received during the comprehensive review process and annually affirmed and prioritized by the program Chair and Dean.
Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan	An ongoing process through which faculty members can assure that students are demonstrating expected knowledge, skills, and abilities (graduate attributes). These rolling multi-year plans identify the outcomes to be examined, specific targets, results, and the department’s response to the assessment.
Self Study	A reflective document that considers the impact of changes implemented from the previous review; evidence that graduates meet the standards for their credential as specified in the Alberta Credential Framework; recent enrolment, retention, and graduation trends; graduate employment and satisfaction; stakeholder feedback; labour

	market trends; and changes in the field/discipline to identify strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for improvement.
Program Profile Data	A common set of quantitative measures used as evidence in the analysis of program effectiveness. Trends in program demand, student success, and the use of resources will be tracked along with other key performance indicators. Each data element in the program profile will be clearly defined.
Program Review Teams	Members of the program faculty assigned to contribute to the development of the self study, respond to the external review report, and contribute to the program’s action plan.
Independent External Reviewers	Appropriately qualified academic, professional, or industry representatives asked to provide advice to the program based on materials provided and interactions with stakeholders. External reviewers should have an arms-length relationship to the program. They should not have been employed by, served on the Board of Governors for, or earned their highest credential from, the institution. They should not have served as a mentor, supervisor, research collaborator, co-author, or external examiner to a program faculty, Chair, or Dean. They must not be in a close family relationship with a member of the program under review.

8.4. Roles and Responsibilities:

8.4.1. Academic Council:

8.4.1.1. Has the overall responsibility for regulating program offerings and ensuring effective processes are in place for continuous quality improvements to the curriculum in order to promote student success.

8.4.2. Vice President Academic and Research:

8.4.2.1. In consultation with the Deans and Program Chairs, will monitor the operational requirements for the review processes and allocate necessary resources to support the comprehensive program reviews, including sponsoring relevant faculty development workshops.

8.4.2.2. The Vice President Academic and Research will review the self study and its recommendations before the materials are circulated externally and will meet with the external visiting team chair at the beginning and end of their visits.

8.4.2.3. The Vice President Academic and Research will review the External Review report for accuracy and completeness.

8.4.2.4. The Vice President Academic and Research will approve the program action plan and provide it to the Program Review Committee for information.

8.4.3. Deans:

8.4.3.1. Will confirm the appointment of the program review team members, manage the invitations and scheduling of the external reviewers, review the self-study and the external team report, and assist with the development of the program action plan.

8.4.3.2. Deans will oversee the implementation of the program action plans in their areas.

8.4.4. Program Chairs:

8.4.4.1. Are primarily responsible for providing the logistical supports to the program review and external reviewers.

8.4.5. Program Faculty Members and Staff:

- 8.4.5.1. Actively participate in review activities including providing access to course materials to assist with curriculum review and mapping, examining trends in the profile data, championing recommendations for improving student success, and contributing to action plans.
- 8.4.6. Program Review Committee:
 - 8.4.6.1. Is a standing committee of Academic Council that approves the self study form and project scope and schedule.
 - 8.4.6.2. Monitors the rolling schedule of reviews and makes provisions for linked and/or similar programs to be reviewed together.
- 8.4.7. Program Review Team:
 - 8.4.7.1. Undertakes the program's self-study. This includes developing a project plan that identifies the schedule deliverables and each member's responsibilities in the analysis, writing, and review of the report which addresses the questions in the template and such other matters that may be relevant to understand the program's strengths and areas for improvement.
 - 8.4.7.2. Program Review Team members will be available to meet with stakeholders and external reviewers. They contribute to the response to the External Review Report and the development of the program's action plan.
- 8.4.8. Institutional Planning and Research:
 - 8.4.8.1. Will work with the Program Review Team and provide a program profile with clearly defined, timely, accurate, and relevant data.
 - 8.4.8.2. IPR staff will provide training for academic staff on the uses of dashboards and/or templates and limitations of available data.
 - 8.4.8.3. IPR will also make relevant comparator data available including the institutional completion rates, labour force demand metrics, and institutional enrolment projections.
- 8.5. Procedures
 - 8.5.1. Figure 1 offers an overview of the Comprehensive Program Review process. The steps include: formation and orientation of the review team; creation of a project plan to guide the data collection and analysis in the self-study; identification of external reviewers, gathering of stakeholder feedback, completion of the self study document; getting external feedback on the program and the recommendations to improve it; and development of an action plan that will be reviewed and renewed in the Annual Program Review process.
 - 8.5.2. The key elements in the process are as follows:
 - 8.5.2.1. Schedule of Comprehensive Reviews
 - 8.5.2.1.1. The Program Review Committee maintains a rolling five-year schedule of comprehensive program reviews
 - 8.5.2.1.2. The schedule will take into consideration external accreditation requirements so that internal and external processes can be harmonized.
 - 8.5.2.1.3. Where the results from the Annual Program Review warrant, the Program Review Committee may determine that a program or cluster of related programs should initiate a Comprehensive Program Review with a focus on a particular opportunity or concern.
 - 8.5.2.1.4. New academic programs should have their first Comprehensive Program Review scheduled after the completion of their first graduating cohorts. The schedule will be reconfirmed each fall and the Deans and Institutional Planning

and Research will be given notice of the programs expected to commence the comprehensive program reviews in the Spring.

Figure 1: Comprehensive Review Workflow



8.5.3. Program Review Team

- 8.5.3.1. The formation of the Program Review Team marks the beginning of the Comprehensive Review process.
- 8.5.3.2. The review team should include all continuing faculty members from within the program.
- 8.5.3.3. The relevant Dean, in consultation with the program review team, will appoint one member to lead the self study process.
- 8.5.3.4. The program review team will have an orientation meeting with the Dean and Institutional Planning and Research to discuss the Self Study Template (Form D) and available information. They will consider supplementary research questions and data requests.
- 8.5.3.5. Program Review Teams are expected to rely primarily on existing documentation including the external report, recommendations, and action plan from the previous comprehensive review; the previous annual program review documents; the program's curriculum map; and learning outcomes assessment plan.
- 8.5.3.6. The Program Review Team will develop a project plan for the self study identifying key milestones and responsibilities for analysis and reporting. The project plan should indicate how key stakeholders will be involved in the review process.
- 8.5.3.7. The Program Review Team will contribute to the analysis of the questions in the self study and the team lead consolidate the findings. The completed internal self-study report will be provided to the relevant Dean for review. The Dean may provide feedback and/or suggested revisions to the Program Review Team.
- 8.5.3.8. The Program Review Team will be expected to meet with the external reviewers and respond to their questions about the substance and process of developing the self-study.

8.5.4. Curriculum Review Workshop:

- 8.5.4.1. One of the benefits of the Comprehensive Program Review is the opportunity to take a holistic view of the program and its curriculum.
- 8.5.4.2. This will be facilitated through a faculty workshop that examines course outlines and the program curriculum map as well as course sequencing and the cumulative impact of the Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan.
- 8.5.4.3. The faculty may also consider comparisons with benchmark programs at other institutions.

8.5.5. Stakeholder engagement:

- 8.5.5.1. The quality assurance process relies on input from both internal and external stakeholders. Recent graduates and/or students can contribute insights from their experience in the program. Short surveys can be used, but focus groups often provide for more dynamic engagement. External community and industry representatives should have experience and/or credentials that will allow them to comment on the relevance of the program. Feedback can be gathered through facilitated in-person or virtual meetings or focus group sessions. The question prompts should be designed to encourage a solutions-focused discussion (see suggested focus group questions).

8.5.6. Self Study Report:

- 8.5.6.1. The aims of the self study should be to understand, evaluate, and enhance the program. It should be analytic and forward looking with key recommendations supported by evidence.

- 8.5.6.2. The Program Review Team should try to maximize existing documentation and standard data sources to respond to the prompts in the Self Study Template (Form D: Self Study Template).
- 8.5.6.3. If the Program Review Team has supplemental questions, the necessary data sources need to be identified during the project planning stage of the review process.
- 8.5.6.4. Not every question will be resolved over the course of the self study and additional investigations may become part of the program's future action plan.
- 8.5.6.5. All program faculty and staff should be given the opportunity to provide feedback on the self study and its key recommendations.
- 8.5.6.6. The Program Advisory Committee should also be given an opportunity to provide suggestions regarding the key findings and recommendations in the report.
- 8.5.6.7. The relevant Dean will also review the self study and may have suggestions or require revisions.
- 8.5.6.8. The Vice President Academic and Research's approval is needed before the Self Study is circulated to external reviewers.
- 8.5.7. External Review for Degree Programs:
 - 8.5.7.1. The External Review Team for Degree Programs is normally composed of two independent academic experts and one reviewer internal to the institution but external to the academic unit.
 - 8.5.7.2. The External Review Team will participate in the evaluation of the degree program by reviewing the self-study, visiting the campus to conduct on-site interviews, and preparing a report.
 - 8.5.7.3. Independent academic experts should hold terminal degrees in their fields and hold senior academic appointments at institutions similar in nature to GPRC.
 - 8.5.7.4. An internal-external member (a senior GPRC faculty member from a different division than the program under review) will be a full participant on the review team and will help with interpreting institutional contexts.
 - 8.5.7.5. The External Review Teams for professional programs should include at least one expert active outside of academia.
 - 8.5.7.6. The Program Chair will submit a list of six to eight potential reviewers to the Dean's office for approval.
 - 8.5.7.6.1. A brief rationale should be provided for each potential reviewer, and any potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed.
 - 8.5.7.7. The Dean's office will confirm selection of the independent experts based on their availability and arms-length relationship to the program.
 - 8.5.7.7.1. The Dean's office will also determine the best times for the external review to take place.
 - 8.5.7.8. The Vice President Academic and Research will invite the external reviewers.
 - 8.5.7.9. The agenda for the site visit will be developed in collaboration with the Dean and Program Chair.
 - 8.5.7.9.1. It will normally begin with a meeting with the Vice President Academic and Research to answer general questions about the institution and to reiterate the purpose and structure of the review process.
 - 8.5.7.9.2. The External Review Team will then have meetings with the Program Review Team, part-time and contracted instructors, students and alumni, and staff members as appropriate.

- 8.5.7.9.3. With students' permission, samples of assessed capstone projects or other significant assignments will also be made available to the External Review Team during their site visit.
- 8.5.7.10. The External Review Team will be asked to assess the program's compliance with Campus Alberta Quality Council's Program Quality Assessment Standards, and the Alberta Credential Framework expectations for degree programs.
 - 8.5.7.10.1. The report should also address questions raised by the Program Review Team in the self-study and offer such commendations and recommendations that the External Review Team deems appropriate.
- 8.5.8. External Review for Certificate and Diploma Programs:
 - 8.5.8.1. The External Review Team for certificate and diploma programs will consist of one independent academic reviewer and one industry reviewer who will conduct a desk review of the program.
 - 8.5.8.1.1. The industry reviewers should hold a recognized credential and/or certification in an industry area or discipline that is closely related to the program under review and be actively employed in a relevant industry position.
 - 8.5.8.1.2. The academic reviewer should be a senior academic from a post-secondary institution similar in size and scope and hold the highest possible credential in a discipline that is the same as, or closely related to, the program under review.
 - 8.5.8.2. The Program Chair will submit a list of six to eight potential reviewers with rationale to the Dean's office for approval. Any potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed.
 - 8.5.8.3. The Dean's office will contact the independent academic experts and confirm their availability and arms-length relationship to the program.
 - 8.5.8.4. The External Review Team for certificate and diploma programs will be provided with the self study report along with the criteria for program quality and Campus Alberta Quality Council standards.
 - 8.5.8.4.1. They will be given orientation material about the process and provided with the opportunity to request additional information and/or clarifications from the program review team.
 - 8.5.8.4.2. They may also request the opportunity to connect virtually with other program stakeholders.
 - 8.5.8.4.3. Their assessment and recommendations should be based on the materials provided and informed by their knowledge of the industry trends and/or benchmark programs.
- 8.5.9. Evaluation of the External Report
 - 8.5.9.1. The External Review Team's report should be provided to the Vice President Academic and Research within 30 days of the on site or virtual visit and will be made available to the relevant Dean, Program Chair, and Program Review Team.
 - 8.5.9.2. The Vice President Academic and Research will review the External Reviewer Team's report and, if necessary, ask the reviewers to provide any omitted components and/or to correct factual errors.
 - 8.5.9.3. Once the Vice President Academic and Research is satisfied with the external review report, they will forward it to the Program Review Team and the relevant Dean.
 - 8.5.9.4. Program Response to the External Review Report:

- 8.5.9.4.1. The Program Review Team respond to the concerns and areas for improvement identified in the External Review Report and prioritize potential actions.
- 8.5.9.5. Dean's Response:
 - 8.5.9.5.1. The Dean will receive the External Review Report and the Program Review Team's response and work with the Program Chair to confirm the Program's Action Plan (Form E: Program Action Plan).
 - 8.5.9.5.2. The External Review Report, Program Review Team Response, and the Program's Action Plan will be forwarded to the Vice President Academic and Research for Approval and then to the Program Review Committee for information.
- 8.5.10. Action Plan:
 - 8.5.10.1. Implementation of the program action plans are fundamental for continuous quality improvement.
 - 8.5.10.2. The action plan may include changes such as the introduction, revision or removal of a course; calendar changes; or adjustments to administrative practices.
 - 8.5.10.3. Major program changes may need additional approvals and be subject to other external review processes. Any additional approval requirements should be noted in the action plan.
- 8.6. Exceptions:
 - 8.6.1. Programs with external accreditation requirements will provide a gap analysis between the required external processes and the expectations for meeting the institution's policies and procedures.
- 9. Forms
 - 9.1. All Forms are available from the Vice President Academic and Research Office and the Program Review shared site.
 - 9.1.1. For Annual Reviews:
 - 9.1.1.1. Form A: Annual Program Review
 - 9.1.1.2. Form B: Program Profile Data
 - 9.1.1.3. Form C: Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
 - 9.1.2. For Comprehensive Reviews:
 - 9.1.2.1. Form D: Self Study Template
 - 9.1.2.2. Form E: Program Action Plan



RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH

RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH			
Effective Date	Date policy is approved	Policy Type	Academic
Responsibility	Vice-President Academic and Research	Related Policies	Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research Agreement on the Administration of Agency Grants and Awards by Research Institutions
Approval Authority	Academic Council	Review Schedule	Every 5 years

1. **Policy Statement:** GPRC maintains high standards for the responsible conduct of research. As such, GPRC requires a robust procedure for preventing breaches of conduct, reporting ethical breaches, and investigating allegations thoroughly and impartially.
2. **Scope:** This policy applies to all GPRC Employees, Students, and third parties engaged in research, including research administrators.
3. **Reason for Policy:** As a research institution committed to high standards of ethical conduct, GPRC is signatory to the *Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research* (RCR Framework) and must adhere to its principles. The contents of this policy closely mirror terms outlined in the RCR Framework and fulfills many of our compliance obligations. Failure to adhere to guidelines for responsible conduct could result in significant risk to the institution, researcher, and all other parties affected by the research, including risk to reputation and future ability to hold research funds and engage in research.
4. **Definitions:**

Breach: Failure to comply with any Agency policy throughout the life cycle of a research project – from application for funding to the conduct of the research and the dissemination of research results.

Breaches of Tri-Agency Research Integrity Policy:

- **Destruction of research records:** The destruction of one’s own or another’s research data or records to specifically avoid the detection of wrongdoing or in contravention of the applicable funding agreement, institutional policy and/or laws, regulations and professional or disciplinary standards.
- **Fabrication:** Making up data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images.
- **Falsification:** Manipulating, changing, or omitting data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images, without acknowledgement and which results in inaccurate findings or conclusions
- **Inadequate acknowledgement:** Failure to appropriately recognize contributors.
- **Invalid authorship:** Inaccurate attribution of authorship, including attribution of authorship to persons other than those who have made a substantial contribution to, and who accept responsibility for, the contents of a publication or document.
- **Mismanagement of conflict of interest:** Failure to appropriately identify and address any real, potential or perceived conflict of interest, in accordance with GPRC’s policy on conflict of interest in research, preventing one or more of the objectives in the RCR Framework from being met.

- **Plagiarism:** Presenting and using another's published or unpublished work, including theories, concepts, data, source material, methodologies or findings, including graphs and images, as one's own, without appropriate referencing and, if required, without permission.
- **Redundant publication or self-plagiarism:** The re-publication of one's own previously published work or part thereof, including data, in any language, without adequate acknowledgement of the source, or justification.

Misrepresentation in an Agency Application or Related Document

- Providing incomplete, inaccurate, or false information in a grant or award application or related document, such as a letter of support or a progress report.
- Applying for and/or holding an Agency award when deemed ineligible by NSERC, SSHRC, CIHR, or any other research funding organization world-wide for reasons of breach of responsible conduct of research policies such as ethics, integrity, or financial management policies.
- Listing of co-applicants, collaborators or partners without their agreement.

Mismanagement of grants or award funds: Using grant or award funds for purposes inconsistent with the policies of the agencies; misappropriating grants and award funds; contravening Agency financial policies, namely the Tri-Agency Financial Administration Guide, Agency grants, and award guides; or providing incomplete, inaccurate or false information on the documentation for expenditures from grant or award accounts.

Breach of Agency Policies or Requirements for Certain Types of Research: Failing to meet Agency policy requirements or to comply with relevant policies, laws, or regulations for the conduct of certain types of research activities; failing to obtain appropriate approvals, permits, or certifications before conducting these activities.

Breach of Agency Review Process

- Non-compliance with the Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Policy of the Federal Research Funding Organizations (NSERC, SSHRC, and CIHR)
- Participating in an Agency review process while under investigation

Complainant: Individual alleging a breach has taken place. Complainants may be directly or indirectly involved in the research (e.g. as participants or collaborators) or they may be other concerned members of the public or GPRC community.

Employee or staff: Any person who is employed by GPRC or who provides services to GPRC under an employment contract.

Research: An undertaking intended to extend knowledge through disciplined inquiry or systematic investigation. All GPRC researchers must comply with the *Tri-Agency Framework*, not just researchers that receive Tri-Agency funding.

Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR): In this policy, research conducted in a manner compliant with the *Tri-Agency Framework, Responsible Conduct of Research*.

Student: Any person registered in a GPRC credit course.

Tri-Council or Tri-Agency: Collective term that describes the federation of all three Agencies.

5. The Policy:

5.1 Confidentiality

- 5.1.1 Upon receiving an allegation of breach of responsible conduct, GPRC shall maintain strict confidentiality of the complainant(s) and respondent(s) throughout the investigation process unless compelled to break confidentiality by law or Tri-Agency policy.

5.2 Receiving allegations

- 5.2.1 Inquiries, allegations of breaches, and other information related to allegations shall be directed in writing to the Director, Research and Innovation or designate.
- 5.2.2 Any person may register a confidential report or inquiry concerning a breach of responsible conduct, regardless of relationship to the institution, the researcher, or the research project.
- 5.2.3 Anonymous allegations will be considered if accompanied by sufficient information to enable an investigation without the need for further information from the Complainant.
- 5.2.4 Upon receipt of an allegation, GPRC may independently or at an Agency's request take immediate action to protect research funds (e.g., by freezing a research spending account).
- 5.2.5 Individuals making an allegation in good faith or providing information related to an allegation will be protected to the extent possible from reprisals in a manner consistent with GPRC policies, Tri-Council guidelines, and relevant legislation.
- 5.2.6 When an allegation concerns conduct that has taken place at another institution, GPRC will contact the other institution to determine which is best placed to handle the allegation.

5.3 Investigating Allegations

- 5.3.1 GPRC will engage in an initial inquiry process to establish whether an allegation is credible and an investigation is required. This will usually involve consultation between the Vice-President, Academic and Research; Director, Research and Innovation; and the divisional Dean(s)/Director(s) of the Complainant and/or Respondent.
- 5.3.2 If an investigation process is warranted, the Respondent will be notified of the allegation(s) against them and the investigation will be initiated.
 - Instances of alleged breaches may be resolvable through informal consultation between the complainant and the respondent.
 - If a breach is determined to have taken place, the respondent may appeal the decision to the Vice-President Academic and Research, who may decide to proceed to the next stage of investigation.
- 5.3.3 If the allegation is not resolved through initial inquiry or informal consultation, an ad hoc Research Misconduct investigation committee will be assembled.
 - Committee members will be appointed by the Director, Research and Innovation.
 - The investigation committee shall include up to five members who have the necessary expertise and who are without conflict of interest, whether real or apparent. The committee must include at least one external member who has no current affiliation with the institution.
 - The committee may include members in good standing of the Research Planning Committee (RPC) and the Research Ethics Board (REB).
 - Should any person involved in the investigation find him or herself in a real or apparent conflict of interest at any point, he or she must disclose the conflict and recuse him or herself from the investigation process immediately and an appropriate replacement will be appointed by the committee.
- 5.3.4 The investigation committee will consider documented evidence, interviews, and statements brought forward by the complainant, respondent, or any other person who may have information related to the allegation.
- 5.3.5 The investigation committee shall complete their investigation, report on findings, recommend recourse, and communicate results to the Director, Research and Innovation as well as the parties involved within a reasonable timeframe of commencing the investigation (at the latest, within six months of when the allegation was first received by GPRC).
- 5.3.6 The Director, Research and Innovation will consider the committee's recommendation, taking into account intent and severity of the breach, and make an ultimate ruling on recourse.

5.4 Accountability

- 5.4.1 Following the committee decision, all affected parties will be notified in a timely manner of the decision and of any recourse to be taken by GPRC.

5.4.2 Should allegations be determined to be unfounded, every reasonable effort will be made by GPRC to protect or restore the reputation of those wrongly subjected to an allegation.

5.4.3 Depending on the severity of the offense and at the discretion of the College, a researcher found to be in breach may be...

- Required to return research funds and cease research activities;
- Required to surrender or destroy all research data whose collection was made possible by the Breach
- Suspended from applying for Tri-Council funds, either indefinitely or for a set period of time
- Issued a letter of reprimand
- Required to issue a formal apology
- Suspended without pay
- Terminated from their position at the College

5.5 Institutional Reporting and Follow-Up

5.5.1 Pursuant to Section 4.4 of the Tri-Agency Framework, the College must advise the Secretariat on RCR matters (SRCR) of any allegations related to activities funded by the Agency, even if the investigation does not proceed beyond its initial stages.

5.5.2 GPRC must also provide a full and detailed report on all investigations annually to the SRCR.

5.5.3 Reports for SRCR should include all information outlined in 4.4.c of the Framework (or in relevant sections of any successor Tri-Agency framework, policy, or guidelines).

6 Revision history: Revised March 2021.



SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY POLICY			
Effective Date	Month Date, Year	Policy Type	Academic
Responsibility	Vice President Academic and Research	Cross-Reference	1. Academic Staff Association/Board of Governors Collective Agreement 2. Campus Alberta Quality Council Handbook (June 2021 revision) 3. Program Review Policy
Approver	Board of Governors	Appendices	Appendix 1: Scholarly Activity Procedure
Review Schedule	Maximum of every 3 years.		

1. Policy Statement

- 1.1. To obtain and maintain degree-granting status, GPRC must offer leading-edge, hands-on polytechnic education that prepares students for success in their chosen industries. To support this goal, GPRC instructors may engage in the exploration of two fields of practice to maintain currency and a level of expertise: (a) the subject area in which the instructor teaches, and (b) teaching and learning.
- 1.2. The nature of scholarly activity may vary amongst instructors and across academic programs or departments.

2. Background

- 2.1. Scholarly activity, as defined within a polytechnic context, asks that the explorations of instructors, whether industry-, teaching-, or research-based, be shared with the community through appropriate forms of polytechnic peer review.
- 2.2. Polytechnic peer review is foundational to post-secondary scholarly activity. Scholarly peer review is the process of subjecting scholarly work to the scrutiny of others who are experts in that field.

3. Policy Objective

- 3.1. To ensure through ongoing scholarly activity that the academic programs offered to students at GPRC maintain credibility, quality, and portability within the Alberta Advanced Education System.

4. Scope

- 4.1. This policy applies to GPRC instructors engaged in scholarly activity as part of their instructional and professional responsibilities.

5. Definitions

- 5.1. **Expertise** Expert skill and knowledge in a particular field, and the ability to demonstrate mastery and currency of practice in a particular field.
- 5.2. **Polytechnic Peer Review** The sharing of scholarly activity with industry, teaching or research peers with the aim of sharing knowledge and/or gathering feedback on the value and validity of the scholarly activity. Examples of polytechnic peer review may include but are not limited to:
 - Presentation to and scrutiny by colleagues (e.g. departmental presentations)

- Presentation to and scrutiny by industry stakeholders (e.g. external presentations to various industry groups)
 - Presentation to and scrutiny by other experts (e.g. presentations at academic or professional conferences, peer-reviewed publications)
 - Evaluation of activity or activity outcomes by colleagues, industry stakeholders, or other experts (e.g. consulting, or participatory or collaborative projects).
 - Consultation with and incorporation of feedback or recommendations from colleagues, industry stakeholders, or other experts into scholarly activity.
- 5.3. **Scholarly Activity** Any activity that involves the intentional investigation, integration and dissemination of knowledge that is subject to polytechnic peer review. Scholarly activity intends to inform professional practice, contribute to the state of practice within a field, or impact the broader external environment. Broadly speaking, scholarly activity, in the polytechnic context, is:
- Integral to program quality
 - Framed within a polytechnic research environment, where validation by industry is as important as validation within the academic community
 - Reliant on the investigation of subject matter, industry practice translated to teaching and learning or the investigation of teaching practice
 - Reliant on polytechnic peer review, whether by teaching colleagues, industry stakeholders, or other experts/peers
 - Inclusive of institutional and individual activities

Scholarly activity may take a variety of forms as indicated in the Campus Alberta Quality Council Handbook:

- Independent or collaborative research (i.e. basic, applied, educational, policy, quantitative, qualitative, or other in nature)
- Maintaining competency in the content and methodology in one's field of expertise through professional practice, research, critical evaluation of literature, or reflective practice.
- Inquiry and reflective practice of one's teaching whereby changes or strategies for improvement are offered, evaluated, and implemented or shared through polytechnic peer review.
- Innovation in pedagogy incorporated into one's teaching and evaluated through research, reflective practice, or peer review.
- Composition, creative activity, professional exhibition or performance
- Publication
- Presentation at scholarly conference or expert groups
- Applied scholarship through problem-solving practices, innovation, product development (e.g. creating or adapting tools, handbooks, manuals, software, standards, guidelines, establishment of best practices, or other element for courses taught or professional practice.)
- Technology development, patents, technology transfer and commercialization

6. Guiding Principles

- 6.1. At GPRC, scholarly activity takes place with a strong focus on teaching, learning, and sharing knowledge through polytechnic peer review.
- 6.2. GPRC Instructors engage in good teaching practices which includes maintaining expertise in the subject matter in which the instructor is teaching and the field of practice of teaching and learning.
- 6.3. Instructors teaching in GPRC credentialed degree programs will engage in appropriate forms of scholarly activity as required by Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC).

- 6.3.1. Instructors teaching in University Transfer or Collaborative Degree programs will engage in appropriate forms of scholarly activity as required by the degree granting institution.
- 6.4. GPRC will provide various mechanisms to support scholarly activity.
- 6.5. Scholarly activity is documented as part of GPRC’s program review/quality assurance process.
- 6.6. To support reporting requirements of Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC) GPRC instructors, whose teaching assignments relate to GPRC credentialed degree programs will formally report on their scholarly activity on an annual basis.

7. Roles and Responsibilities

Stakeholder	Responsibilities
Board of Governors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve and formally support this policy.
Academic Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and formally support this policy.
Vice-President, Academics and Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and formally support this policy.
Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and formally support this policy.
Instructors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review, support, and adopt this policy into their yearly activities.

8. Exceptions to the Policy

- 8.1. Exceptions to this policy may be granted by the Dean.

9. Inquiries

- 9.1. Inquiries on this policy can be directed to the Vice President Academic and Research.

10. Amendments (Revision History)

- 10.1. Approved by the Board of Governors DATE

Appendix 1 – Scholarly Activity Procedures

1. Procedures

- 1.1. Instructor scholarly activity reports as submitted during the program review processes are used on an annual basis to plan and document scholarly activity of instructors.
- 1.2. If additional time or financial resources are required to support scholarly activity, instructors can access resources through opportunities outlined in the Academic Staff Association/Board of Governors Collective Agreement:
 - Professional Development time
 - GPRC Tuition Waiver
 - Individualized Professional Enhancement
 - Professional Leave with Financial Assistance
 - Professional Leave without Financial AssistanceThrough opportunities outlined in policy:
 - Professional DevelopmentAnd through opportunities available within GPRC:
 - Annual Teaching and Learning Day
 - Centre for Teaching and Learning Activities
- 1.3. GPRC reports/tracks the scholarly activities of the instructors by department or program on an annual basis in accordance with timelines and formats provided by GPRC's Program Review processes and as required by Campus Alberta Quality Council or external accreditation bodies.



PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY

PROGRAM REVIEW			
Effective Date	TBA	Policy Type	Academic
Responsibility	Vice President Academic and Research	Cross-Reference	Academic Council Bylaws Campus Alberta Quality Council Handbook Program Review Committee Terms of Reference Program Advisory Committee Policy Conflict of Interest Policy
Approver	Board of Governors	Appendices	Appendix 1 – Annual Review Procedures Appendix 2 – Comprehensive Review Procedures Appendix 3 – Forms
Review Schedule	3 years		

1. Policy Statement

- 1.1. The institution will maintain a regular and systematic program review process that facilitates the ongoing improvement of the quality and effectiveness of academic programs and their relevance in supporting the institutional mandate, vision, mission, and values.

2. Background

- 2.1. The Program Review Policy supports academic offerings that ensures relevancy with industry demands, student demands, and academic quality standards. Routine program review supports curriculum and program improvement to meet the current and future needs of the community.

3. Policy Objective

- 3.1. Program reviews will examine program strengths and areas for improvement, the efficacy of curriculum and instruction, and program relevance and viability within the discipline/sector.

4. Scope

- 4.1. This Policy applies to all credential programs approved by the Ministry of Advanced Education and/or the Alberta Board of Skilled Trades.¹

5. Definitions

- 5.1. **Action Plan:** An action plan is one of the main outcomes of the comprehensive review process. It documents the steps needed to reach established goals. Action plans clarify the timelines, tasks, and investments needed to respond to approved recommendations received during the comprehensive review process and annually affirmed and prioritized by the program Chair and Dean.

¹ This reflects the pending legislation and may need to be adjusted.

- 5.2. **Degree Program:** Any Ministry approved program that meets the criteria for Baccalaureate level studies or higher in Alberta's Credential Framework.
- 5.3. **Program Review Committee:** A sub-committee of Academic Council.
- 5.4. **Self Study:** A reflective document that considers the impact of changes implemented from the previous review; evidence that graduates meet the standards for their credential as specified in the Alberta Credential Framework; recent enrolment, retention, and graduation trends; graduate employment and satisfaction; stakeholder feedback; labour market trends; and changes in the field/discipline to identify strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for improvement.
- 5.5. **Annual Review:** Program Review completed annually.
- 5.6. **Comprehensive Review:** Program Review completed every five years.

6. Guiding Principles

- 6.1. Program Review is an academic-driven process that is intentionally collaborative and flexible enough to meet the unique needs of the institution's diverse programs and disciplines.
- 6.2. The program review process demonstrates accountability through the development and implementation of evidence-informed action plans and presentation of those plans to planning and governance committees.
- 6.3. The institution recognizes the mutually reinforcing relationship between internal quality assurance and external accreditation and will, wherever possible, harmonize internal and external processes.
- 6.4. Similar or linked programs, especially those with common courses and/or faculty members may be grouped together in one program review. Related Certificate and Diploma programs should be reviewed together. In cases where non-credit or micro-credentials may serve as an alternate entry stream to a given program, they should be included in the program review.
- 6.5. Curriculum alignment and renewal processes will provide a basis for judgments regarding the continuation, suspension, termination, or reactivation of programs.
- 6.6. Annual Program Reviews provide timely updates to ensure programs are responding to the needs of students and employers.
- 6.7. Programs will complete a Comprehensive Program Review at least once every five years.
- 6.8. Degree programs will comply with Campus Alberta Quality Council cyclical review guidelines.
- 6.9. All Program Review Forms are available from the Vice President Academic and Research Office and the Program Review shared site.
 - 6.9.1. For Annual Reviews:
 - 6.9.1.1. Form A: Annual Program Review
 - 6.9.1.2. Form B: Program Profile Data
 - 6.9.1.3. Form C: Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
 - 6.9.2. For Comprehensive Reviews:
 - 6.9.2.1. Form D: Self Study Template
 - 6.9.2.2. Form E: Program Action Plan

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



7. Roles and Responsibilities

Stakeholder	Responsibilities
Board of Governors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approve and formally support this policy.
Academic Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and formally support this policy.
Vice-President, Academics and Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and formally support this policy.
Program Review Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support and implement this policy.• Review completed reviews

8. Exceptions to the Policy

8.1. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the Board of Governors.

9. Inquiries

9.1. Inquiries to this policy can be directed to the Vice President Academic and Research.

10. Amendments (Revision History)

First Effective: July 1, 1998

Reaffirmed by Academic Council: February 8, 2001

Revised by Academic Council: February 13, 2003

Revised and Approved by Academic Council: April 27, 2006

Revised and Approved by Academic Council: October 14, 2010

Revised and Approved by Academic Council: November 7, 2016

Revised and Approved by Board of Governors: DATE

Appendix 1 – Annual Review Procedures

1. Purpose:
 - 1.1. Annual program reviews are conducted to ensure that the content and delivery of credit programs continues to be responsive, current, and relevant in meeting learner, community, and employer needs.
 - 1.2. The review is an evidence informed process that helps programs maintain their alignment with the institution’s mission, mandate, strategic initiatives, and priorities.
2. Principles:
 - 2.1. Program review and renewal is a collaborative process whereby data informs meaningful discussions to build on a program’s strengths and successes through clear action plans.
 - 2.2. The review processes provide an opportunity for the program to learn more about itself by engaging with Stakeholders.
 - 2.3. The process should be flexible enough to accommodate the diverse program offerings of the institution. This includes allowing linked credentials and/or common disciplines to be grouped together for reviews with the expectation that any divergent trends will be analyzed.
 - 2.4. Annual program reviews are formative, not summative, in nature but results may indicate a more comprehensive review is required.
 - 2.5. Program Review is not intended to evaluate performance of individual faculty, staff, or administrators.

3. Definitions:

Term	Definition
Credit Programs	A program of study that is approved by Alberta Advanced Education and leads to a credential defined in Alberta’s Credential Framework.
Action Plan	An action plan is the outcome the comprehensive review process. It documents the steps needed to reach established goals. Action plans clarify the timelines, tasks, and investments needed to respond to approved recommendations received during the comprehensive review process and annually affirmed and prioritized by the program Chair and Dean.
Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan	An ongoing process through which faculty members can assure that senior students are demonstrating expected knowledge, skills, and abilities (graduate attributes). These rolling multi-year plans identify the outcomes to be examined, specific targets, results, and the department’s response to the assessment.
Challenge Questions	Questions designed to elicit an analytic response that engages with relevant data.
Program Profile Data	A common set of quantitative measures used as evidence in the analysis of program effectiveness. Trends in program demand, student success, and the use of resources will be tracked along with other key performance indicators. Each data element in the program profile will be clearly defined.

4. Roles and Responsibilities

- 4.1. Academic Council:

- 4.1.1. Has the overall responsibility for regulating program offerings and ensuring effective processes are in place for continuous quality improvements to the curriculum in order to promote student success.
- 4.2. Vice President Academic and Research:
 - 4.2.1. In consultation with the Deans and Program Chairs, will monitor the operational requirements for the review processes and allocate necessary resources to support the annual and comprehensive program reviews including sponsoring relevant faculty development workshops.
 - 4.2.2. In collaboration with the Deans, the Vice President Academic and Research will confirm the institutional priorities and the related challenge questions to be included on the annual form.
 - 4.2.3. The Vice President Academic and Research will approve the program action plan updates and provide them to the Program Review Committee for information.
- 4.3. Deans:
 - 4.3.1. Will review all the annual program review reports for their area and may make suggestions for revisions prior to forwarding the reports to the Vice President Academic and Research for approval.
 - 4.3.2. The Deans may use the annual program updates to inform business cases for resource allocation/re-allocation. Deans monitor the activities of the Program Advisory Councils and the involvement of other relevant stakeholders in the quality assurance processes.
- 4.4. Program Chairs:
 - 4.4.1. Are primarily responsible for engaging colleagues in the review of the evidence provided from learning outcomes assessments and the program profile data to respond to the challenge questions in the review form.
 - 4.4.2. Program Chairs are also responsible for managing stakeholder engagement, including Program Advisory Council meetings.
 - 4.4.3. Program Chairs will submit their program review reports on the required forms at the end of term and will respond to suggestions and recommendations from the relevant Dean.
- 4.5. Program Faculty Members and Staff:
 - 4.5.1. Actively participate in review activities including providing access course materials to assist with curriculum review and mapping, examining trends in the profile data, championing recommendations for improving student success, and contributing to action plans.
- 4.6. Program Review Committee:
 - 4.6.1. Is a standing committee of Academic Council that reviews the completed annual program review forms and updated program actions plans and makes recommendations to Academic Council.
 - 4.6.2. It also monitors the rolling schedule of reviews and makes provisions for linked and/or similar programs to be reviewed together.
 - 4.6.3. Will assess the annual review forms and data elements. The committee will make recommendations on forms and dashboard organization as well as the combination of programs that can be reviewed together. They may also identify common themes from the Action Plan updates which require further investigation.
- 4.7. Institutional Planning and Research (IPR):
 - 4.7.1. Will work with members of Academic and Research Council to develop standard data packages for program profiles that are clearly defined, timely, accurate, and relevant.

- 4.7.2. IPR staff will provide training for academic staff on the uses of dashboards and/or forms and identify limitations of available data.
 - 4.7.3. IPR will also make relevant comparator data available including the institutional completion rates, labour force demand metrics, and institutional enrolment projections.
5. Procedures:
- 5.1. Annual Program Review Form
 - 5.1.1. This program summary should be a succinct (4 to 5 page) analysis of the standard program profile data package, ongoing learning outcomes assessments, stakeholder feedback, student and faculty achievements, and the implementation of the program action plan.
 - 5.1.2. Form A: Annual Program Review includes a program description section along with questions on relevance and currency, student success, faculty qualifications and workloads, program resources, institutional priorities, changes in the operating environment, and recommendations for the coming year. Suggested evidence is listed for each section.
 - 5.2. Timing of Reports:
 - 5.2.1. Annual Program Review Reports should be compiled by the designated program chair and submitted to the relevant Dean for review within six weeks of the end of the spring term.
 - 5.2.2. The reports should reflect on activities, including curriculum mapping, course outline audits, learning outcomes assessments, and any stakeholder engagements that have taken place through out the year.
 - 5.3. Program profile data:
 - 5.3.1. A standard data package Form B: Program Profile Data will include tracking of program demand, student success, and use of resources.
 - 5.3.2. This will be made available by Institutional Planning and Research at the end of the spring term.
 - 5.3.3. The data elements will include key performance indicators for the institution and other identified priorities.
 - 5.4. Learning Outcome Assessment Plans:
 - 5.4.1. Each year Form C: Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan should be appended as evidence that the curriculum is up-to-date, and that due consideration has been given to student achievement on selected attributes.
 - 5.4.2. Discipline-specific and credential-level knowledge and skills should be tracked using predominantly direct evidence. Providing the crossovers with the Alberta Credential Framework are well documented, externally accredited programs can substitute their discipline-specific assurances of learning and/or demonstrations of required competencies.
 - 5.5. Institutional priorities and challenge questions:
 - 5.5.1. The annual program review process provides opportunities for programs to demonstrate their alignment to institutional priorities. This gives the Deans and Vice President Academic and Research insight to how different program initiatives contribute to the overall success of the institution.
 - 5.5.2. Each January, the Deans and Vice President Academic and Research should discuss the challenge questions to be placed in the institutional priority section of the form and, in consultation with the Chairs and Institutional Planning and Research, determine available sources of evidence. Results of these consultations should be shared widely with faculty members so they can contribute to data collection and analysis.

5.6. Stakeholder engagement:

- 5.6.1. The quality assurance process relies on input from both internal and external stakeholders.
- 5.6.2. Faculty and staff should be given opportunities to contribute to the analysis and priority setting activities that are summarized in the review.
- 5.6.3. Recent graduates and/or students may also contribute insights from their experience in the program. Short surveys can be used but focus groups often provide for more dynamic engagement.
- 5.6.4. External community and industry representatives should have experience and/or credentials that will allow them to comment on the relevance of the program. Feedback can be gathered through facilitated meetings or virtual focus group sessions that can take place at any point during the year. The question prompts should be designed to encourage a solutions-focused discussion.

5.7. Action Plan Updates:

- 5.7.1. Implementation of the program action plans are fundamental for continuous quality improvement. The action plan may include changes such as the introduction, revision, or removal of a course; calendar changes; or adjustments to administrative practices.
- 5.7.2. Major program changes may need additional approvals and be subject to other external review processes. Any additional approvals should be noted in the action plan.
- 5.7.3. If a current program action plan is not available, the program chair should draw on the most recent curriculum mapping/course outline audits, learning outcomes assessments, previous annual reviews, and resource plan proposals to determine if there are outstanding issues and priority actions to be tracked.

6. Exceptions:

- 6.1. Programs that have completed comprehensive reviews during the current academic year do not complete an Annual Program Review until the following spring.

Appendix 2 – Comprehensive Review Procedures

1. Purpose:
 - 1.1. Comprehensive program reviews are conducted every five years to assess the overall quality and effectiveness of a credit program including the currency of the curriculum, expected outcomes, and methods of delivery.
 - 1.2. External feedback is an essential step in validating the curriculum and demonstrating accountability. This can be gathered through a team visit from external peer reviewers for degree programs or a desk review by qualified industry representatives for certificates and diplomas.

2. Principles:
 - 2.1. Comprehensive program review is a collaborative process whereby data informs meaningful discussions to build on a program’s strengths and successes through clear action plans.
 - 2.2. The program review methodology is comprehensive, well communicated, and understood by all the stakeholders.
 - 2.3. The process should be flexible enough to accommodate the diverse program offerings of the institution. This includes allowing linked credentials and/or common disciplines to be grouped together for reviews with the expectation that any divergent trends will be analyzed.
 - 2.4. The comprehensive program review should integrate external and internal accreditation and/or certification processes.
 - 2.5. The review processes provide an opportunity for the program to learn more about itself by engaging with stakeholders.
 - 2.6. Implementing changes to respond to findings during the comprehensive review does not have to wait until the completion of the review. The program may wish to begin implementation while the review is in progress if additional approvals have been obtained.
 - 2.7. Program Review is not intended to evaluate performance of individual faculty, staff, or administrators.

3. Definitions:

Term	Definition
Credit Programs	A program of study that is approved by Alberta Advanced Education and leads to a credential defined in Alberta’s Credential Framework.
Degree Program	Any Ministerial approved program that meets the criteria for baccalaureate level, or higher, studies in Alberta’s Credential Framework.
Desk Review	An examination of relevant data and reports to provide an understanding of program operations and outcomes and the evidence underpinning the recommendations in the self-study. An orientation meeting and/or debriefing may be facilitated remotely, but the primary analysis explores available documentation.
Action Plan	An action plan is the one of the main outcomes of the comprehensive review process. It documents the steps needed to reach established goals. Action plans clarify the timelines, tasks, and investments needed to respond to approved recommendations received during the comprehensive review process and annually affirmed and prioritized by the program Chair and Dean.

Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan	An ongoing process through which faculty members can assure that students are demonstrating expected knowledge, skills, and abilities (graduate attributes). These rolling multi-year plans identify the outcomes to be examined, specific targets, results, and the department's response to the assessment.
Self Study	A reflective document that considers the impact of changes implemented from the previous review; evidence that graduates meet the standards for their credential as specified in the Alberta Credential Framework; recent enrolment, retention, and graduation trends; graduate employment and satisfaction; stakeholder feedback; labour market trends; and changes in the field/discipline to identify strengths and weaknesses and make recommendations for improvement.
Program Profile Data	A common set of quantitative measures used as evidence in the analysis of program effectiveness. Trends in program demand, student success, and the use of resources will be tracked along with other key performance indicators. Each data element in the program profile will be clearly defined.
Program Review Teams	Members of the program faculty assigned to contribute to the development of the self study, respond to the external review report, and contribute to the program's action plan.
Independent External Reviewers	Appropriately qualified academic, professional, or industry representatives asked to provide advice to the program based on materials provided and interactions with stakeholders. External reviewers should have an arms-length relationship to the program. They should not have been employed by, served on the Board of Governors for, or earned their highest credential from, the institution. They should not have served as a mentor, supervisor, research collaborator, co-author, or external examiner to a program faculty, Chair, or Dean. They must not be in a close family relationship with a member of the program under review.

4. Roles and Responsibilities:

4.1. Academic Council:

4.1.1. Has the overall responsibility for regulating program offerings and ensuring effective processes are in place for continuous quality improvements to the curriculum in order to promote student success.

4.2. Vice President Academic and Research:

4.2.1. In consultation with the Deans and Program Chairs, will monitor the operational requirements for the review processes and allocate necessary resources to support the comprehensive program reviews, including sponsoring relevant faculty development workshops.

4.2.2. The Vice President Academic and Research will review the self study and its recommendations before the materials are circulated externally and will meet with the external visiting team chair at the beginning and end of their visits.

- 4.2.3. The Vice President Academic and Research will review the External Review report for accuracy and completeness.
- 4.2.4. The Vice President Academic and Research will approve the program action plan and provide it to the Program Review Committee for information.
- 4.3. Deans:
 - 4.3.1. Will confirm the appointment of the program review team members, manage the invitations and scheduling of the external reviewers, review the self-study and the external team report, and assist with the development of the program action plan.
 - 4.3.2. Deans will oversee the implementation of the program action plans in their areas.
- 4.4. Program Chairs:
 - 4.4.1. Are primarily responsible for providing the logistical supports to the program review and external reviewers.
- 4.5. Program Faculty Members and Staff:
 - 4.5.1. Actively participate in review activities including providing access to course materials to assist with curriculum review and mapping, examining trends in the profile data, championing recommendations for improving student success, and contributing to action plans.
- 4.6. Program Review Committee:
 - 4.6.1. Is a standing committee of Academic Council that approves the self study form and comprehensive review scope and schedule.
 - 4.6.2. Monitors the rolling schedule of reviews and makes provisions for linked and/or similar programs to be reviewed together.
- 4.7. Program Review Team:
 - 4.7.1. Undertakes the program's self-study. This includes developing a project plan that identifies the schedule deliverables and each member's responsibilities in the analysis, writing, and review of the report which addresses the questions in the template and such other matters that may be relevant to understand the program's strengths and areas for improvement.
 - 4.7.2. Program Review Team members will be available to meet with stakeholders and external reviewers. They contribute to the response to the External Review Report and the development of the program's action plan.
- 4.8. Institutional Planning and Research:
 - 4.8.1. Will work with the Program Review Team and provide a program profile with clearly defined, timely, accurate, and relevant data.
 - 4.8.2. IPR staff will provide training for academic staff on the uses of dashboards and/or templates and limitations of available data.
 - 4.8.3. IPR will also make relevant comparator data available including the institutional completion rates, labour force demand metrics, and institutional enrolment projections.
- 5. Procedures
 - 5.1. Figure 1 offers an overview of the Comprehensive Program Review process. The steps include: formation and orientation of the review team; creation of a project plan to guide the data

collection and analysis in the self-study; identification of external reviewers, gathering of stakeholder feedback, completion of the self study document; getting external feedback on the program and the recommendations to improve it; and development of an action plan that will be reviewed and renewed in the Annual Program Review process.

5.2. The key elements in the process are as follows:

5.2.1. Schedule of Comprehensive Reviews

- 5.2.1.1. The Program Review Committee maintains a rolling five-year schedule of comprehensive program reviews
- 5.2.1.2. The schedule will take into consideration external accreditation requirements so that internal and external processes can be harmonized.
- 5.2.1.3. Where the results from the Annual Program Review warrant, the Program Review Committee may determine that a program or cluster of related programs should initiate a Comprehensive Program Review with a focus on a particular opportunity or concern.
- 5.2.1.4. New academic programs should have their first Comprehensive Program Review scheduled after the completion of their first graduating cohorts. The schedule will be reconfirmed each fall and the Deans and Institutional Planning and Research will be given notice of the programs expected to commence the comprehensive program reviews in the Spring.

5.3. Program Review Team

- 5.3.1. The formation of the Program Review Team marks the beginning of the Comprehensive Review process.
- 5.3.2. The review team should include all continuing faculty members from within the program.
- 5.3.3. The relevant Dean, in consultation with the program review team, will appoint one member to lead the self study process.
- 5.3.4. The program review team will have an orientation meeting with the Dean and Institutional Planning and Research to discuss the Self Study Template (Form D) and available information. They will consider supplementary research questions and data requests.
- 5.3.5. Program Review Teams are expected to rely primarily on existing documentation including the external report, recommendations, and action plan from the previous comprehensive review; the previous annual program review documents; the program's curriculum map; and learning outcomes assessment plan.
- 5.3.6. The Program Review Team will develop a project plan for the self study identifying key milestones and responsibilities for analysis and reporting. The project plan should indicate how key stakeholders will be involved in the review process.
- 5.3.7. The Program Review Team will contribute to the analysis of the questions in the self study and the team lead consolidate the findings. The completed internal self-study report will be provided to the relevant Dean for review. The Dean may provide feedback and/or suggested revisions to the Program Review Team.
- 5.3.8. The Program Review Team will be expected to meet with the external reviewers and respond to their questions about the substance and process of developing the self-study.

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



Figure 1: Comprehensive Review Workflow



5.4. Curriculum Review Workshop:

- 5.4.1. One of the benefits of the Comprehensive Program Review is the opportunity to take a holistic view of the program and its curriculum.
- 5.4.2. This will be facilitated through a faculty workshop that examines course outlines and the program curriculum map as well as course sequencing and the cumulative impact of the Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan.
- 5.4.3. The faculty may also consider comparisons with benchmark programs at other institutions.

5.5. Stakeholder engagement:

- 5.5.1. The quality assurance process relies on input from both internal and external stakeholders. Recent graduates and/or students can contribute insights from their experience in the program. Short surveys can be used, but focus groups often provide for more dynamic engagement. External community and industry representatives should have experience and/or credentials that will allow them to comment on the relevance of the program. Feedback can be gathered through facilitated in-person or virtual meetings or focus group sessions. The question prompts should be designed to encourage a solutions-focused discussion (see suggested focus group questions).

5.6. Self Study Report:

- 5.6.1. The aims of the self study should be to understand, evaluate, and enhance the program. It should be analytic and forward looking with key recommendations supported by evidence.
- 5.6.2. The Program Review Team should try to maximize existing documentation and standard data sources to respond to the prompts in the Self Study Template (Form D: Self Study Template).
- 5.6.3. If the Program Review Team has supplemental questions, the necessary data sources need to be identified during the project planning stage of the review process.
- 5.6.4. Not every question will be resolved over the course of the self study and additional investigations may become part of the program's future action plan.
- 5.6.5. All program faculty and staff should be given the opportunity to provide feedback on the self study and its key recommendations.
- 5.6.6. The Program Advisory Committee should also be given an opportunity to provide suggestions regarding the key findings and recommendations in the report.
- 5.6.7. The relevant Dean will also review the self study and may have suggestions or require revisions.
- 5.6.8. The Vice President Academic and Research's approval is needed before the Self Study is circulated to external reviewers.

5.7. External Review for Degree Programs:

- 5.7.1. The External Review Team for Degree Programs is normally composed of two independent academic experts and one reviewer internal to the institution but external to the academic unit.
- 5.7.2. The External Review Team will participate in the evaluation of the degree program by reviewing the self-study, visiting the campus to conduct on-site interviews, and preparing a report.
- 5.7.3. Independent academic experts should hold terminal degrees in their fields and hold senior academic appointments at institutions similar in nature to GPRC.

- 5.7.4. An internal-external member (a senior GPRC faculty member from a different division than the program under review) will be a full participant on the review team and will help with interpreting institutional contexts.
- 5.7.5. The External Review Teams for professional programs should include at least one expert active outside of academia.
- 5.7.5.1. The Program Chair will submit a list of six to eight potential reviewers to the Dean's office for approval.
- 5.7.5.1.1. A brief rationale should be provided for each potential reviewer, and any potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed.
- 5.7.5.2. The Dean's office will confirm selection of the independent experts based on their availability and arms-length relationship to the program.
- 5.7.5.2.1. The Dean's office will also determine the best times for the external review to take place.
- 5.7.5.3. The Vice President Academic and Research will invite the external reviewers.
- 5.7.5.4. The agenda for the site visit will be developed in collaboration with the Dean and Program Chair.
- 5.7.5.4.1. It will normally begin with a meeting with the Vice President Academic and Research to answer general questions about the institution and to reiterate the purpose and structure of the review process.
- 5.7.5.4.2. The External Review Team will then have meetings with the Program Review Team, part-time and contracted instructors, students and alumni, and staff members as appropriate.
- 5.7.5.4.3. With students' permission, samples of assessed capstone projects or other significant assignments will also be made available to the External Review Team during their site visit.
- 5.7.5.5. The External Review Team will be asked to assess the program's compliance with Campus Alberta Quality Council's Program Quality Assessment Standards, and the Alberta Credential Framework expectations for degree programs.
- 5.7.5.5.1. The report should also address questions raised by the Program Review Team in the self-study and offer such commendations and recommendations that the External Review Team deems appropriate.
- 5.7.6. External Review for Certificate and Diploma Programs:
- 5.7.6.1. The External Review Team for certificate and diploma programs will consist of one independent academic reviewer and one industry reviewer who will conduct a desk review of the program.
- 5.7.6.1.1. The industry reviewers should hold a recognized credential and/or certification in an industry area or discipline that is closely related to the program under review and be actively employed in a relevant industry position.
- 5.7.6.1.2. The academic reviewer should be a senior academic from a post-secondary institution similar in size and scope and hold the highest possible credential in a discipline that is the same as, or closely related to, the program under review.
- 5.7.6.2. The Program Chair will submit a list of six to eight potential reviewers with rationale to the Dean's office for approval. Any potential conflicts of interest should be disclosed.

- 5.7.6.3. The Dean's office will contact the independent academic experts and confirm their availability and arms-length relationship to the program.
- 5.7.6.4. The External Review Team for certificate and diploma programs will be provided with the self study report along with the criteria for program quality and Campus Alberta Quality Council standards.
 - 5.7.6.4.1. They will be given orientation material about the process and provided with the opportunity to request additional information and/or clarifications from the program review team.
 - 5.7.6.4.2. They may also request the opportunity to connect virtually with other program stakeholders.
 - 5.7.6.4.3. Their assessment and recommendations should be based on the materials provided and informed by their knowledge of the industry trends and/or benchmark programs.
- 5.7.7. Evaluation of the External Report
 - 5.7.7.1. The External Review Team's report should be provided to the Vice President Academic and Research within 30 days of the on site or virtual visit and will be made available to the relevant Dean, Program Chair, and Program Review Team.
 - 5.7.7.2. The Vice President Academic and Research will review the External Reviewer Team's report and, if necessary, ask the reviewers to provide any omitted components and/or to correct factual errors.
 - 5.7.7.3. Once the Vice President Academic and Research is satisfied with the external review report, they will forward it to the Program Review Team and the relevant Dean.
 - 5.7.7.4. Program Response to the External Review Report:
 - 5.7.7.4.1. The Program Review Team respond to the concerns and areas for improvement identified in the External Review Report and prioritize potential actions.
 - 5.7.7.5. Dean's Response:
 - 5.7.7.5.1. The Dean will receive the External Review Report and the Program Review Team's response and work with the Program Chair to confirm the Program's Action Plan (Form E: Program Action Plan).
 - 5.7.7.5.2. The External Review Report, Program Review Team Response, and the Program's Action Plan will be forwarded to the Vice President Academic and Research for Approval and then to the Program Review Committee for information.
- 5.7.8. Action Plan:
 - 5.7.8.1. Implementation of the program action plans are fundamental for continuous quality improvement.
 - 5.7.8.2. The action plan may include changes such as the introduction, revision or removal of a course; calendar changes; or adjustments to administrative practices.
 - 5.7.8.3. Major program changes may need additional approvals and be subject to other external review processes. Any additional approval requirements should be noted in the action plan.
- 5.8. Exceptions:

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



5.8.1. Programs with external accreditation requirements will provide a gap analysis between the required external processes and the expectations for meeting the institution's policies and procedures.

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



Appendix 3 – Forms

Form A – Annual Program Review Summary

Review Elements	References	
	Department Provided	Common Data Package /Program Dashboard
1. Program Description		
Program(s) reviewed	Link to calendar descriptions	
Expected career pathways and occupational outlooks	Links for labour market projections	
2. How well is the program maintaining its relevance and currency? Use specified evidence to discuss strengths and weaknesses in the following areas.		
Evidence of student demand		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application and Registration trends</i> • <i>Applicant yield ratio comparisons</i> • <i>Program fill rate</i> • <i>Student diversity measures for underrepresented groups</i>
Evidence the curriculum is up to date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning outcomes assessed • Provincial and/or institutional curriculum committee recommendations addressed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number of calendar courses by category (offered, not offered, discontinued, revised, new)</i>
Evidence of employer demand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from business and industry representatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Graduate employment and employment related to field of study*</i> • <i>Employer perceptions of graduates</i> • <i>Evidence of successful graduate industry freelance and consultants</i>
Impact of community engagement activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program advisory consultations • Outreach activities and events 	

Review Element	References	
3. How does the program monitor and enhance student success?		
Analysis of retention and completion trends		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Comparative course pass rates</i> • <i>Retention/persistence rates* by program stage</i> • <i>Graduation rates*</i>

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity differentials for underrepresented groups.
Analysis of student engagement and satisfaction trends		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student engagement survey results • Student satisfaction with instruction and support services • Graduates who would recommend the program
Special initiatives and achievements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of special initiatives • Summary of student awards and recognition 	
4. What are the faculty qualifications and workloads?		
What is the faculty complement? What are the regular teaching loads? Have there been significant changes?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number, rank, demographics for contracted and continuing, full-time, and part-time instructors. • Sections taught /workload* • Student-faculty ratios
What professional development/ scholarly activities have faculty engaged in?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief description of workshops attended/presentations made/publications/ and applied research grants 	
5. Are program resources being used efficiently and effectively?		
What are the comparative costs for the program and explanations for any significant variances from the disciplinary and/or institutional averages?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special operational considerations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct and total costs per FLE comparisons • One-time and annual costs
Are there any offsetting program revenues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differential fees, collaborations, grants, industry partnerships 	

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



Review Element	References	
6. How is the program responding to institutional priorities?		
What steps have been taken in the past year to improve student connections to the labour market?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department initiatives to enhance graduate outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Work integrated learning (WIL)*</i> • <i>Students accessing career and employment services*</i>
What initiatives have been undertaken to respond to the TRC's calls to action?	TBD	TBD
What training has been undertaken for improving staff and student wellness and mental health?	TBD	TBD
7. What have been the most significant changes in the program and its operating environment during the past year?		
8. What are the key recommendations for the coming year?		
Based on the above, are there any areas which need additional research and/or consultation?		
What activities will be undertaken by faculty within the department?		
What recommendations should be incorporated in the program's action plan?		

Form B: Program Profile Data – to be provided by Institutional Research and Planning Office

PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY



Form C: Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

Year	Program Goal/Outcome Assessed	Method of assessment	Target	Result	Response

Form D: Self Study Template

This template should be used by programs undergoing Comprehensive Program Review. The aims of the self study should be to understand, evaluate, and enhance educational offerings. It should be analytic and forward looking and supported by evidence.

The suggested questions in each section should prompt reflection on common data accumulated through regular annual updates, curriculum mapping, and outcomes assessments. The self-study should strive for both brevity and substance with a recommended length of **no more** than 15 double spaced pages in the self study report and no more than 25 pages of apparatus.

The review process starts with the formation of the review team and confirmation of the data collection strategies and should not take more than eight months to complete. Stakeholders should be consulted early in the data collection and analysis phase of the review. Since the comprehensive review is one stage in the ongoing curriculum assessment and alignment processes, the program should maximize the use of existing documentation and focus their efforts on analysis rather than customized data collection.

The self-study and supporting documentation will be provided to a panel of external experts who will undertake a peer review of the program. Approved recommendations will inform the program's action plan which will be tracked in subsequent annual updates.

Programs with external accreditation processes should do a gap analysis between the standards of their disciplines and the guided reflections in each section of this document.

Please note: program reviews are meant to focus on overall effectiveness of academic programming and are not, in themselves, business cases for expansion or reallocation of resources.

Self Study Contents

Executive Summary	
1. Program Background	
2. Learner Experiences	
3. Curriculum Design and Assessment.....	
4. Alignment and Community Engagement	
5. Resources	
6. Program Self-evaluation.....	
7. Recommendations and Future Directions.....	
Appendix A: Status of Previous Program Action Plan	
Appendix B: Student Demographics, Retention, and Graduate Rates	
Appendix C: Graduate Pathways and Shared Course Analysis	
Appendix D: Analysis of Student and Alumni Feedback	
Appendix E: Curriculum Map for Alberta’s Credential Framework Standards for Knowledge and Skills	
Appendix F: Curriculum Map for Discipline-Specific Competencies.....	
Appendix G: Learning Outcomes Assessment Tracking	
Appendix H: Program Advisory Committee (PAC) Membership	
Appendix I: Faculty Qualifications and Currency	

Executive Summary

What are the main highlights from the program review? What are the most significant recommendations? What focus questions should be considered by external reviewers?

1. Program Background

1 a. Program Record What is the program/specialization name in Program and Provider Registry System (PAPRS)? What is the credential type? What is the full load/length? What is the actual load/length?

1 b. Program Description What are the objectives and characteristics of the program? What aspects are unique provincially and nationally? If different programs have been grouped together, what are similarities and linkages between the programs under review?

1.c. Administrative Structure How does the program fit into the division/school? What is the overall department and staff complement?

1.d. Program Development Background (Reference *Appendix A and the most recent annual update*) When did the program open? What is the program capacity and how well does it meet student demand (consider fill rates, wait lists, etc.)? What curricular revisions have been undertaken since the previous comprehensive review? What other changes or innovations are in progress?

1.e. Review Process. Who participated on the review team? What data sources were used? How were internal and external stakeholders involved?

2. Learner Experiences

2 a. Student Characteristics (Reference Appendix B) Who is the program intended to serve? Who does the program serve? What are the demographic characteristics of the current student body? What initiatives have been undertaken to improve balance and inclusion of underrepresented groups? What are the admission requirements and what evidence demonstrates that these requirements contribute to student success? Which schools/institutions do students come from and are their significant differences in their academic preparation?

2 b. Student Success Initiatives What efforts have been made by the program to create an intellectual and social climate that fosters student development? How do program students connect to student supports including academic advising, learner supports, and career counseling? What co-curricular activities are available? How do work experiences and/or service opportunities impact student learning and success?

2 c. Retention and Pathways (Reference Appendix C) Have there been changes in retention and graduation rates during the period of this review? What is the impact of prerequisites and/or gatekeeper courses on learner progress? What are the most common service courses offered (or taken) by students in other departments? Are there any particular areas of concern, remediation needs, and/or special advisement? What transfer credit or prior learning assessment and recognition options have been used?

2 d. Satisfaction and Graduate Employment (*Reference Appendix D*) What are the employment outcomes of recent graduates and how do these compare with regional and disciplinary benchmarks? What do students and alumni say about the quality of the program and its relevance to their career goals?

2 e. Student Achievements Have there been any notable achievements by program students in the past three years? (Please note these highlights should not be more than one page of text).

3. Curriculum Design and Assessment

3 a. Accreditation Standards or Comparison to Benchmark Programs What professional standards or external accreditation requirements apply to the program? What was the outcome of the most recent external review? If not externally accredited, how does this program compare to similar offerings at like institutions (include a brief explanation of benchmark comparators)?

3 b. Program Structure, Objectives, and Coherence (*Appendices E and F*) What is the overall logic of the curriculum and the key points where core concepts are introduced, practiced, and proficiencies demonstrated? How well do course outlines align with the curriculum map? Do regulation waivers and/or student appeals suggest areas that need to be addressed? What are the laddering and/or collaborative opportunities for students to further their education and/or achieve professional certifications?

3 c. Assessment (*Appendix G*) Which direct measure of learning outcomes have been examined (e.g., graduate performance on licensure examinations, analysis of capstone assignments, and feedback on placements)? Which indirect measures of learning outcomes have been examined (e.g., grade analysis and satisfaction with instruction)? What curriculum adjustments were made as a result of assessment review?

4. Alignment and Community Engagement

4 a. Strategic Alignment How does the program align with the mandate and mission of the institution and its overall academic plan? How does program contribute to achieving institutional goals?

4 b. Program Relevance What is the evidence of employer demand for the skills and knowledge acquired by graduates? What further education and training do graduates pursue and how well prepared are they to advance? How is this program connected to the standards of the profession?

4 c. Outreach and Community Engagement (*Appendix H*) How does the program liaise with the external community and how do these activities contribute to the program?

5. Resources

5 a. Faculty Complement and Performance (*Appendix I – degree programs should also address relevant CAQC standards*) How many continuing and contracted (full and part-time) instructors support the department? What are their respective roles? What efforts have been made to improve diversity and inclusion? How do faculty demonstrate currency and engagement

with their discipline? What professional development is needed for faculty development in the program? How do the professional practice innovations and/or scholarly activities of the faculty relate to teaching and learning in the program?

5 b. Physical and Technological Resources What library resources, facilities, and equipment are available to support the program? Are the resources being used effectively? Are the available resources adequate to meet disciplinary expectations for the program?

5 c. Budget Trends (*Reference annual program updates*) What are recent trends in program expenses and revenues? How do program costs compare with provincial averages in the discipline? What factors might contribute to deviations from the provincial average? Consider credit hours, class sizes, salaries, and workloads. What cost reduction and/or revenue generating initiatives have been undertaken during the period of this review? What potential is there for obtaining external funds?

6. Program Self-evaluation

6 a. Previous Recommendations What recommendations were made during the last review and what has been achieved?

6 b. Current Program Strengths Based on information in the previous sections, what does the program identify as its strengths?

6 c. Areas of Concern Considering environment and outlook, what are areas of concern for this program?

7. Recommendations and Future Directions

As a result of this self-study, what changes are recommended to improve overall program quality and effectiveness? What is the rationale for each recommendation? Are there recommendations that require additional follow-up?

Appendix A: Status of Previous Program Action Plan

Proposed Action	Current Status	Comment
<i>e.g., Collaboration agreement renewal</i>	<i>On Hold</i>	<i>Partnership agreement and risk analysis templates under review in current year.</i>

Appendix B: Student Demographics, Retention Rates, and Graduate Rates (provided by Institutional Research and Planning Office)

Appendix C: Graduate Pathways and Shared Course Analysis

- a. heat map of number of courses by semester and completion category for recent graduates (based on graduation date).
- b. network visualization of courses/specializations by department

Appendix D: Analysis of Student and Alumni Feedback (narrative)

Appendix E: Curriculum Map for Alberta's Credential Framework Standards for Knowledge and Skills

Courses in which standards I – Introduced P – Practiced D - Demonstrated	Depth and Breadth of Knowledge	Conceptional Awareness and/or knowledge of Research	Communication Skills	Application of Knowledge	Professional Capacity/Autonomy	Awareness of Limits of Knowledge

Appendix F: Curriculum Map for Discipline Specific Competencies

Courses where competencies: I – Introduced (Keystone) P – Practiced (Corner Stone) D –Demonstrated (Capstone)	Discipline specific competency	Discipline specific competency	Discipline specific competency	Discipline specific competency

Appendix G: Learning Outcome Assessment Tracking

Assessment Plan Summary

Year	Program Goal/Outcome Assessed	Method of Assessment*	Target	Result	Response

* multiple rater matrix scores for capstone assignment, relevant item scores on standard examinations, etc.

Follow-up on prior year(s) responses

Goal/Outcome	Action Plan /Improvements Implemented	Impact

Appendix H: Program Advisory Committee (PAC) Membership

PAC Member	Industry Segment	Company/Association	Position/Professional Certification/Academic Qualification	Community/ Location	Dates Attended In Past 3 Years

Appendix I: Faculty Qualifications and Currency

Faculty Members	Professional Certification/Academic Qualification	Professional Development/Scholarly Activity (since last comprehensive review)	Relevant Industry Experience (since last comprehensive review)	Years of Teaching Experience	Role/Position in Program/Area of Expertise

Form E: Program Action Plan

Department: _____

Date: _____

Program: _____

Completed by (name) _____

Proposed actions to be achieved through internal resource allocations	Issue or concern to be addressed (evidence of continuing need)	Expected Outcome	Rank/Priority

Proposed actions requiring business case development	Institutional priority or risk to be addressed	Expected Outcome	Rank/Priority

Reviewed by Faculty Council on (Date) _____

Approved by _____ (Date) _____

Approved by _____ (Date) _____



STUDENT AWARDS POLICY

STUDENT AWARDS POLICY			
Effective Date	TBA	Policy Type	Academic
Responsibility	Vice President Academic and Research	Cross-Reference	1. Students with Disabilities Policy 2. Committee Terms of Reference
Approver	Board of Governors		
Review Schedule	5 years		

1. Policy Statement

1.1. The GPRC awards program exists to encourage and reward academic excellence in all areas of study and to provide financial assistance for students who may face financial challenges. The awards program also seeks to recognize achievement, reward good character, community involvement and leadership, and to encourage continued educational pursuits. The College offers awards described using the terminology below.

2. Background

2.1. In order to provide a fair, unbiased, consistent and equitable awards program, a policy must be in place to ensure continuity when awards are being granted to students

3. Policy Objective

3.1. This policy has been established to ensure the unbiased disbursement of awards at GPRC.

4. Scope

4.1. This policy applies to the entire awards program at GPRC.

5. Definitions

- 5.1. **Scholarship:** A monetary award given on the basis of academic achievement. Additional secondary selection criteria may also be applied.
- 5.2. **Bursary:** A monetary award given on the basis of demonstrated financial need and satisfactory academic achievement. Additional secondary selection criteria may also be applied.
- 5.3. **Award:** Is a general term used to indicate an item of financial or other value presented to a student. The term "Award" does not carry any implication of criteria used in the selection decision.
- 5.4. **Entrance Award:** Available to students who are entering any program for the first time at GPRC on a full-time basis.
- 5.5. **Renewable Award:** An award that may be disbursed to the student recipient again in subsequent years, as long as he/she continues to meet the all conditions for renewal specified in the terms of reference for the award.
- 5.6. **Nominated Award:** These awards are designated to a specific department and their students are automatically considered. Students are selected by department nominating committees and vetted by Financial Aid to ensure eligibility has been observed.

6. Guiding Principles

STUDENT AWARDS POLICY



- 6.1. The criteria and conditions of all awards established at GPRC must comply with the Alberta and Canadian Human Rights Act and must be free of criteria based on personal characteristics such as race, ancestry, colour, ethnic origin, sex, creed, age, marital status, family status, sexual orientation or disability.
- 6.2. Eligibility: Unless otherwise stated by the donor, the following are the eligibility guidelines applicable to GPRC administered awards:
 - 6.2.1 Students must be enrolled full-time at GPRC
 - 6.2.2 Scholarships and bursaries are available for Canadian citizens, and permanent residents. International students who have attended at least one year of full-time studies at GPRC are also eligible to apply.
 - 6.2.3 Students must submit all required documentation and provide full and complete information on their application. Should the required documentation not be provided with the initial application the application may be disqualified.
 - 6.2.4 Students with disabilities enrolled at 40% of a normal full-time course load will be eligible for full-time awards, provided that the Accessibility Services and Disability Supports Team has approved a reduced course load.
 - 6.2.5 The term "Alberta Resident", when used as a condition of eligibility for an award, shall be defined as a student who has lived in Alberta for twelve consecutive full months without being a full-time student.
 - 6.2.6 An Indigenous person in Canada is defined by the Constitution of Canada and regulated by the Indian Act.
 - 6.2.7 A full course load is unique to each program. Full time is defined as a minimum of 9 credits per semester.
- 6.3. Scholarship/Award Selection

In many cases the conditions for scholarships and awards are such that winners are automatically identified. Scholarships will be awarded by applying the following guidelines:

 - 6.3.1 Minimum GPA;
 - 6.3.2 Where students submit high school records for Entrance Awards based on academic achievement, eligibility will be determined by calculating the average mark on a minimum of five high school core courses. A core course has a credit value of 5.
 - 6.3.3 In the event of a tie for awards using high school records, the recipient will be determined through the use of grades from courses in the same discipline from the preceding year. (i.e. If English 30 is used in first round use English 20 to break the tie.)
- 6.4 Bursary Selection

The Student Awards Committee will select recipients in accordance with the award criteria. The Manager, Financial Aid will prepare the necessary data required for the selection process.

 - 6.4.1 Bursary recipients will be selected using the following guidelines:

STUDENT AWARDS POLICY



- 6.4.2 Unless otherwise stated, students must have a GPA of 1.7 and be registered full-time to be eligible for bursaries. In the event of a tie in financial need, GPA will be considered.
- 6.4.3 Applications will be assessed by financial need.
- 6.4.4 Every attempt will be made for fair and equitable distribution.

6.5. Administration of Awards

- 6.5.1 Disbursement: In general, every effort is made to make payment to the recipient at the earliest possible date, pending confirmation of enrolment if required. Any outstanding debts payable to GPRC are the first charges against the award. Unless otherwise stated in the terms of any award, awards administered by the Awards and Financial Aid Office are tenable only at GPRC.
- 6.5.2 Withdrawal from Studies. In the event that an award winner withdraws from study within the academic year in which the award was paid, no attempt shall be made to recover the amount of the award from the student. However, should there be a second instalment it will be cancelled.
- 6.5.3 Un-awarded Monies. In the event that an eligible recipient cannot be found, the donor may be contacted by the Community Relations Office. The donor may be asked to consider additional information, or indicate that the award is to remain un-awarded for that academic year.
- 6.5.4 Cancelling of Awards. Any awards may be withheld or cancelled for any of the following reasons: lack of eligible candidates, failure to meet terms and conditions of award, withdrawal from the College, withdrawal of the award by the donor
- 6.5.5 Liability. GPRC assumes liability for payment of awards only to the extent that gifts from donors or finances permit. GPRC, therefore, reserves the right to make the necessary changes that circumstances may require, including the cancellation of particular awards.
- 6.5.6 Protection of Awards Information: Personal information collected about students and donors for the purpose of administering GPRC financial assistance and awards program will be treated and protected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
- 6.5.7 Other: Any conditions, criteria or guidelines outlined by the donor which are described in the specific awards information supersede the general guidelines and definitions outlined in this document.

7. Roles and Responsibilities

Stakeholder	Responsibilities
Board of Governors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approve and formally support this policy
Academic Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and formally support this policy.• Provide a yearly report to the Board of Governors of Award Recipients.
Vice-President, Academics and Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and formally support this policy.

STUDENT AWARDS POLICY



Registrar	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Monitor successful implementation of this policy
Manager, Financial Aid	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Implement the policy

STUDENT AWARDS POLICY

8. Exceptions to the Policy

- 8.1. Any exceptions to this policy shall be directed to the Vice-President, External Relations and the Vice-President, Academic & Research

9. Inquiries

- 9.1. Vice President Academic and Research

10. Amendments (Revision History)

Approved by Academic Council: November 8, 2001

Revised and Approved by Academic Council: November 13, 2003

Revised and Approved by Academic Council: December 7, 2006

Revised and Approved by Academic Council: April 12, 2007

Revised and Approved by Academic Council: September 10, 2009

Approved by Academic Council: October 10, 2019

Approved by Board of Governors: DATE



STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

POLICY NAME: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Effective Date		Policy Type	Academic Policy
Responsibility	Vice President Academic and Research	Related Policies	Grading Policy Examination Policy Course Outline Policy Respectful Workplace Policy
Approval Authority	Board of Governors	Review Schedule	3 years

Table of Contents

1. Policy Statement:1

2. Scope:1

3. Reason for Policy:.....2

4. Definitions:2

5. Student Rights3

6. Student Responsibilities3

7. Academic Grievance:3

8. Academic Misconduct4

9. Non-Academic Misconduct5

Appendix A: Examples of Academic Student Misconduct7

Appendix B: Examples of Non-Academic Student Misconduct9

Appendix C: Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy Procedures10

Appendix D: The Students Rights and Responsibilities Committee13

Appendix E: The Appeal Process15

Appendix F: Student Complaint Form17

Appendix G: Example Student Academic Misconduct Letter18

1. Policy Statement:

Registered students are expected to abide by the rules and regulations of the College. As students, rights apply to the College in terms of what students are expected to know, expect and receive in all aspects of their period of study at GPRC. The standards of student responsibilities apply to all students in terms of what they are expected to take responsibility for and how to conduct themselves during their period of study at GPRC.

There are no exceptions to this policy. Further clarification on the policy requirements may be provided by the Director, Student Experience.

2. Scope:

This Policy applies to all registered students at any campus, any College-owned property or on any College-related field trip and activities. Students are required to adhere to GPRC policies and regulations and acknowledge the right of the College to address misconduct.

3. Reason for Policy:

This policy provides a framework for the identification and resolution of issues related to students' rights and responsibilities during their period of study at GPRC.

4. Definitions:

Academic Staff: Instructional staff in all credit courses, apprenticeship courses, and Professional Harley Davidson® courses, the T.E.N. Coordinator, Librarians, and Chairpersons of Departments.

Academic Grievances: An academic grievance is a complaint by a student specifically related to academic matters, alleging arbitrary and unpredictable instructional activities, grading procedures, or other incidents.

Academic Misconduct: means the commission of any action which falsely indicates the student's level of academic achievement or assists in falsely indicating another student's level of achievement. Plagiarism and cheating are examples of academic misconduct. *Refer to Appendix A for examples of Academic Misconduct.*

Academic Standing: a student's status or rank in any course or program. Academic matters are those concerned with instructional activities, grading procedures or other incidents related to academic affairs.

Advocate: any person who will support the grievor or who will plead on behalf of the grievor.

Appeal: a formal request to overturn an adverse decision affecting a student's academic standing.

Department: refers to the administrative unit of the College responsible for the academic functions of a program of study.

Cheating: is a form of academic misconduct that occurs when a student attempts to obtain credit for work in a way that is dishonest, irresponsible, untrustworthy, or unfair. Cheating misrepresents a student's knowledge, skills, and abilities, and can lead to an advantage over others in the assessment of academic work. Any student who voluntarily and consciously aids another student in the commission of one of these offenses is also guilty of misconduct. *Refer to Appendix A for examples of Cheating.*

FOIP: refers to The Freedom of Information and Privacy Act.

Hearing: the opportunity for the Appellant and the Respondent to present the case in person to the Students Rights and Responsibility Committee.

Non-Academic Misconduct: means behaviour on property-owned, leased or operated by the College, or on any endeavours during College-related activities such as field trips, that violates explicitly stated College rules and regulations, or a Federal, Provincial or Municipal statute, regulation or by-law. *Refer to Appendix B for examples of Non-Academic Misconduct.*

Plagiarism: means submitting work (words, ideas, images, or data) in a course as if it were the student's own work done expressly for that course when, in fact, it is not. Academic work often involves reference to the ideas, data, and conclusions of others, which must be explicitly and clearly noted. *Refer to Appendix A for examples of Plagiarism.*

Program: means the degree and specialization in which a student is registered (programs are offered by departments, non-departmentalized, or extra-departmentally).

Student: refers to an individual who has been admitted to GPRC on either a part-time or a full-time basis.

Withdraw with Permission: refers to a withdrawal that results in a final grade of "W". Normally the deadline to withdraw and receive a grade of "W" is identified in the Academic Schedule.

Working day: means a day on which the College administrative offices are open.

5. Student Rights

1. A student has the right to learning conditions that do not interfere with the learning process and the right to participate in activities for students at the College, without harassment, intimidation, discrimination, disruption or acts of violence.
2. A student has the right to freedom of inquiry, expression and assembly on campus.
3. A student has the right to engage and participate in dialogue and to examine diverse views and ideas.
4. A student has the right to know the basic content, general procedures and course requirements of the course in advance of the first day of class, and to be assured that a course that is offered will not be substantially changed after the first day of class.
5. A student has the right to receive formal academic advising concerning program and graduation requirements, academic regulations and university admissions.
6. A student has the right to expect that he/she will be informed of his/her course performance prior to the "withdraw with permission" date for the course and that the evaluation of his/her learning will be ongoing for the semester.
7. A student has the right to have his/her grades maintained in confidence. A student has the right to view any record that exists in his/her file in accordance with the FOIP Act.
8. A student has the right to review any of his/her final examinations or final assignments for ninety days following publication of the final grade.
9. A student has the right to timely resolution of issues brought forth to the instructor or department.

Refer to Section 7: Academic Grievance

Refer to Appendix C: Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy Procedures

Refer to Appendix F: Student Complaint form

6. Student Responsibilities

1. It is the student's responsibility to act consistently with the values of the College community and to obey local, provincial and federal laws.
2. It is the student's responsibility to respect the rights of the other members of the College community. The responsibility to behave in a way that does not harm or threaten to harm another person's physical or mental wellbeing.
3. It is the student's responsibility to uphold an atmosphere of civility, honesty, equity and respect for others, thereby valuing the inherent diversity in our community.
4. It is the student's responsibility to respect the property of others including the property of the college.
5. It is the student's responsibility to be fully acquainted with and adhere to College's policies, procedures or rules.
6. It is the student's responsibility to become familiar with course outlines, content, evaluation methods, timelines and methodology.
7. It is the student's responsibility to observe and obey all health and safety procedures outlined for classrooms, laboratories, field trips practica, and other spaces on campus.

Refer to Section 8: Academic Misconduct

Refer to Section 9: Non-academic Misconduct

7. Academic Grievance:

The Student Academic Grievance Procedure outlines the steps students are required to follow in the event that Academic Staff's grading procedures or instructional activities are deemed to be adversely affecting the student's academic standing. Students have the right to fair and equitable procedures for resolving matters affecting academic standing.

Adverse grading procedures and instructional activities:

Grading procedures: The assignment of a course grade to a student on some basis other than performance in the course.

- a. The assignment of a course grade to a student by resorting to unreasonable standards different from those which were applied by the same instructor to other students in that course.
- b. The assignment of a course grade by a substantial, unreasonable and unannounced departure from the instructor's previously articulated standards.
- c. Other incidents: Biased behaviour toward a student.

Instructional activities: Teaching methods, class conduct, course preparation, or non-adherence to the course outline by the Academic Staff.

7.1 The student is advised that the entire process of grievance, all professional personnel, Academic Staff, staff, and administrators are bound by a code of professional ethics to hold in confidence discussions with students and names of students, unless the student specifically gives permission in writing for that information to be divulged.

7.2 Filing a complaint of academic grievance should normally occur within 20 days of grades being posted for an assignment or within 20 days of the completion of the course/program.

Refer to Appendix F: Student Complaint form

8. Academic Misconduct

GPRC is committed to the principles of academic integrity. Any action that contravenes the standard of academic integrity is prohibited and may result in disciplinary measures. Alleged incidents of academic misconduct are investigated and resolved in a manner that is fair, transparent, and timely.

Registered students are expected to abide by the rules and regulations of the College. The College expects academic integrity from its students. Academic misconduct undermines the quality of teaching and learning and detracts from the College's reputation. Accordingly, the College has adopted appropriate penalties for plagiarism and cheating. Penalties are levied according to the degree of the infraction.

Refer to Appendix A: Examples of Academic Misconduct

Refer to Appendix C: Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy Procedures

8.1 Guiding Principles

- 8.1.1** GPRC fosters academic integrity through education and the use of preventative measures in all teaching and learning activities.
- 8.1.2** Academic Staff are to ensure that all reasonable measures are taken to inform students of the specific requirements of their courses regarding academic integrity.
- 8.1.3** Academic Staff model and enforce clear and fair standards of academic integrity.
- 8.1.4** Students are allowed to proceed in courses until the investigation into the alleged academic misconduct is complete except in situations where safety to self or others is an issue or there is disruption to the learning environment.
- 8.1.5** Students will be informed of consequences and presented with the evidence gathered when an incident of academic misconduct is alleged.

- 8.1.5.1** If evidence includes classmates' information, the confidentiality of these students will be maintained.

8.2 Academic Responsibilities

8.2.1 Student Responsibilities

- 8.2.1.1 Refraining from engaging in academic misconduct.
- 8.2.1.2 Completing their own academic work.
- 8.2.1.3 Refraining from helping or attempting to help another person commit academic misconduct.
- 8.2.1.4 Taking reasonable precautions to prevent their academic work from being used by others.
- 8.2.1.5 Gaining the skills and knowledge related to proper citation and applying these skills to all borrowed information (words, ideas, work, etc.).
- 8.2.1.6 Respecting and following expectations regarding the accepted degree of collaboration and copy-editing assistance, as laid out in assignment and exam instructions.

8.2.2 Academic Staff Responsibilities

- 8.2.2.1 Taking proactive and reasonable measures to prevent student academic misconduct.
- 8.2.2.2 Making expectations under this policy clear and explicit to students in assignment and exam instructions.
- 8.2.2.3 Reducing the occurrence of academic misconduct through appropriate design and administration of assignments and exams.
- 8.2.2.4 Responding to suspected academic misconduct in accordance with this policy and related procedures.
- 8.2.2.5 Including relevant academic integrity and academic misconduct information in course outlines and course syllabi to be reviewed with students at the beginning of each semester.

8.2.3 Registrar Responsibilities

- 8.2.3.1 Receiving all disclosures and reports of academic misconduct;
- 8.2.3.2 Evaluating, investigating, and determining an appropriate response to academic misconduct allegations in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Procedures for Student Academic Misconduct document.
- 8.2.3.3 Handling information and records related to academic misconduct in compliance with Alberta's FOIP and the provisions outlined in the Procedures for Student Academic Misconduct document.
- 8.2.3.4 Overseeing the development and implementation of any education and awareness activities needed to ensure the college community is aware of and understands the policy.
- 8.2.3.5 Maintaining an online student resource page related to academic integrity and academic misconduct.

8.2.4 Vice-President Academic and Research Responsibilities

- 8.2.4.1 Developing, publishing, and maintaining procedures and regulations for dealing with allegations of academic misconduct.
- 8.2.4.2 Monitoring the effectiveness of the policy and making policy refinements as needed to ensure the policy remains relevant and effective.
- 8.2.4.3 Evaluating outcomes of academic misconduct allegations when issues are raised at the Vice-President Academic and Research level and responding accordingly.

8.2.5 All College Community Responsibilities

- 8.2.5.1 Complying with and enforcing academic integrity standards.
- 8.2.5.2 Reporting apparent violations of academic integrity that they have observed.

9. Non-Academic Misconduct

The disciplinary power of the College is inherent in its responsibility to protect its educational purposes and processes through the setting of standards of conduct and the regulation of the use of its facilities. The established standards of conduct apply to students whenever they are on property-owned, leased or operated by the College. The standards of conduct also apply to students representing the College at functions, meetings or sports events that are held off-site. Students are also expected to abide by applicable Provincial and Federal laws.

The Non-Academic Misconduct procedure is intended to provide a framework for the identification and

STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES



resolution of issues (tracked by the Director, Student Experience) concerning the non-academic conduct of GPRC students, including students enrolled in Collaborative Programs.

Refer to Appendix B: Examples of Non-Academic Misconduct

Refer to Appendix C: Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy Procedures

Appendix A: Examples of Academic Student Misconduct

Examples of academic misconduct include but are not limited to the following acts, whether completed or attempted. Any student who voluntarily and consciously aids another student in the commission of an act of academic misconduct is also guilty of academic misconduct.

Cheating

Examples of cheating include but are not limited to situations where a student:

1. Presents false or fabricated material, including research results.
2. Communicates with other students during tests or examinations without explicit permission from the instructor.
3. Consults any person or materials outside the confines of the examination environment (physical or virtual) without permission to do so.
4. Writes an examination or part of it outside the confines of the examination environment (physical or virtual) without permission to do so.
5. Impersonates another student in an examination or other class assignment.
6. Copies from another student's examination or assignment.
7. Allows another student to copy from their examination or assignment.
8. Works with others on an evaluative assessment beyond the degree of what is permissible.
9. Possesses and/or uses unauthorized materials (such as print or electronic materials, calculators, or other electronic devices) during an evaluative process.
10. Pre-programs a calculator, electronic or other device to contain answers or other unauthorized information for use in examinations or other evaluative assessments.
11. Removes any examination materials and papers from the examination room, without permission to do so.

Plagiarism

Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to situations where a student:

1. Submits or presents work, in whole or in part, taken from another source without appropriate reference to the original creator and/or source.
2. Commits self-plagiarism by submitting the same work from one course for assessment in a subsequent offering of that same course or in a different course, without prior written permission from all the instructors involved.
3. Mentions an author or source with a paper without including a full citation in the bibliography.
4. Cites a source with inaccurate information, making it impossible to find that source.
5. Uses a direct quote from a source, cites that source, but fails to indicate the copied text with quotation marks.
6. Submits work that the student has obtained from someone else.
7. Submits work that contains a purported statement of fact or refers to a source that does not exist or has been concocted.

Other Types of Academic Misconduct

Examples of other types of academic misconduct include but are not limited to situations where a student:

1. Sells, distributes, posts, or publishes course materials, recordings, or other information provided by an instructor, or using them for any commercial purpose without the express permission of the instructor.
2. Uses the intellectual property of others for distribution, sale, or profit without the authorization of the owner of that material. This includes slides and presentation materials used in a class wherever the owner of those materials has not authorized further use.
3. Intentionally or deliberately acquires or attempts to acquire, possesses, or distributes examination or assessment materials without the instructor's prior approval.
4. Tamper or attempts to tamper with examinations, class work, grades, or class records.
5. Removes, defaces, destroys or deliberately keeps library, academic, or reference materials from other students.
6. Furnishes false information in the context of an assignment or evaluative task.
7. Has unauthorized access to or interferes with the academic records, data and documents from GPRC, an instructor, another student or a third party.
8. Alters a previously graded examination or assignment or alters a grade without the instructor's prior consent.
9. Intentionally damages or destroys the academic work of others.
10. Impersonates someone or has someone impersonate them in person, in writing, or electronically.
11. Withholds or alters academic information, portfolios, essays, transcripts, or documents, including during the admissions process.
12. Submits altered, forged, or falsified medical or other certificates or documents for academic consideration, or making false claims for such consideration, including in or as part of an academic appeal, or the academic misconduct process.
13. Altering, in any way, official documents issued by the College.

Appendix B: Examples of Non-Academic Student Misconduct

Non-Academic Misconduct: means behaviour on property-owned, leased or operated by the College, or on any endeavours during College-related activities such as field trips, that violates explicitly stated College rules and regulations, or a Federal, Provincial or Municipal statute, regulation or by-law.

Student misconduct includes but is not limited to:

1. furnishing false or misleading information to College officials or on official College records or altering or tampering with such official records;
2. theft, malicious destruction, damage or injury to property;
3. appropriating for the student's own use property which is not the student's own without the consent of the owner or person legally responsible for such property;
4. possession, use or distribution of any illegal substance;
5. unauthorized consumption, possession or distribution of alcoholic beverages;
6. unauthorized entry into, or use of, College facilities;
7. failure to comply with directions of College administrative officers or Academic Staff within the purview of their authority when they are carrying out their normal duties;
8. conduct which causes injury to a person and/or damage to College property and/or the property of any member of the College community;
9. bullying, violence or threat of violence, and or unacceptable behaviour or language (on campus, in classrooms, online or while using computers, at events, on trips, etc.).

"Supervisor" is a person in a position of responsibility when the misconduct occurs (in that moment, in that setting).

Appendix C: Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy Procedures

1. Student Rights/Academic Grievance

1.1 Informal Discussion with the Academic Staff/Supervisor: If a student feels that their student rights have been violated, the student should approach the instructor to resolve the situation causing the concern.

1.1.1 If the informal method for resolving the situation does not succeed or the student is not comfortable approaching the instructor, the student will complete the Student Complaint form.

1.2 Submit a Student Complaint Form: The student will complete a Student Complaint form and submit it to the Department Chairperson. For all complaints except Academic Grievances, the student will be notified within two working days that the complaint has been received and a follow-up meeting, with the Department Chairperson or Dean depending on the scope of the complaint, will be scheduled within ten working days of the date of the written complaint.

1.3 Academic Grievances:

1.3.1 Review by the Department Chairperson: The Department Chairperson will normally meet informally with the student and the instructor (with permission of the student) to facilitate a timely resolution to the issue at this step.

1.3.2 Review by the Dean: If the concern is not resolved at the review by the Department Chairperson, the student complaint form will be submitted to the Dean. The Dean shall try to negotiate the resolution of the dispute at this step.

1.3.3 If the Dean has concerns about perception of bias, he/she may disqualify him/herself and name another Dean as a replacement. If the grievance cannot be resolved by these steps, the Dean or designate will advise the student of the process for proceeding with a formal grievance.

1.3.4 Formal submission to the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee: If the review by the Dean fails to resolve the issue the student may request a formal hearing by delivering a statement in writing signed by the student to the Director, Student Experience. The original student complaint submitted to the Department Chairperson should be the basis of this submission. The Academic Grievance will be heard by the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

Refer to Appendix D: for Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee

2. Student Academic Misconduct

2.1 Identification of Offence: Instructor or supervisor identifies or is notified about the student's alleged academic misconduct offence. Instructor or invigilator determines if the alleged offence warrants further action. The instructor or invigilator may meet with the student to discuss the allegation. If the instructor decides that sufficient evidence exists to pursue the allegation, the instructor reports the allegation in writing to the department chair.

2.1.1 If the instructor issues a verbal warning to the student without formal documentation of the offence, the incident will not be considered a first offence in the Student Academic Misconduct Procedure.

2.2 Review by the Department Chairperson: The Department Chairperson decides if there is sufficient evidence to pursue the allegation. If the Department Chairperson decides to pursue the allegation, the Department Chairperson checks with the Registrar's Office to determine if the student has had previous findings of academic misconduct. If no, this allegation is a possible first offence. If yes, this allegation is a possible second offence or third offence.

2.2.1 A student who has committed a first offence of academic misconduct will receive a record of first occurrence of academic misconduct added to the student's academic file along with one or more of the following sanctions:

- Verbal warning from instructor
 - Formal warning/reprimand
 - Resubmission of the evaluation associated with the academic misconduct
 - Failing grade of zero (0) on the evaluation associated with the academic misconduct
- 2.2.2** A student who has committed a second offence of academic misconduct will receive a record of second occurrence of academic misconduct added to the student's academic file along with one of more of the following sanctions:
- Formal warning/reprimand
 - Failing grade of zero (0) in the course associated with the academic misconduct
- 2.2.3** A student who has committed a third offence of academic misconduct will receive a record of third occurrence of academic misconduct added to the student's academic file along with one of more of the following sanctions:
- Formal warning/reprimand
 - Failing grade of zero (0) in the course associated with the academic misconduct
 - Suspension for at least two (2) academic terms
- 2.2.4** A student who has committed a fourth offence of academic misconduct will receive a record of fourth occurrence of academic misconduct added to the student's academic file along with one of more of the following sanctions:
- Expulsion
 - Prohibited from applying or registering for any credit or non-credit courses
- 2.3 Formal Communication to Student:** The Department Chairperson sends written notice of the allegation to the student and instructor. The notice includes the course, academic misconduct details, and consequences.

See Appendix G: Academic Misconduct Letter

- 2.4** The student may request a formal hearing to appeal the disciplinary action by delivering a statement in writing signed by the student to the Director, Student Experience.

Refer to Appendix D: Student Rights & Responsibilities Committee

3. Student Non-Academic Misconduct

- 3.1** Where non-academic misconduct is covered by another policy, such as the Residence Handbook, the procedures contained in that policy are to be followed.
- 3.2 Determine level of threat:** When it is determined that a student poses a threat to campus security or the safety of any person on campus, the College reserves the right to take immediate and necessary action. This may include a possible distance education component until an investigation can be carried out. The threat may result from activities or behaviour that occurred on or off-campus (e.g. field trips).
- 3.3 Notification of Non-Academic Misconduct:** Any individual witnessing non-academic misconduct in common areas of the College should report the incident to Campus Security or the RCMP who will follow up with the Director, Student Experience. The Director, Student Experience will follow up with appropriate Department Chairperson and Dean thereafter.

Non-academic misconduct is initially managed by the Academic Staff/supervisor of the student(s). If the Academic Staff/supervisor does not feel safe in dealing with the misconduct, they will contact Campus Security or the local RCMP who will follow up with the Director, Student Experience. If the Academic Staff/supervisor feels safe in dealing with the misconduct, they will notify the Department Chairperson of the non-academic misconduct.

In consultation with the Dean and Director, Student Experience, the Department Chairperson will decide on an appropriate disciplinary action.

3.4 Disciplinary Action: Disciplinary action(s) can include, but are not limited to:

- 3.4.1** Verbal warning
- 3.4.2** Written warning
- 3.4.3** Non-academic probation or restitution
- 3.4.4** Removal from the learning environment or an activity
- 3.4.5** Required to withdraw
- 3.4.6** Suspension or expulsion

3.5 The student may request a formal hearing to appeal the disciplinary action by delivering a statement in writing signed by the student to the Director, Student Experience.

Refer to Appendix D: Students Rights & Responsibilities Committee

Appendix D: Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee is to hear matters of grievance affecting the rights and responsibilities of a student, including Academic Grievances, Academic Misconduct appeals, and Non-Academic Misconduct appeals.
- 1.2 The Committee will submit a recommendation for resolution of the issue to the Director, Student Experience.

2. Membership

- 2.1 The Committee shall normally consist of four persons with an annual membership and a rotating Dean based on the division of the hearing:
 - 2.1.1 The Chair of the Committee shall normally be the appropriate Dean responsible for the delivery of the courses;
 - 2.1.2 Two academic staff members, one selected by the Academic Staff Association and one nominated by the Vice-President Academic and Research;
 - 2.1.3 Two student representatives, one selected from the Students' Association membership at large and one nominated by the Vice-President Academic and Research.
- 2.2 Members of the Committee may disqualify themselves from deliberating on an issue if there are concerns about perception of bias. Another member from the same constituency is named as a replacement.

3. Operation

- 3.1 The quorum of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee is five.
- 3.2 Three affirmative votes are required to uphold the decision of the Committee. All Committee members, including the chair of the committee, must vote.

4. Term

- 4.1 The term of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee will be for one Academic Year.

5. Jurisdiction of the Committee

- 5.1 The Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee shall hear and determine outcomes for grievance affecting the rights and responsibilities of a student, including Academic Grievances, Academic Misconduct appeals, and Non-Academic Misconduct appeals.
- 5.2 The Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee shall have no jurisdiction to hear a grievance unless the procedures outlined in the student rights and responsibilities have been followed. The informal procedures may include seeking resolution under related policies.
- 5.3 The Committee has the right to request any College employee or student to appear.
- 5.4 All business of the Committee shall be conducted confidentially.

6. Procedure

- 6.1 Upon receipt of a written grievance and/or appeal, the Director, Student Experience shall inform the Dean of the School. The Dean shall, within five working days, ensure that a Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee is formed. The Director, Student Experience will confirm the participation of the Students' Association designates.
- 6.2 The Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee will meet to consider the issue presented within five working days of receiving the complaint and will strive to conclude the issue within ten (10) working days.
- 6.3 Both the grievor and the respondent will be given opportunity to state their case. The Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee will invite anyone they deem necessary to present

information. In exceptional circumstances, written submissions or teleconference participation may be acceptable.

- 6.4** Upon conclusion of their deliberation, the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee shall prepare a brief summary of the information presented to it, to which shall be added the recommendation of the Committee and the reasons for the recommendation. The summary and recommendation shall be signed by the Chair of the committee and normally delivered to the griever and respondent within five (5) working days of the conclusion of the hearing with a copy to the Director, Student Experience and the Registrar.

Appendix E: The Appeal Process

1. Appeal Procedures

- 1.2 An appeal of the Recommendation of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee may be made by either party,

2. Grounds

- 1.1 The grounds for an appeal shall include but not be restricted to the following:
 - 1.1.1 Procedural errors on the part of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee.
 - 1.1.2 Failure of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee to consider all factors relevant to the decision being appealed.
 - 1.1.3 Bias or discrimination against either party on the part of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee.
 - 1.1.4 New information that was not available during the Student Rights and Responsibilities committee meeting.

3. Powers of the Appeal Panel

- 2.1 The Appeal Panels has the authority to determine if the appeal is to be heard based on Item 10.1.
- 2.2 The decision of the Appeal Panel shall be either:
 - 3.2.1 to uphold the appeal and make such order as is required, or
 - 3.2.2 to deny the appeal
- 2.3 The panel shall hear an appeal from the same appellant against the same decision only once.
- 2.4 The decision of the Appeal Panel shall be final and binding.

4. Procedures

- 3.1 Within fifteen (15) working days of receiving the decision of the Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee, an appeal shall be instituted by delivering a statement in writing signed by the appellant to the Vice-President Academic and Research. The statement must set forth the decision being appealed, the grounds for the appeal, the nature of the injustice, and the relief requested.
- 3.2 The Vice-President will convene a meeting as per membership described in section 5.1.
- 3.3 The Appeal Panel shall meet within ten (10) working days of receipt of the written statement.
- 3.4 Prior to hearing evidence, the Appeal Panel shall determine that the appeal falls within its jurisdiction.
- 3.5 The Appeal Panel shall hear evidence from all involved parties. An advocate or an advisor may accompany the appellant and the respondent.
- 3.6 Upon conclusion of the hearing, the Appeal Panel shall prepare a brief summary of the evidence and argument presented to it, to which shall be added the decision of the Appeal Panel and the reasons for the decision. The summary and decision shall be signed by the Chair of the Appeal Committee and normally delivered to the appellant and respondent within five (5) working days of the conclusion of the hearing.

5. Membership

- 1.1 The panel shall consist of three members:
 - 1.1.1 the Vice-President Academic and Research will act as Panel Chair (the Vice-President may designate an alternate Vice-President to select and chair the panel, if perception of bias is a concern),
 - 1.1.2 one student named by the Vice-President,
 - 1.1.3 one Academic Staff member outside the Department named by the Vice-President.

6. Records Management

- 1.1 The Student Rights and Responsibilities Committee and the Appeal Panel will create and maintain, in confidence the record of proceedings and outcomes. The records will be stored/destroyed as per the Records Management Policy of the College.

Appendix F: Student Complaint Form

All students will be notified within two working days that a complaint has been received and a follow-up will be scheduled within ten working days of the date of the written complaint.

Student Name: Click or tap here to enter text. Student ID: Click or tap here to enter.

Phone Number: Click or tap here to enter text. Email: Click or tap here to enter text.

Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

Nature of complaint (please select):

- Academic (please specify the subject of the academic complaint)
 - Academic Grievance
 - Instructor/learning environment
 - Program/course content
 - Academic Misconduct Appeal
- Non-Academic (student services, safety concern, administrative action, procedure, decision, etc.)

Students are encouraged to discuss their concerns and complaints via informal conferences with the appropriate administrator or Academic Staff member.

Have you attempted to resolve your complaint? Yes No

If yes, please provide any evidence of resolutions steps (include dates, times, names, etc.):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Summarize the nature of your complaint using factual information in your narrative. You may attach an additional sheet of paper if needed:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Specify the outcome being sought:

Click or tap here to enter text.

With any additional comments, please attach a separate sheet to this form. For academic complaints, please submit a hard copy of this form to the Department Chairperson. For non-academic complaints, please submit a hard copy of this form to the Dean, Student Experience.

I hereby declare the information on this form is correct, true, and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that any misrepresentation of the information may result in disciplinary action in accordance with the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy.

Student Signature: _____ Date: Click or tap here to enter text.

Appendix G: Example Student Academic Misconduct Letter

Student Name

Student ID:

Date:

Re: Academic Misconduct in [course code]

Dear [Student first name],

The GPRC Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy on Student Academic Misconduct, provides examples of cheating and plagiarism as it relates to examinations and assignments submitted in a GPRC course.

[Provide additional details regarding discussions of expectations reviewed in class or in course outline: example - *Prior to the final exam, students were also reminded of repercussions of cheating (receiving a zero on the final exam) and reminded of GPRC cheating and plagiarism policies.*]

As per the GPRC policies, [Student Name] submitted a [assignment/quiz/exam] that demonstrates an academic misconduct has taken place for the following reasons:

- 1) [provide evidence of the misconduct]
- 2) [provide evidence of the misconduct]
- 3) [provide evidence of the misconduct]

Based on the academic misconduct and this being a [1st/2nd/3rd/4th] offense, [student name] has received [outline the consequence of the academic misconduct aligning with the specification of the student rights and responsibilities policy].

As outlined in the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy, you may request a formal hearing to appeal this decision by delivering a statement in writing signed by the student to the Director, Student Experience.

Sincerely,

[Chairperson name]

[Department]



10726-106 Ave, Grande Prairie, AB T8V 4C4

Ph: Office:

Cc: [Name] GPRC Registrar

Nominations Slate – 2021-2022

ACADEMIC COUNCIL LEADERSHIP		
ACADEMIC COUNCIL 2021-2022		
Nominees		Representation Required
		Chair
		Vice Chair
Glenn Feltham		President
Vanessa Sheane		Vice President Academics and Research
Brian Redmond		Dean
Carly McLeod		Dean
Aman Litt		Director, Student Experience
Dianne McWatt	(1 of 2)	Community Member
Sasha Dorscheid	(2 of 2)	Community Member
Lesley Brazier	(2 of 2)	ASA
Julia Dutove	(2 of 2)	ASA
Jeremy Parker	(2 of 2)	ASA
Craig Smith	(2 of 2)	ASA
[Vote at Oct 20 meeting]	(2 of 2)	ASA
Brent Boutilier	(1 of 2)	ASA
Deena Honan	(1 of 2)	ASA
Theresa Suderman	(1 of 2)	ASA
Elena Voskovskaia	(1 of 2)	ASA
Lorelle Warr	(1 of 2)	ASA
Cara Leaf	(1 of 2)	ASA Alternate
Terrah Lindsay	(1 of 2)	ASA Alternate
Myles Mintzler	(1 of 2)	ASA Alternate
Shawn Morton	(1 of 2)	ASA Alternate
Tamara Van Tassell	(1 of 2)	ASA Alternate
John Tiede	(1 of 1)	SA President
Brooklyn Broaders	(1 of 1)	SA VP Internal
	(1 of 1)	SA VP External
Tyler Barr	(1 of 1)	SA
Jordan Drake	(1 of 1)	SA
Josh Winland	(1 of 1)	SA
Liberte Tiede	(1 of 1)	SA
Sara Yelligadu	(1 of 1)	SA
Saransh Kapoor	(1 of 1)	SA
	(1 of 1)	SA
	(1 of 1)	SA (Alternate)
	(1 of 1)	SA (Alternate)
	(1 of 1)	SA (Alternate)
Lana Bennett	(2 of 2)	EA
Lisa Hollis	(1 of 2)	EA
Tanya Kinderwater	(2 of 2)	EA Alternate
Lin Roy	(1 of 2)	AUPE
Lynnette Tye	(1 of 2)	AUPE Alternate

Nominations Slate – 2021-2022

CO-CURRICULAR COMMITTEE 2021-2022 – Proposed TOR		
Nominees		Representation Required
Tanya Lopez		Registrar (Chair)
John Tiede	(1 of 1)	President of Students' Association (or designee)
Charlene MacIntyre	(2 of 2)	Representative from Student Experience
	(1 of 2)	Representative from HCWS
Tina Strasbourg-voted by ASA per old TOR	(1 of 2)	Representative from ASU
	(1 of 2)	Representative from TAE
	(1 of 2)	Unique representative from Academic Council

CO-CURRICULAR COMMITTEE 2021-2022 – Based on current TOR		
Nominees		Representation Required
Aman Litt		Director, Student Experience (or designee), usually serves as Chair
	(1 of 2)	Representative of the Fine Arts Department
James Phillips	(1 of 2)	Representative of the PEAK Department
		President of Student's Association (or designee)
Charlene MacIntyre	(2 of 2)	Representative from Student Services
Tina Strasbourg	(1 of 2)	ASA Member (not from Fine Arts or PEAK)

Nominations Slate – 2021-2022

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE 2021-2022 – Proposed TOR		
Nominees		Representation Required
Vanessa Sheane		Vice-President Academic and Research (Chair)
Carly McLeod		Dean, HWCS
Brian Redmond		Dean, ASU
Tony Shmyruk		Dean, TAE
Tanya Lopez		Registrar
		Chairperson(s) or delegate(s) bringing items forward
Brooklyn Broaders	(1 of 1)	1 representative from Students' Association
John Tiede	(1 of 1)	1 representative from Students' Association
	(1 of 1)	1 Faculty Member from Academic Council*
	(1 of 1)	1 Faculty Member from Academic Council*
	(1 of 1)	1 Faculty Member from Academic Council*
	(1 of 1)	1 Faculty Member from Academic Council*
Kieren Bailey	(1 of 1)	1 Faculty Member from Centre for Teaching and Learning

*No more than 2 from one School

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE 2021-2022 – Based on current TOR (All department representatives serve two-year terms, students serve one-year terms.)		
Nominees		Representation Required
Glenn Feltham		President and CEO, Ex Officio
Vanessa Sheane		Vice-President Academics and Research
Aman Litt		Director, Student Experience (Chairperson)
Brian Redmond		Dean, School of Arts, Science and Upgrading
Carly McLeod		Interim Dean, School of Health, Wellness and Career Studies
Mark Heartt		Dean, School of Trades, Agriculture and Environment
Megan Slifka		Associate Registrar, Records (update title)
		Associate Registrar, Admissions (position does not exist)
Luc Boyer		Institutional Research and Planning Officer (update title to Manager, Institutional Planning and Research)
Jennifer Robertson		Advising Coordinator (update title to Associate Registrar, Advising and Articulation)
Tina Strasbourg Craig Smith (Alt)	(2 of 2)	1 representative from Arts & Education
Nicoletta Harabor Tanya Keller (Alt)	(1 of 2)	1 representative from Academic Upgrading
Carolyn Vasileiou Abby Head (Alt)	(1 of 2)	1 representative from Business and Office Administration
Dallas Sawtell	(1 of 2)	1 representative from Science
Terrah Lindsay (Alt)	(2 of 2)	1 representative from Human Services
Louise Rawluk Tamara Van Tassell (Alt)	(2 of 2)	1 representative from Nursing
Julia Dutove	(2 of 2)	1 representative from PEAK

October 7, 2021

Nominations Slate – 2021-2022

Lorelle Warr (Alt)		
	(2 of 2)	1 representative from Fine Arts
Chad Boone	(2 of 2)	1 representative from Continuing Education (this is not an academic department, do they need a representative on this committee?)
Dave Hiebert Peter Sellers (alt)	(1 of 2)	1 representative from Automotive, Motorcycle, and Powersport
Clint Peterson	(1 of 2)	1 representative from Heavy Equipment
Karlee Worobetz Christy Barlund (Alt)	(1 of 2)	1 representative from Animal Health Sciences
Brent Boutilier; Myles Mintzler (Alt)	(1 of 2)	1 representative from Construction, Fabrication and Operations
Clinton Derocher	(1 of 2)	1 representative from Electrical, Industrial Mechanical & Parts Department
Emma Doris	(1 of 1)	1 representative from the Student' Association appointed for 1 year term
Devansh Kapoor	(1 of 1)	1 representative from the Student' Association appointed for 1 year term
	(1 of 1)	1 Student from TAE program to participate in TAE meetings
	(1 of 1)	1 Student from either the SHWC or SASU to participate in corresponding meeting

Nominations Slate – 2021-2022

NOMINATING COMMITTEE 2021-2022		
Nominees		Representation Required
Julia Dutove		Academic Council Chair
Misha Albert	(2 of 2)	1 ASA member from the Academic Staff Association
Raoudha Kallel	(1 of 2)	1 ASA member from the Academic Staff Association
Tanya Kinderwater	(1 of 2)	1 member from the Employees' Association
	(1 of 2)	1 member from the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees

Nominations Slate – 2021-2022

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE 2021-2022 – Proposed TOR		
Nominees		Representation Required
Vanessa Sheane		Vice-President Academic and Research (Chair)
Carly McLeod		Academic Dean
	(1 of 2)	1 Faculty Member from Academic Council*
	(1 of 2)	1 Faculty Member from Academic Council*
	(1 of 2)	1 Faculty Member from Academic Council*
	(1 of 2)	1 Faculty Member from Academic Council*
	(1 of 2)	1 Faculty Member from Academic Council*
	(1 of 2)	1 Non-Academic Member from Academic Council
Lorelle Warr	(1 of 2)	1 Member from Centre for Teaching and Learning
John Tiede	(1 of 1)	1 Students' Association Representative
Andrea Rosenberger		1 Indigenous Knowledge Keeper
Tanya Lopez		Registrar
Aman Litt		Director of Student Experience or Designate (non-voting)
Luc Boyer		Manager, Institutional Planning and Research or Designate (non-voting)

*At least one member from each School and at least one from a degree program

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE 2021-2022 – Based on current TOR		
Nominees		Representation Required
Vanessa Sheane		Vice-President Academics and Research (Chair)
		1 Academic Dean
Aman Litt		Director, Student Experience or designate
Luc Boyer		Institutional Research and Planning Officer, non-voting
	(1 of 1)	1 Member of Students' Association
Doris Hoveland	(2 of 2)	1 representative from the School of Health, Wellness and Career Studies
	(1 of 2)	1 representative from the School of Arts, Science and Upgrading
	(1 of 2)	1 representative from the School of Trades, Agriculture and Environment
Lana Bennett	(2 of 2)	1 representative from Employees' Association but not from Student Services where possible
	(1 of 2)	1 member from the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees but not from Student Services where possible
	(1 of 2)	1 community member
Amanda Heiford - confirm		1 Communication Director or designate, non-voting

Nominations Slate – 2021-2022

Proposed TOR – this committee with run through Student Experience, not as a sub-committee of Academic Council

CONVOCATION COMMITTEE CAMPUS 2021-2022 – Based on current TOR		
Nominees		Representation Required
Vanessa Sheane		Vice-President, Academics and Research
Aman Litt		Director, Student Experience – Chairperson
Amanda Heiford		Director, Communications and Marketing (need to update to Manager, Communications and Marketing)
Tanya Lopez/Megan Slifka		Registrar
Shawna Boyd		Administrative Assistant to the Director, Student Experience
Desiree Mearon		Indigenous Liaison Coordinator
Teresa Bell		Administrative Assistant to the Dean, School of Trades, Agriculture and Environment
Tony Shmyruk (acting)		Principal, Fairview Campus and Dean of School of Trades, Agriculture and Environment (need to update title)
Janelle MacRae	1 of 2	1 ASA representative from Certificate program
[replacement needed from ASA]	1 of 2	1 ASA representative from Diploma program
Bobby Craig-Sparkes	1 of 2	1 ASA representative from Trades program
	1 of 2	1 Alumnus/Alumna (or alternate), selected by Alumni Association
	1 of 1	1 Student's Association representative or designate
	1 of 1	1 Circle of Indigenous Students representative
Shelly Hegge	2 of 2	1 representative from Event Services
	1 of 2	1 representative from Information Technology
Brian Parlee	2 of 2	1 representative from Facilities – Maintenance and Operations

Nominations Slate – 2021-2022

DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE 2021-2022 – Dissolved in 2021		
Nominees		Representation Required
John Rigby		Vice-President Academics and Research, Ex Officio
Brian Redmond		Dean, School of Arts, Science and Upgrading (Engaged)
Vanessa Sheane		Interim Dean, School of Health, Wellness and Career Studies (Engaged)
Charles Sanderson		Interim Dean, School of Trades, Agriculture and Animal Sciences
Ben Driedger		1 instructional designer
NOTE:		One faculty member who is actively teaching a distance education course this academic year from each academic department engaged in distance education this academic year Chair elected by Committee, must be a faculty representative
No distance education classes	N/A	1 representative from Arts & Education
No distance education classes	N/A	1 representative from Academic Upgrading
Carly McLeod	1 of 2	1 representative from Department of Business
No distance education classes	N/A	1 representative from Science
Tanya Ray	1 of 2	1 representative from Human Services
Deena Honan	1 of 2	1 representative from Nursing
No distance education classes	N/A	1 representative from PEAK
Geoff Whittall	1 of 2	1 representative from Fine Arts
Katie Stabb	1 of 2	1 member of Student Experience appointed by the Director of Student Experience
Devansh Kapoor	1 of 1	1 member from the Students' Association

Nominations Slate – 2021-2022

Proposed to move to Research & Innovation, not Academic Council sub committee

RESEARCH PLANNING COMMITTEE 2021-2022 – Based on current TOR		
Nominees		Representation Required
Vanessa Sheane		Vice-President Academics and Research (Chair)
Tony Shmyruk (acting)		Dean, School of Trades, Agriculture and Environment
Brian Redmond		Dean, School of Arts, Science and Upgrading
Carly McLeod (acting)		Dean, School of Health, Wellness and Career Studies
Andrew Dunlop		Director, Innovation and Research
Taylor Merkley Doyle		Research Facilitator
Julia Dutove		Chair of the Ethics Review Board
Nathanial Smith		Chair of the Animal Care Committee
Ali AL-Asadi		ASA President (or delegate)
	(1 of 2)	Chairperson Representative(s) selected by the Vice President, Academics and Research
Chris Mizzi Gavin Winter (Alternate)	(2 of 2)	One representative from the School of Trades, Agriculture and Environment plus alternate
James Phillips Carolyn Vasileiou (alternate)	(2 of 2)	One representative from the School of Health, Wellness and Career Studies plus alternate
Ubaid Abbasi Denise Nowicki (alternate)	(2 of 2)	One representative from the School of Arts, Science and Upgrading plus alternate
	(1 of 2)	Full-Time GPRC Employee Actively Engaged in Research
Charlene MacIntyre	(2 of 2)	One representative from Employees' Association
Lenora Roy (alternate)	(2 of 2)	One member from the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees
	(1 of 2)	One Communications Representative
	(1 of 1)	One Student representative

Nominations Slate – 2021-2022

Proposed to move to Student Experience, not Academic Council sub committee

STUDENT AWARDS COMMITTEE 2021-2022 – Based on current TOR		
Nominees		Representation Required
Christine Gurlitz		Financial Aid Advisor (Chairperson) (TOR needs to be updated with correct title)
Bernie Matlock	(1 of 1)	Financial Aid Advisor, as record keeper
	(1 of 1)	Financial Aid Advisor, as record keeper
	(1 of 1)	One student appointed by the SA Executive
	(1 of 1)	One student appointed by the SA Executive
	(2 of 2)	One ASA representative from the School of Trades, Agriculture, and Environment
	(1 of 2)	One ASA representative from The School of Health and Wellness and Career Studies
	(2 of 2)	One ASA representative from the School of Arts, Science and Upgrading
	(1 of 1)	One public member from the Foundation
	(1 of 1)	One representative from Student Experience
	(1 of 2)	One representative from Community Relations