

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROGRAM REVIEW

Minutes of Regular Meeting
Wednesday, November 23, 2022
2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
MS Teams Online

| Voting Member Quorum: 9 | | |
|---|--|--|
| Aimee Begalka Cherylynn Bassani Craig Wright David Burns Fergal Callaghan, Vice-Chair Hao Ma Jeff Dyck Jianying (Jennifer) Gao Julia Denker | Lori McElroy Lindsay Norris Marti Alger Nishan Perera | |
| | | Non-voting Amy Jeon, Chair Laura McDonald Melike Kinik-Dicleli |
| Regrets | Senate Office | Guests |
| Alan Davis Courtney Verhage Melissa Swanink Rajmale Kaur Tomasz Gradowski | Sonia Banwait | Ana Robles Andhra Goundrey Brett Favaro Briar Schulz Dana Csrepes Jeanette Paschen Mandeep Pannu Marla McMullen Maureen Lee Rebecca Harbut Shelley Boyd Victor Martinez Yanfeng Qu |

1. Call to Order

The Chair, Amy Jeon, called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Fergal Callaghan moved the agenda be confirmed as circulated.

The motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes, October 19, 2022

Julia Denker moved the minutes be accepted as circulated.

The motion carried.

4. Chair's Report

The Chair shared that there are external reviews taking place this month for Political Science, Physics for Modern Technology and for Creative Writing in January.

The Chair also informed there are kickoff meetings taking place in December for Fine Arts and Journalism.

4.1. New Membership

The Chair welcomed new member, Hao Ma, Faculty Representative – Melville School of Business and informed the committee there is one vacancy remaining for a Faculty of Arts member.

5. New Business

5.1. Sustainable Agriculture Quality Assurance Plan

The Chair summarized the reviewer's comments and informed that revisions were made to the suggested edits by the respective proponent(s). Rebecca Harbut and Brett Favaro were present to answer questions.

Aimee Begalka thanked the proponent for the great responses to the reviewer's questions and comments and asked how the department planned to address the need for increased human capacity to achieve the ambitious goals outlined in the quality assurance plan. Lori McElroy echoed that plans and actions proposed may need to be revised and adapted and changes should be documented during annual check-ins so they can be tracked. Rebecca Harbut and Brett Favaro acknowledged the recommendation and advised the request for additional staffing is underway.

Fergal Callaghan moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review accept the Sustainable Agriculture Quality Assurance Plan as attached.

The motion carried.

5.2. Language and Culture Self-Study Report

The Chair summarized the reviewer's comments and informed revisions were made to the suggested edits.

Fergal Callaghan asked for further clarification on chapter 3.1, page 20, noting that the revised wording still suggests that students could complete their minor without encountering some of the program learning outcomes (PLOs). Ana Robles and Yanfeng Qu were present to answer questions.

David Burns reminded the committee that full program proposals sent to the Ministry at the time of creation should be referenced for programs with no formal PLOs. This is to ensure program

objectives line up with proposals and to avoid regulatory issues. Nishan Perera also suggested to revisit the curriculum map to identify any substantial gaps that need to be addressed.

Nishan Perera moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review accept the Minor in Language and Culture Self-Study Report as attached.

The motion carried.

5.3. Counselling Second Annual Follow-Up Report

The Chair summarized the reviewer's comments and informed that revisions were made to the suggested edits by the respective proponent(s). Briar Schulz and Maureen Lee were present to answer any questions.

Marti Alger moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review accept the Counselling Second Annual Follow-up Report as attached.

The motion carried.

Lori McElroy moved THAT another Annual Follow-Up Report be provided to the committee.

The motion carried.

5.4. Product Design First Annual Follow-up Report

The Chair summarized the reviewer's comments and informed revisions were made to the suggested edits by the respective proponent(s). Lindsay Norris, Victor Martinez and Andhra Goundrey were present to answer questions.

Cherylynn Bassani asked for clarification on page 2 and 10 of the report on whether all courses were being reviewed and if outlines were being altered. Victor Martinez responded that overall mapping of changes is taking place and outlines are being updated accordingly.

Amy Jeon asked for further clarification to be provided in the report regarding what the program was planning to do for step one under strategy.

Action Items:

Strategy 2, page 2 – include additional information under “develop an updated course content”.

Strategy 4, page 6 – include additional information under “viability of graduate distinctive program”

Strategy 6, page 11 – include additional information regarding international workshop.

Aimee Begalka moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program review accept the Product Design First Annual Follow-up Report as attached.

The motion carried.

Lori McElroy moved THAT another Annual Follow-Up Report be provided to the committee.

The motion carried.

5.5. Business Management Second Annual Follow-up Report

The Chair summarized the reviewer's comments and informed revisions were made to the suggested edits by the respective proponent(s). Jeanette Paschen was present to answer any questions.

Fergal Callaghan moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review accept the Business Management Second Annual Follow-up Report as attached.

The motion carried.

Lori McElroy moved THAT another Annual Follow-Up Report be provided to the committee.

The motion carried.

5.6. Human Resources Management Third Annual Follow-up Report

The Chair summarized the reviewer's comments and informed that revisions were made to the suggested edits. Marla McMullen was present to answer any questions.

Julia Denker moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review accept the Human Resources Management Third Annual Follow-up Report as attached.

The motion carried.

5.7. Computer Science and Information Technology First Annual Follow-up Report

The Chair summarized the reviewer's comments and informed that some revisions were made to the suggested edits. Mandeep Pannu was present to answer questions.

Nishan Perera asked for clarification on the completion date of September 2026 on page 3 of the report. Lori McElroy added that if the completion date is considering the annual follow-up report timelines, then the late date of September 2026 does not need to be included.

Lori McElroy also noted that comments of clarification are not consistent throughout the report. There are a number of places where clarification needs to be expanded so readers can review this report at any time and understand what is being conveyed.

Amy Jeon asked if there was a reason why faculties need to start proposals from scratch rather than picking up where the other faculties left off. Mandeep Pannu explained that starting from scratch may not be entirely necessary, however listed the loss of faculty members and the need to redo surveys may require starting from the start.

Action Items:

Page 3 – remove completion date of Sept 2026.

Revisit completion dates and update them as needed.

Provide additional details for both ‘in progress’ and ‘completed’ comments

The committee agreed that the report be resubmitted with the necessary edits and missing information. The proponent will be notified with the new deadline for submission.

David Burns moved THAT the Senate Standing Committee on Program Review accept the Computer Science and Information Technology First Annual Follow-up Report as attached.

Lori McElroy moved THAT the motion be postponed and the report be resubmitted with the requested information.

The motion carried.

6. Items for discussion

6.1. Curriculum Mapping

Nishan Perera raised concerns regarding the cumbersome process of helping with curriculum mapping for multiple programs during the program review stage and wondered if there could be discussion around combining all programs into one program review. Lori McElroy suggested to this be discussed between the two of them before bringing it to the committee for further discussion.

7. Manager’s Report for OPA

Melike Kinik-Dicleli, Manager, Quality Assurance presented her report.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.