

Monday, April 29, 2024
2-100 University Hall, Council Chamber
2:00 PM - 4:00 PM

OPENING SESSION 2:00 - 2:05 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda Verna Yiu
2. Comments from the Chair (no documents) Verna Yiu
 - Update on the President's Review Committee

CONSENT AGENDA 2:05 – 2:10 p.m.

[If a member has a question or feels that an item should be discussed, they should notify the Secretary to GFC, in writing, two business days or more in advance of the meeting so that the relevant expert can be invited to attend.]

3. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of February 26 and March 18, 2024
4. New Members of GFC
5. Proposed Changes to Academic Standing Regulations for Graduate Students, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

ACTION ITEMS

6. GFC Motion on Bill 18 Gordon Swaters
Motion: To Approve
7. Student Academic Integrity Policy Suite 2:10 – 2:30 p.m. Ravina Sanghera
Chris Hackett
Jax Oltean
Motion: To Approve
8. Exam Rescheduling Procedure 2:30 – 2:50 p.m. Norma Rodenburg
Motion: To Approve
9. Proposed revisions to the Terms of Reference for the GFC Academic Planning Committee, Committee on the Learning Environment, and Programs Committee and Proposed Disbanding of the Student Conduct and Policy Committee 2:50 – 3:10 p.m. Ryan Dunch
Motion: To Approve

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| 10. | Question Period | 3:05 – 3:35 p.m. | Verna Yiu |
| 11. | Service on University of Alberta Senate | 3:35 – 3:40 p.m. | Peggy Garritty |
| 12. | People Strategy Consultation Draft | 3:40 – 4:00 p.m. | Verna Yiu
Todd Gilchrist |

INFORMATION REPORTS

[If a member has a question about a report, or feels that a report should be discussed by GFC, they should notify the Secretary to GFC, in writing, two business days or more in advance of the meeting so that the Committee Chair (or relevant expert) can be invited to attend.]

13. Report of the GFC Executive Committee
14. Report of the GFC Academic Planning Committee
15. Report of the GFC Programs Committee
16. Report of the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment
17. Report of the Board of Governors
18. Information Items:
A. Annual Ombuds Report
19. Information Forwarded to GFC Members Between Meetings
 - Board of Governors Open Session Agenda for March 22, 2024
 - Message sent on behalf of the Chair of the Board of Governors

CLOSING SESSION

20. Adjournment
 - Next Meeting of General Faculties Council: May 27, 2024

Presenter(s):

Verna Yiu	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Gordon Swaters	President of the AASUA
Ravina Sanghera	Vice Provost and Dean of Students
Chris Hackett	Discipline Officer, Student Services
Jax Oltean	Associate General Counsel, University of Alberta
Norma Rodenburg	Acting Vice-Provost and University Registrar
Ryan Dunch	Professor and Chair of GFC Executive Subcommittee on Governance and Procedural Oversight (Exec GPO)
Todd Gilchrist	Vice-President (University Services and Finance) and Interim Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)
Peggy Garritty	Chancellor, University of Alberta

Documentation was before members unless otherwise noted.

Meeting REGRETS to: GFC Services, ugovgfc@ualberta.ca
Prepared by: Kate Peters, Secretary to GFC, Manager, GFC Services
University Governance www.ualberta.ca/governance

General Faculties Council
DRAFT Open Session Minutes

Monday, February 26, 2024
Council Chamber, 2-100 University Hall
2:00 PM - 4:00 PM

OPENING SESSION

The Chair began with a land acknowledgement:

The University of Alberta acknowledges that we are located on Treaty 6 territory, and respects the sovereignty, lands, histories, languages, knowledge systems and cultures of First Nations, Métis, Inuit, and all First Peoples of Canada, whose presence continues to enrich our vibrant community.

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Verna Yiu, Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and Vice-Chair, General Faculties Council (GFC)

The motion was moved and seconded.

THAT General Faculties Council approve the agenda.

CARRIED

2. Comments from the Chair (no documents)

- ZTC Course Awards
- Presidential Review Committee Update
- Budget Update

Presenter(s): Verna Yiu, Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and Vice-Chair, GFC

Discussion: During comments from the Chair, the Chair invited P Almeida, the Vice-President (Academic) of the University of Alberta Students' Union to present an award for the promotion of Zero-Cost Textbooks. A Lam, a GFC member and student from Augustana Campus, accepted the award on behalf of the Dean and students of Augustana and K Hurley, a student from Agricultural, Life and Environmental Science, was recognized for their achievement.

During the Chair's Comments, the following information was presented:

- Update on the Learning Management System;
- Presidential Review Committee Update;
- Budget; and
- Google Storage.

The Chair screened a new pedagogical video on Sweetgrass Teachings and noted the importance of relationality to GFC's work.

CONSENT AGENDA

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

3. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of January 29, 2024

4. New Members of GFC

5. Suspension of the Specialisations in Educational Policy Studies and Elementary Education in the Doctor of Education
6. Deletion of GFC Policy Manual Section 109 - Student Records: Contents, Access, Use, and Protection
7. Deletion of GFC Policy Manual Section 56 - General Appeals Committee (GAC)

The motion to approve the consent agenda was moved and seconded.

THAT General Faculties Council approve the consent agenda.

CARRIED

ACTION ITEMS

8. Master of Management Analytics

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Michael Maier, Associate Dean, MBA Program, Alberta School of Business

Discussion: The Chair noted the recommendation of the GFC Programs Committee and invited M Maier to present on the proposed program. M Maier provided an overview of the program proposal including the rationale for development of a new course-based master's; the targeted applicant pool; and the proposed length.

Members asked how the program will align with the University's strategic directions on equity, diversity and inclusion and whether this was typically a graduate credential as well as the potential for an equivalent undergraduate program.

The motion was moved and seconded.

THAT the General Faculties Council recommend that the Board of Governors approve the new Master of Management Analytics (MMA) program in the Alberta School of Business for implementation upon final approval.

CARRIED

DISCUSSION ITEMS

9. Question Period
9.1 - GFC Question and Response on LMS Replacement

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Verna Yiu, Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and Vice-Chair, GFC

Discussion: Members asked questions concerning:

- The Google Storage issue and the intersection with the Collective Agreement which stipulates that the employer will supply all necessary instruments for the employee to do their work;
- Whether GFC would be receiving a full budget presentation in advance of the proposed presentation of the proposal to the Board of Governors in March;
- Who made the decision on the Learning Management System (LMS) and why GFC was not asked to approve it;
- The consultation of support staff which did not include any opportunity to provide feedback;

A member asked follow-up questions on the written responses concerning the implementation of a new LMS system, including:

- the decision to move away from the current LMS, Moodle;
- the weighting of votes in favour of *Desire to Learn* or *Canvas*;
- whether the University had assessed the cost of keeping Moodle in comparison with the cost of implementing a new LMS;
- whether students would be reimbursed for tuition if the LMS does not perform as expected;
- whether the LMS chosen could be counted on to function effectively; and
- timelines for implementation and how instructors' time is being considered in conversations with the vendor.

Other members made comments affirming the platform is outdated and lacks functionality and that students have lost trust due to numerous issues over the past few years. A member asked about other U15 users and whether a Canadian company owned Canvas.

10. Annual Enrolment Report

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Norma Rodenburg, Acting Vice-Provost and University Registrar, Office of the Registrar; Tracy Raivio, Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies

Discussion: The Chair noted the report had been discussed at several GFC standing committees and asked N Rodenburg and T Raivio to present on the report.

Members discussed the impact of international tuition rates on undergraduate and graduate enrolment.

11. Revised Draft of the Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy - Appendix B: Multifaceted Evaluation of Teaching and Learning

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Karsten Mündel, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives); Deanna Davis, Interim Executive Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL)

Discussion: K Mündel and D Davis presented the proposed guidelines developed as a result of the Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy suite approved in 2023. They noted, in particular, the use of the Framework for Effective Teaching and the requirement for multifaceted evaluation of teaching. D Davis spoke to the provision of supports from CTL to implement the Appendix.

Members discussed:

- Whether the Appendix could go further in evaluating instructors' efforts to make teaching and learning more flexible;
- If it was appropriate to include evaluation criteria concerning affordability of course materials;
- A request that the guidelines and supports materials, once developed, be distributed to GFC for information; and
- A comment that the Student Perspectives of Teaching (SPOT) questions don't require direct feedback on teaching and a question about whether Appendix B could provide avenues for direct feedback from students.

12. SHAPE Implementation

Presenter(s): Verna Yiu, Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

Discussion: The Provost presented on the 3-year implementation plan for *SHAPE* noting the need for clear accountabilities and metrics for growth. She noted that a roadmap would be released in the coming months.

Members asked what work will need to be performed at a department level by Chairs and others.

13. Proposed revisions to GFC Academic Planning Committee Terms of Reference

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Ryan Dunch, Professor and Chair, History, Classics & Religion, and Chair of the Executive Sub-Committee on Governance and Procedural Oversight (Exec GPO); Kate Peters, Secretary to GFC

Discussion: R Dunch presented the proposed changes to the format of the APC Terms of Reference, the pending motion to disband FDC, and the Board delegated authority to approve General Space Plans.

Members discussed:

- A concern that the proposed composition which will include three additional *ex officio* members who are also Provostial delegates, will weaken the student voice on the committee;
- A suggestion that the proposed new Graduate Students' Association Executive who will represent Indigenous graduate students could be added to the composition;
- A comment that the proportion of student seats will not change and that, as a result, with only four students, there is a decrease in the weight of student representation; and
- That the student seats could be opened to at-large students rather than only GFC students.

INFORMATION REPORTS

14. Report of the GFC Executive Committee

15. Report of the GFC Academic Planning Committee

16. Report of the GFC Programs Committee

17. GFC Nominations and Elections

- February 2, 2024 GFC Nominating Committee Report to GFC

18. Information Forwarded to GFC Members Between Meetings

- Joint Summit - Materials now available
- Action Required: Presidential Review Process Ballot

CLOSING SESSION

19. Adjournment

- Next Meeting of General Faculties Council: March 18, 2024

INFORMATION REPORTS

20. Information Items:

- A. General Appeals Committee Annual Report
- B. U of A Non-Credit Programming Framework and Non-credit Micro-credential Guide
- C. [GFC Schedule - 2024-2025](#)

ATTENDEES:

<p>Verna Yiu, Vice- Chair Kathryn Todd (delegate) Wajid Ali Pedro Almeida Chris Andersen Saadet Andrews Bishoi Aziz Jill Bagwe Quinn Benders Barbara Billingsley Angelina Botros Ahmed Bouferguene Marsha Boyd Jennifer Branch- Mueller Heather Bruce Jessica Butts Scott Cameron Carlyle Susan Chatwood Jency Chhaiya Odile Cisneros Gavin Clark Chetan Dave Chathuranga De Silva Stephanie Dickie Duncan Elliott Darren Fast Carlos Fernandez- Patron Richard Field Shawn Flynn Kyle Foster Christian Fotang Zachary Friggstad Megan Garbutt Danielle Gardiner Milln Kenneth Gariepy Julianne Gibbs-Davis Todd Gilchrist Douglas Gingrich Eva Glancy Lise Gotell Brenda Hemmelgarn Tammy Hopper Tracy Howlett Christine Hughes</p>	<p>Nole Kjemhus Tim Klassen Valentina Kozlova Vadim Kravchinsky Sandeep Kumar Denise LaFitte Adrian Lam Corrine Langinier Pierre Lemelin Christopher Lupke Ola Mabrouk Elan MacDonald Nikolai Malykhin Andrew McGee Weimin Mou Pauline Paul Sujata Persad Elena Posse de Chaves Spencer Proctor Kyra Pyke Shannon Scott John Spence Tracy Raivio Norma Rodenburg Dan Romanyak Andrew Sharman Patricia Sherbaniuk Chris Sprysak Tom Stelfox Gordon Swaters Katherine Tamsett Frederick Tappenden Nathan Thiessen Demetres Tryphonopoulos Jennifer Tupper John Ussher Dilini Vethanayagam Madison Villiger Shauna Wilton Robert Wood Richard Wozniak Minn-Nyoung Yoon Tuesday Young</p>	<p>Nathan Thiessen Jennifer Tupper John Ussher Marvin Washington Robert Wood Tuesday Young</p> <p><u>REGRETS</u> Noor Abdelwahab Simaan AbouRizk Adetola Adesida Sandeep Agrawal Minhaal Akbar Seun Akinfolarin Hussain Alhussainy Layla Alhussainy Declan Ali Damon Atwood Gabriel Ayoku Stanford Blade Josh Boissonnault Paige Boyer Alyssa Burant Jason Carey Marie Carrière Pierre Chue Sharon Compton Bailey Dickie Bipro Dhar Ryan Dunch Maesha Elm Elahi Taylor Good Shubham Goswami Michael Griffiths Magda Grzeszczuk Jodi Harding-Kuriger Michael Hendzel Carol Hodgson Birkman Jelena Holovati Spencer Hoppe John Hu Jun Hu Jeff Johnson Zak Kaal Matina Kalcounis- Rueppel</p>	<p>Rija Kamran Esther Kim Julia Kloet Hal Kohestani Liran Levin Jinfeng Liu Derek MacKenzie Divya Maisuriya Precious Majekodunmi Shivani Mandal Vikas Mehrotra Aamir Mohamed Olena Mykhailenko Joanne Olson (delegate) Jennifer Passey Graham Pearson Nathan Perez Muneeba QaDir Bassem Raad Stephen Raitz (delegate) Trish Reay Christian Reyns-Chikuma Liam Richardson Aminah Robinson Fayek Aiman Saif Ravina Sanghera Mikael Schmidtke Allison Sivak Reagan Tremblay Aditya Tutika Marvin Washington Liam Watt Yifeng Wei Lindsey Westover</p> <p><u>GOVERNANCE STAFF</u> John Lemieux, University Secretary Kate Peters, GFC Secretary Erin Plume Laura Riley Charlene Scharf Juli Zinken</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

General Faculties Council
DRAFT Open Session Minutes

Monday, March 18, 2024
Council Chamber, 2-100 University Hall
2:00 PM - 4:00 PM

OPENING SESSION

The Chair began by acknowledging the territory:

The University of Alberta acknowledges that we are located on Treaty 6 territory, and respects the sovereignty, lands, histories, languages, knowledge systems and cultures of First Nations, Métis, Inuit, and all First Peoples of Canada, whose presence continues to enrich our vibrant community.

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Bill Flanagan, President and Vice-Chancellor, Chair of GFC

Discussion: The Chair noted that a member had made a request to modify the minutes and asked to defer approval until the April 29th meeting.

The motion was moved and seconded.

THAT General Faculties Council approve the agenda as amended.

CARRIED

2. Comments from the Chair (no documents)

Presenter(s): Bill Flanagan

Discussion: The Chair made comments regarding:

- The appointment of Nizar Somji as the new Chancellor;
- Announcements of the recently appointed Dean of the Faculty of Nursing, Shannon Scott and of the Augustana Campus, John Parkins;
- Thanks to outgoing Dean Demetres Tryphonopoulos for his leadership at Augustana Campus;
- The 2024-2025 Provincial Budget;
- An Update on Bargaining;
- The Presidential Review Process; and
- Tools for Indigenous ceremony;

CONSENT AGENDA

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

3. New Members of GFC

TO RECEIVE:

The following ex-officio members to serve on GFC for a term beginning July 1, 2024 and ending June 30, 2029:

- Shannon Scott (Nursing)
- John Parkins (Augustana)

CARRIED

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. Question Period

Presenter(s): Bill Flanagan, President and Vice-Chancellor, Chair of GFC

Discussion: There were no questions.

5. Fiscal Year 2024-25 Budget Update

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Todd Gilchrist, Vice-President (University Services and Finance)

Discussion: T Gilchrist provided a high-level overview of the budget including the operating and program support grant, the capital maintenance and renewal grant, the funding for the Universiade Pavilion (Butterdome) repairs, and targeted enrolment expansion funding. He noted the possibility of using carry-forward funding and the use of functional planning to assess potential projects. He shared the projected deficit for the University and noted the approvals of the Academic Planning Committee and the Board Finance and Property Committee and the forthcoming approval by the Board of Governors on March 22, 2024.

Members asked questions including:

- Spending plans for reserve funding and the process to make decisions on the projects selected;
- How much of the additional spending was a carry-forward from last year; and
- The proportion of spending that will be allocated to faculties in the operating budget.

6. Policy Development Policy

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Brad Hamdon, General Counsel; John Lemieux, University Secretary; Jay Jorgenson, Institutional Policy Lead

Discussion: B Hamdon spoke to the rationale for changes to the University's Policy Framework, including the original approval close to 20 years ago and the creation of a new role for institutional policy development. He noted the forthcoming definition of a "board policy" and the desire to more clearly define what needs to be enshrined in policy.

Members expressed support for reviewing the institutional approach to policy and asked questions including:

- Whether this policy would need to be implemented at the department or faculty level;
- If the Framework could limit the number of acronyms used in policy because of their exclusionary impacts; and
- Who is able to initiate projects to propose changes or in consideration of the ongoing review, amendment, and removal of policy documents.

The next two items were considered in tandem.

7. Proposed revisions to GFC Committee on the Learning Environment Terms of Reference
8. Proposed revisions to GFC Programs Committee Terms of Reference

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Ryan Dunch, Professor and Chair, GFC Executive Subcommittee on Governance and Procedural Oversight (Exec GPO)

Discussion: R Dunch began by explaining the mandate and responsibilities of the Executive Governance and Procedural Oversight Committee (Exec GPO) and thanking members for their work. He prefaced his comments by noting that the draft changes to the GFC Programs Committee (PC) and the Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) were before GFC for discussion and that Exec GPO welcomed feedback. He reminded members that Exec GPO and the GFC Executive Committee has conceived a new model for GFC standing committee terms of reference.

Concerning the CLE Terms of Reference, he noted in particular:

- The proposed move of the delegated authority currently held by the Student Conduct and Policy Committee (SCPC) to CLE;
- The addition of the Vice-Provost and Dean of Students to the CLE and several non-voting resource members who have expertise in student affairs;
- Clarification of the authority over assessment of student learning and evaluation of teaching;
- Clarifying the authority over libraries; and
- Authority under section 19 concerning how to equip facilities for teaching and learning.

Members made suggestions including:

- Specifying that the University of Alberta Students' Union (UASU) Vice-President (Academic) sit on the CLE;
- Changing seat currently designated as a student residence representative to an undergraduate at-large student representative; and
- Whether the Provost and Vice-President would still be delegating to the Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives).

Concerning the PC Terms of Reference, he noted in particular:

- Clarification of the authority over academic programs and continuing and online programs;
- New sub-delegated authority to the Provost to approve undergraduate and graduate course and minor program changes and second-level specialisations;
- That sub-delegating these authorities to the Provost was in effect deference to the authority of Faculty Councils who approve these proposals before they are submitted to GFC;
- How the Program Support Team, an administrative committee made up of all the associate deans, would be supporting program approvals;
- Creation of a "right of appeal" under section 4.2 to ensure that members concerned about sub-delegated decision-making can raise the issues and have them discussed at PC;
- Removal of three appointed *ex officio* members from Native Studies, Campus Saint-Jean and Augustana Campus to align with Principles of Committee Composition; and
- The intention to revise the Principles of Committee Composition.

Members expressed support for the addition of section 4.2 and concerns about the removal of members from Campus Saint-Jean, Native Studies and Augustana Campus. A member noted the proposed initiative to add a new Graduate Students Association (GSA) executive position, with responsibility for Indigenous relations and asked about:

- the possibility of adding them to several GFC standing committees' composition; and
- whether that change would need to be approved concurrently with the changes to terms of reference.

INFORMATION REPORTS

9. Report of the GFC Executive Committee
10. Report of the GFC Academic Planning Committee
11. Information Items:
 - A. Office of Safe Disclosure and Human Rights Annual Report
 - B. Helping Individuals At Risk Annual Report
12. Information Forwarded to GFC Members Between Meetings:
 - Canvas 101 Video
 - [Affirming and Acknowledging Indigenous Ceremonial Practices at the University of Alberta](#)

CLOSING SESSION

13. Adjournment
 - Next Meeting of General Faculties Council: April 29, 2024

ATTENDEES

<p>Bill Flanagan, Chair Verna Yiu, Vice-Chair Simaan M AbouRizk Adetola Adesida Layla Alhussainy Wajid Ali Pedro Almeida Chris Andersen Saadet Andrews Bishoi Aziz Jill Bagwe Quinn Benders Barbara Billingsley Josh Boissonnault Angelina Botros Marsha Boyd Paige Boyer Jennifer Branch-Mueller Heather Bruce Cameron Carlyle Jency Chhaiya Pierre Chue Odile Cisneros Chetan Dave Bipro Dhar Bailey Dickie Stephanie Dickie Ryan Dunch Duncan Elliott Richard Field Bill Flanagan Shawn Flynn Kyle Foster Zachary Friggstad Megan Garbutt Danielle Gardiner Milln Kenneth Gariepy Todd Gilchrist Douglas Gingrich Eva Glancy Lise Gotell Jodi Harding-Kuriger Michael Hendzel Carol Hodgson Birkman Jelena Holovati Spencer Hoppe Christine Hughes Jeff Johnson Matina Kalcounis-Rueppell Rija Kamran Nole Kjemhus Esther Kim Tim Klassen Julia Kloet</p>	<p>Valentina Kozlova Vadim Kravchinsky Sandeep Kumar Denise LaFitte Adrian Lam Corrine Langinier Pierre Lemelin Liran Levin Christopher Lupke Ola Mabrouk Elan MacDonald Derek MacKenzie Nikolai Malykhin Andrew McGee Vikas Mehrotra Weimin Mou Pauline Paul Elena Posse de Chaves Spencer Proctor Kyra Pyke Tracy Raivio Christian Reyns-Chikuma Aminah Robinson Fayek Norma Rodenburg Dan Romanyk Harvir Sandhu Ravina Sanghera Shannon Scott Andrew Sharman Patricia Sherbaniuk Allison Sivak Chris Sprysak Gordon Swaters Katherine Tamsett Frederick S Tappenden Nathan Thiessen Demetres Tryphonopoulos Dilini Vethanayagam Liam Watt Yifeng Wei Shauna Wilton Minn-Nyoung Yoon Tuesday Young</p> <p><u>REGRETS</u></p> <p>Noor Abdelwahab Sandeep Agrawal Minhaal Akbar Seun Akinfolarin Hussain Alhussainy Declan Ali Damon Atwood Gabriel Ayoku Stanford Blade Ahmed Bouferguene</p>	<p>Alyssa Burant Jessica Butts Scott Jason Carey Marie Carriere Susan Chatwood Gavin Clark Chathuranga De Silva Maesha Elm Elahi Darren Fast Carlos Fernandez-Patron Christian Fotang Julianne Gibbs-Davis Taylor Good Shubham Goswami Michael Griffiths Magda Grzeszczuk Brenda Hemmelgarn Tammy Hopper Tracy Howlett John CH Hu Zak Kaal Hal Kohestani Jinfeng Liu Divya Maisuriya Precious Majekodunmi Shivani Mandal Jun Ming Hu Aamir Mohamed Joanne Olson (Delegate Nursing) Jennifer Passey Graham Pearson Nathan Perez Sujata Persad Muneeba Qadir Bassem Raad Stephen Raitz Liam Richardson Aiman Saif Mikael Schmidtke John Spence Tom Stelfox Reagan Tremblay Jennifer Tupper Aditiya Tutika John Ussher Madison Villiger Marvin Washington Lindsey Westover Robert Wood Richard Wozniak</p>	<p><u>GOVERNANCE STAFF</u></p> <p>John Lemieux, University Secretary Kate Peters, GFC Secretary Faiza Billo Erin Plume Juli Zinken Charlene Scharf</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



New Members of GFC

MOTION I: TO APPOINT/REAPPOINT:

The following undergraduate student representatives to serve on GFC for terms commencing May 1, 2024 and ending April 30, 2025:

- Nathan Thiessen Arts
- Angelina Raina Arts
- Nathan Perez Arts
- Rebeca Avila Arts
- Fardeen Chowdhury Arts
- Ramish Raza Arts
- Nate Goetz Augustana
- Katie Tamsett Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences
- Mohit Makhija Business
- Mikael Schmidtke Engineering
- Madiha Maroof Engineering
- Asha Jama Nursing
- Pedro Almeida Science
- Angelina Botros Science
- Hannan Sandhu Science

The following undergraduate student members elected by the Students' Union to the Board of Governors and appointed to GFC for a term that is concurrent with terms on the Board (May 1, 2024 to April 30, 2025):

- Lisa Glock President, Students' Union
- Adrien Lam Student Appointee (Board of Governors Representative)

The following graduate student member elected by the Graduate Students' Association to the Board of Governors and appointed to GFC for a term that is concurrent with a term on the Board (May 1, 2024 to April 30, 2025):

- Muhammed Haseeb Ashad President, Graduate Students' Association

MOTION II: TO RECEIVE:

The following statutory undergraduate student members nominated by the Students' Union to serve on GFC for terms beginning May 1, 2024 and ending April 30, 2025:

- Layla Alhussainy Students' Union Nominee
- Renson Alva Students' Union Nominee

The following statutory graduate student member nominated by the Graduate Students' Association to serve on GFC for terms beginning May 1, 2024 and ending April 30, 2025:

- Rija Kamran Graduate Students' Association Nominee



Decision **Discussion** **Information**

ITEM OBJECTIVE: Propose Changes to Academic Standing Regulations for Graduate Students

DATE	April 29, 2024
TO	General Faculties Council
RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

MOTION: That the General Faculties Council, on the recommendation of the GFC Programs Committee, approve the changes to the Academic Standing, Academic Probation and related portions of the Calendar for Graduate Regulations (as noted), for implementation upon approval and inclusion as addenda in the 2024-2025 calendar.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The proposal is before the committee to discuss changes to areas of the calendar related to graduate student Academic Standing and Academic Probation, including:

- Academic Standing
 - Failure in or Failure to Complete a Course or Research Work
 - Repeating Courses
 - Minimum Academic Requirements
- Convocation

A review of the policies on the following topics will provide updates, clarity, and transparency to these and other related items:

- Failed grades and GPA calculation
- Replacing courses with the same course (if core/required) or approved alternate
- Number of times a student may attempt to repeat or replace a failed grade
- Maximum allowable credits of failed coursework in a graduate program

The proposed changes will facilitate administrative decisions related to failed grades/academic standing and program progression for graduate students. They will also ensure students are not negatively impacted by a single failed grade once it has been successfully replaced/remediated. In those instances where a student is not able to successfully meet their program’s requirements, clearer and more consistent thresholds are set out (e.g. maximum allowable failed credits).

In all instances, a supervisor/academic unit can request exceptions be considered to allow a student to continue in their program with a clear plan in place so as to regain satisfactory academic standing.

GOVERNANCE OUTLINE



ITEM NO. 5

The changes will be easier to manage/monitor, more inclusive of student support/success, and allow for earlier intervention and remediation where necessary.

Supporting Materials:

1. Calendar Language Change: Academic Standing, Academic Probation and Related Changes

SCHEDULE A:

Engagement and Routing

Approval Route:

- Early Discussions at GPST, PRC and GEFAC - Fall 2021
- GEFAC - December 2, 2021
- GPST - January 24, 2022
- **PRC - February 2, 2022 (Approved)**
- GEFAC - February 3, 2022
- GFC Programs Committee - February 10, 2022 (Discussion)
- FGSR Council (Distributed; introduced) - February 22, 2022
- **FGSR Council - March 30, 2022 (Approved)**
- **GFC Programs Committee - April 14, 2022 (Approved)**
- **GFC Executive Committee - April 8, 2024 (For placement on the GFC Agenda)**
- **GFC Programs Committee - April 11, 2024 (For information)**
- **General Faculties Council - April 29, 2024 (For Final Approval)**

Supplementary Notes / Context from University Governance:

In Spring, 2022, the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research (FGSR) brought forward four various proposals for approval.. In two different meetings, proposals were brought forward and approved by the GFC Programs Committee. First, on [March 17, 2022, three proposals were approved by the GFC Programs Committee](#):

- Proposed Changes to Course Requirements for Graduate Programs, FGSR
- Proposed Changes to Extra-to-Degree Regulations for Graduate Programs, FGSR
- Proposed Changes to Transfer Credits and Requirements for Graduate Programs, FGSR

Then, on [April 14, 2022 GFC Programs Committee approved the Proposed Changes to Academic Standing Regulations for Graduate Programs](#) (as attached).

However, when the March 17th Proposals were brought to [GFC on May 2, 2022](#), members requested that the three proposed decision-items be transformed into discussion items. In light of this change, FGSR decided to pause decision-making on all four proposals.

The Proposal for Academic Standing Regulations is now coming forward for approval.

CURRENT	PROPOSED
<p>Regulations of the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Academic Standing</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>[Re-ordered from below]</p> <p>Minimum Faculty Academic Requirements</p> <p>Regardless of the student's category, the pass mark in any course taken while registered in the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies is a grade of C+.</p> <p>All students in degree programs (including time spent as a qualifying graduate student) or diploma or certificate programs must maintain a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.7 throughout the course for the duration of their program. (In cases where the cumulative grade point average falls between 2.3 and 2.7, departments may recommend the student be required to withdraw, or continuation in the program for a specified probationary period; in any case, convocation shall not take place with a cumulative grade point average of less than 2.7.) Notwithstanding the above, a student whose cumulative grade point average falls below 2.7 may be required to withdraw.</p> <p>The above are minimum grades and grade point averages acceptable to the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies. Individual departments may require higher grades than these.</p> <p>Students in thesis-based programs must ensure they complete, with their supervisor and/or supervisory committee, a Progress Report <link to new section> and submit it to GPS at least once annually.</p> <p>[...]</p>	<p>Regulations of the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Academic Standing</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Minimum Academic Requirements</p> <p>The GPS minimum cumulative grade point average required to remain in satisfactory academic standing is 2.7 on a scale of 4.0. Students must achieve, at minimum, a passing grade of C+ in any course taken in their degree program.</p> <p>Note: Some graduate programs may have higher approved academic standing requirements than those specified by GPS (both GPA and passing course grades), and students should consult their academic units for further information (see Graduate Programs). Where a program has higher approved minimum academic standing requirements, the student must adhere to those specified by the graduate program and cannot default/downgrade to the GPS minimums.</p> <p>Students who fail to maintain these minimum academic standing requirements as outlined by GPS and/or their graduate program will normally be required to withdraw unless the academic unit recommends a plan of remediation for the student to complete within a specified time period. Any such plan must be approved by the Dean of GPS.</p> <p>Students may also choose to voluntarily withdraw. However, there may be academic record and fee implications for withdrawing from a program and from courses. Students should discuss this option with their supervisor/advisor, academic unit, and GPS, and should consult Changes to Registration, Registration, and Tuition and Fees.</p> <p>Students in thesis-based programs must ensure they complete, with their supervisor and/or supervisory committee, a Progress Report <link to new section> and submit it to GPS at least once annually.</p> <p>[...]</p>

Failure in or Failure to Complete a Course or Research Work

Satisfactory performance in the coursework component of a graduate program entails completion of all courses taken as part of the student's program requirements (~~i.e., courses designated as extra to the student's program requirements~~ are excluded). ~~Normally,~~ the minimum acceptable passing grade ~~in individual courses~~ is C+ (see [Minimum Faculty Requirements](#) below); ~~however, some departments may require higher grades.~~

~~Graduate students are not permitted to take reexaminations. Regardless of their category,~~ students who do not obtain an acceptable grade, or fail to complete a course that is required as part of their graduate program, must ~~have the approval of the department~~ and the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies to retake the course ~~and~~ must obtain a passing grade. ~~Alternatively, students may take an alternate course recommended by the department and approved by the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies, but they must also obtain a passing grade.~~

~~In calculating a student's CGPA, the original failing grade will be included. The failing grade and the grade achieved for the repeated or substitute course will appear on the student's transcript. A Grade of IN5 is counted as a numeric grade of 0.0 in the computation of the CGPA.~~

~~A student whose course and/or research work is unsatisfactory may at any time be required to withdraw.~~

[...]

Failure in or Failure to Complete a Course or Research Work

Satisfactory performance in the coursework component of a graduate program entails completion of all courses taken as part of the student's program requirements (courses **declared extra-to-degree** are excluded). The **GPS** minimum acceptable passing grade is C+ per course (see [Minimum Faculty Requirements](#)); **however, individual programs may set higher standards that students are required to meet.**

Students who do not obtain an acceptable **passing** grade, or fail to complete a course that is required as part of their graduate program, must **seek approval from their academic unit** and the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies to retake the course. **Once approved to retake the course, the student must minimally obtain a passing grade of C+, or the minimum noted by their graduate program, if it is higher.**

A failed course that is required and/or core must be replaced with the same course. If the failed course is not a required and/or core course, an alternate course may be taken to remediate the failure as recommended by the academic unit and approved by GPS. The alternate course must be at the same level or higher as the failed course and it must be successfully completed with at least a passing grade of C+, or the minimum noted by the graduate program, if it is higher.

When the failed course has been successfully remediated/replaced, the new grade will be included in the calculation of the student's CGPA. While the original failed course grade will no longer be included in the CGPA, it will remain on the student's transcript.

A student may attempt to repeat or replace a failed course only once. Students who earn a grade of C or lower in more than six credit hours of coursework are normally required to withdraw from their graduate program. Some graduate programs may have approved thresholds for allowable failed course credits that exceed those set by GPS and students are advised to consult with their academic units accordingly.

Note: In exceptional circumstances, the academic unit can submit a request to the Dean of GPS to consider and approve remedial recommendations that fall outside of those noted above.

Thesis-based students may also be required to withdraw when they fail to meet satisfactory progress in their research work. Should a student find themselves in such a situation, the supervisor and/or academic unit will develop a plan that sets out attainable milestones and timelines to ensure the student understands what is required to successfully progress. Such a plan should be set out using the Progress Report [add LINK], which can be completed once every 12-months or once every academic term. Should a student require more attentive support, regular check-ins are encouraged to assess progression towards meeting the milestones and timelines set out in the plan. (See: Required to Withdraw) [...]

Repeating Courses

- Students may not repeat any successfully completed university course or course for which transfer credit has been awarded ~~, except with the written approval of the Dean, GPS.~~
- ~~Only one re-registration for credit or audit will be permitted in any failed university course, except with the written approval of the Dean, GPS.~~
- ~~Only one re-registration for credit or audit will be permitted in any university course in which a student has received a final grade of W, except with the written approval of the Dean, GPS.~~
- ~~If a student contravenes regulations listed above, the Dean of GPS may withhold credit or indicate the course as extra to the degree on the registration that contravenes the regulation.~~
- ~~Students may repeat a first term course in the second term, if it is offered, as long as the student complies with regulations listed above.~~
- Students may re-register in the 900-level capstone courses and in thesis (THES) ~~as often as is required~~

~~Students are responsible for monitoring the number of times they have repeated a course. Withdrawals (W) from courses will be considered together with failing grades when a faculty is restricting the number of multiple registrations in a course.~~

[Minimum Academic Requirements section reordered to above]

Academic Probation

~~Academic probation is used to address deficiencies in program or performance standards relevant to a student's particular program of studies such as CGPA, or progress in research. The conditions attached to a period of academic probation are designed to meet the specific needs of a student's academic situation.~~

~~When a student's term or cumulative grade point average falls between 2.3 and 2.7 or the minimum required by the program (See Graduate Programs), departments may recommend to the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies continuation in a graduate program on academic probation for a specified period.~~

~~For students in thesis-based programs, a student rating of 'In Need of Improvement' on a Progress Report will normally result in a recommendation for Academic Probation as determined by the supervisor and/or supervisory committee in consultation with the student.~~

[...]

Repeating Courses

- Students may not repeat any successfully completed university course or course for which transfer credit has been awarded.
- **A student may attempt to repeat or replace a failed course only once.**
- Students may re-register in **900-level** capstone courses, **capping exercises, or practicums**, and in thesis (THES) **for the length of time required to complete the requirement provided it does not exceed the time limits approved for program completion.**

[Minimum Academic Requirements section reordered to above]

[...]

Require to Withdraw

Departments may recommend to GPS that students be required to withdraw on academic grounds. Reasons for the recommendation include:

- Failure to maintain the adequate academic standing; failure to meet requirements set out in a conditional admission; candidacy or final oral examination failure; or expiry of program time limit. Requests to require to withdraw for these reasons must be documented in the academic record or student's file: **for example**, grades, exam reports, **etc**;
- Failure to make satisfactory academic progress in other aspects of the program, such as adequate progress in research. Requests to require to withdraw for these reasons **should** be supported by evidence that the process of feedback, assessments and warnings has been followed;
- Failure to complete the practicum component of a graduate program, if that practicum component is an integral part of the program;
- Failure of the department to secure alternate supervision for a thesis-based student following dissolution of a supervisory relationship (see Resolving Conflicts in Supervisor-Student Relationships) as it is an academic requirement that thesis-based students have a supervisor (see Appointment of the Supervisor(s)).
- For students in thesis-based programs, two consecutive student ratings of 'In Need of Improvement' or one rating of 'Unsatisfactory' on their Progress Report will normally result in a recommendation to withdraw from their program.

The following considerations apply:

- **Cannot require to withdraw except for** just cause;
- Students shall be given adequate warning, feedback and timelines related to what is the nature of the inadequate progress, what special performance would be required to rectify the inadequacy, and what is the timeline for demonstration of the required improved performance;
- Student should be given an opportunity to respond in writing to any warning given;
- Meetings with appropriate advisors (members of supervisory committee; Chair's designate, etc.) may assist the process of providing adequate warning and advice.

The decision to require a student to withdraw rests with the **Associate Deans, GPS**. Students may appeal to the GPS Academic Appeals Committee. For details, see **Appeals and Grievances**.

Require to Withdraw

Departments may recommend to GPS that students be required to withdraw **from their graduate program** on academic grounds. Reasons for the recommendation **may** include:

- Failure to maintain the adequate academic standing; failure to meet requirements set out in a conditional admission; candidacy or final oral examination failure; or expiry of program time limit. Requests to require to withdraw for these reasons must be documented in the academic record or student's file (e.g. grades, exam reports);
- Failure to make satisfactory academic progress in other aspects of the program, such as adequate progress in research. Requests to require a student to withdraw for these reasons **must** be supported by evidence that the process of feedback, assessments, and warnings has been followed. **This evidence should be recorded in the student Progress Report;**
- Failure to complete the practicum component of a graduate program, if that practicum component is an integral part of the program; **and/or,**
- Failure of the department to secure alternate supervision for a thesis-based student following dissolution of a supervisory relationship (see Resolving Conflicts in Supervisor-Student Relationships) as it is an academic requirement that thesis-based students have a supervisor (see Appointment of the Supervisor(s)).
- For students in thesis-based programs, two consecutive student ratings of 'In Need of Improvement' or one rating of 'Unsatisfactory' on their Progress Report will normally result in a recommendation to withdraw from their program.

The following considerations apply:

- **Students cannot be withdrawn from their program without** just cause;
- Students shall be given adequate warning, feedback and timelines related to what is the nature of the inadequate progress, what special performance would be required to rectify the inadequacy, and what is the timeline for demonstration of the required improved performance;
- Student should be given an opportunity to respond in writing to any warning given;
- Meetings with appropriate advisors (members of supervisory committee; Chair's designate, etc.) may assist the process of providing adequate warning and advice.

The decision to require a student to withdraw rests with the **Dean, GPS or designate**. Students may appeal **a decision to withdraw** to the GPS Academic Appeals Committee. (For details, see **Appeals and Grievances**.)

[...]

[...]

Convocation

There are two convocations each year, normally held in June and November. Students must apply for graduation on Bear Tracks (<https://www.beartracks.ualberta.ca>) in accordance with the deadlines published in [Academic Schedule, Dates, and Deadlines](#).

~~In order to convocate~~, students in thesis programs must complete all coursework and submit their thesis to the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies by the deadline dates specified in the Academic Schedule.

Departments that require a thesis-equivalent may have **special** submission procedures. See [Graduate Programs](#). For further details on thesis submission refer to the [Thesis Requirements and Preparation page](#) on the GPS website.

Students in course-based programs must complete all **program** requirements prior to the deadlines set out in the Academic Schedule.

It is the responsibility of the **department** to forward a completed *Report of Completion for Course-based Master's Degree* form to the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies by the deadline dates specified in the Academic Schedule, to ensure that the student's name will be included in the convocation list.

[...]

Convocation

There are two convocations each year, normally held in June and November. Students must apply for graduation on Bear Tracks (<https://www.beartracks.ualberta.ca>) in accordance with the deadlines published in [Academic Schedule, Dates, and Deadlines](#).

Thesis-based programs:

To be eligible for convocation, students in thesis programs must **successfully** complete all coursework, **(including remediating/replacing all failed grades) as required by their program, all other approved requirements including GPS's Ethics and Academic Citizenship requirement**, and submit their thesis to the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies by the deadline dates specified in the Academic Schedule.

Students must also be in good academic standing to be eligible to apply for convocation including having at minimum a 2.7 CGPA in their degree program, or the minimum required by the graduate program, if it is higher.

Departments that require a thesis-equivalent may have **discipline-specific** submission procedures. See [Graduate Programs](#). For further details on thesis submission, refer to the [Thesis Requirements and Preparation page](#) on the GPS website.

Course-based programs:

To be eligible for convocation, students in course-based programs must **successfully** complete all coursework, **(including remediating/replacing all failed grades) as required by their program, and all other approved requirements including GPS's Ethics and Academic Citizenship requirement**.

Students must also be in good academic standing to be eligible to apply for convocation including having at minimum a 2.7 CGPA in their degree program, or the minimum required by the graduate program, if it is higher.

Students in course-based programs must complete all requirements **as approved by their program** prior to the deadlines set out in the Academic Schedule.

It is the responsibility of the **academic unit** to forward a completed *Report of Completion for Course-based Master's Degree* form to the Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies by the deadline dates specified in the Academic Schedule, to ensure that the student's name will be included in the convocation list.

[...]

Approved by:

GEFAC - December 2, 2021

GPST - January 24, 2022

PRC - February 2, 2022 (Approved)

GEFAC - February 3, 2022

GFC Programs Committee - February 10, 2022 (Discussion)
GPS Council (Distributed; introduced) - February 22, 2022
GPS Council - March 30, 2022 (Approved)
GFC Programs Committee - April 14, 2022 (Approved)

Submitted GFC Motion on Bill 18

Moved by Professor GE Swaters, President of the Association of Academic Staff at the University of Alberta

Whereas, in its current form, Bill 18 recently introduced by the Government of Alberta poses a threat to academic freedom and institutional autonomy by creating the potential for political interference in the funding of post-secondary research and scholarship in Alberta.

Whereas, unless Bill 18 is withdrawn or significantly amended, passage of Bill 18 has the potential to lead to the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in research and scholarship funding for the University of Alberta and other Albertan post-secondary institutions, funding that is critical to achieving the teaching, research, scholarly and artistic strategic ambitions of the University of Alberta specifically and of all Albertan post-secondary institutions generally.

Whereas Albertans are rightly proud of the top-5 national academic reputation of the University of Alberta specifically, and other post-secondaries in Alberta generally, to provide exceptional high-quality education and scholarship in all fields of knowledge and from all intellectual and epistemological perspectives, which has taken many decades of dedicated work by academic and other staff supported by provincial and federal research grants awarded based solely on intellectual and scholarly merit and not on conformity to any ideological agenda.

Whereas, in its current form, Bill 18 could potentially and significantly negatively impact the teaching, research and scholarly national and international academic reputation of the University of Alberta specifically and of all Alberta's post-secondaries generally; it would mar the academic research and scholarship done with the stamp of political interference, in turn suggesting that the research and scholarship produced is propaganda tailored to advance a political ideology, with the result that the best and brightest post-secondary educators and researchers may simply leave to go to other post-secondary institutions in jurisdictions where academic freedom and institutional post-secondary autonomy are respected, and with them, their students.

Whereas the General Faculties Council, as set out in Section 26(1) the Alberta Post-Learning Act, subject to the authority of the Board of Governors, "is responsible for the academic affairs of the University."

It is therefore resolved that the General Faculties Council at the University of Alberta is opposed to Bill 18 as proposed, and unless post-secondary institutions are fully exempted from any and all provisions of Bill 18, calls on the Government of Alberta to withdraw Bill 18 in its entirety. Further, the General Faculties Council at the University of Alberta respectfully requests the President of the University of Alberta to notify the Premier and Minister of Advanced Education

of the Province of Alberta, respectively, of this resolution by the General Faculties Council of the University of Alberta.

Decision Discussion Information

ITEM OBJECTIVE: To approve the Student Academic Integrity Policy Suite (hereafter, the “Suite”) and rescind the Code of Student Behaviour

DATE	April 29, 2024
TO	General Faculties Council
RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

MOTION:

THAT the General Faculties Council approve the Student Academic Integrity Policy and associated Procedures identified in Attachments 1 through 5, and rescind the Code of Student Behaviour, both to take effect September 1, 2024.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Background

In February 2022, the Minister of Advanced Education, Demetrios Nicolaides, and then Associate Minister of Status of Women, Whitney Issek, issued a joint letter to the governing bodies of all public post-secondary institutions in Alberta, including the Board of Governors of the University of Alberta (hereafter, the “**Ministers’ Letter**”).

The Ministers’ Letter required that all public post-secondary institutions in Alberta update their sexual violence policies and procedures with specific attention to providing procedural fairness and implementing trauma-informed practices for both complainants and respondents to a complaint. The Ministers’ Letter provided a “Checklist” of required and prohibited elements which our policies and procedures must adhere to. There was a timeline to complete revisions to these policies and procedures. While it was undoubtedly time to review the Code of Student Behaviour (the “**Code**”) as a whole, given that it had not been substantially revised since 1999, it was decided that the deadlines to address the non-academic sections meant they needed to be done in two phases.

Phase 1 removed the non-academic sections from the Code which were then incorporated into the Student Conduct Policy, which was approved on November 22, 2022. Phase 2 focussed on the academic sections of the Code. Chris Hackett, Acting Director of Student Conduct and Accountability, organised two working groups to draft the new academic integrity policy. The first working group identified the key issues and laid out principles that needed to be addressed in the new policy. After consultation on those principles, the second working group oversaw the drafting of the proposed policy Suite, composed of:

- Student Academic Integrity Policy
- Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure
- Student Academic Misconduct Procedure

GOVERNANCE OUTLINE

ITEM NO. 6

- Student Academic Integrity Policy Appendix A
- Student Academic Integrity Policy Appendix B

as set out in Attachments 1 – 5.

Since September 2023 we have been consulting broadly on the draft policy suite with the University of Alberta community. The response has been very positive. We have revised the draft policy suite to consider that feedback and to make the processes as understandable and streamlined as possible.

Analysis / Discussion

The key issues the policy suite is intended to address are:

- protecting the integrity of University of Alberta grades, degrees, certifications, research and other scholarly activities involving students;
- shifting from a purely punitive orientation to one that also reflects the educational mission of the University;
- mitigating unintended consequences to students addressed by the policy;
- bring academic conduct appeal processes in line with the principles adopted in the Student Misconduct Appeal Procedure
- adopting best and promising practices in preventing and responding to academic misconduct;
- increasing timeliness and transparency in academic integrity processes;
- addressing new and evolving forms of academic misconduct, such as contract cheating and inappropriate use of homework/tutor websites; and
- providing streamlined processes for mass cheating events.

Risk Discussion / Mitigation of the Risk

A poorly drafted policy runs the risk of damaging the reputation the University of Alberta and creating unnecessary burdens for faculty, staff and students. The current policy has been drafted after reviewing current literature on addressing academic integrity in post-secondary institutions, exploration of practices at U15 peer institutions, and leading institutions in the United States, and careful analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of current practices. The consultation process has provided critical feedback on the impact of the proposed principles and processes.

Where applicable, list the legislation that is being relied upon

Post-Secondary Learning Act (Alberta)

Next Steps

Once the Suite is approved, we will pivot to developing resources to support decision makers and students in the new process so that the policy will have a firm footing when it is implemented in September. In addition, the following policy documents will be updated to reflect the deletion of the Code:

ITEM NO. 6

- Protocol for Urgent Cases of Disruptive, Threatening or Violent Conduct
- Residence Community Standards
- Code of Applicant Behaviour
- Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy
- Practicum Intervention Policy

Supporting Materials:

Attachment 1: Student Academic Integrity Policy

Attachment 2: Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure

Attachment 3: Student Academic Misconduct Procedure

Attachment 4: Student Academic Integrity Policy Appendix A

Attachment 5: Student Academic Integrity Policy Appendix B

SCHEDULE A:**Engagement and Routing**

Consultation and Stakeholder Participation / Approval Route (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity) <[Governance Resources Section Student Participation Protocol](#)>

Those who are actively participating:

- Ravina Sanghera, Vice-Provost and Dean of Students
- Chris Hackett, Acting Director, Student Conduct and Accountability
- Chris Hackett, Jax Oltean, Associate General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, and Deborah Eerkes, Lead, Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Response, Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
- First working group:
 - Chris Hackett
 - Jax Oltean
 - Deb Eerkes
 - Ali Shiri, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
 - Karsten Mundel, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives)
 - Shirley Schipper, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
 - Pierre Mertiny, Faculty of Engineering
- Second working group
 - Chris Hackett
 - Jax Oltean
 - Deborah Eerkes
 - Shirley Schipper



- Karsten Mundel, Office of the Provost
- Gurleen Kaur, Vice-President (Academic), University of Alberta Students' Union (UASU)
- Pedro Almeida, Vice-President (Academic), UASU
- Bishoi Aziz, Vice-President (Academic), Graduate Students' Association (GSA)
- Rija Kamran, Vice-President (Academic), GSA
- Fraser Brenneis, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
- Cagri Ayranci, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
- Jim Bohun, College of Natural and Applied Sciences
- Allen Ball, Online and Continuing Education
- Remonia Stoddart-Morrison, Office of the Student Ombuds

Those who have been consulted:

- Dean of Student's Advisory Council
- Student Union Student Council
- Student Union Council of Faculty Associations
- Student Union - GFC student caucus
- Graduate Students Association Council
- Indigenous Graduate Students Association
- Kumarie Achaibar-Morrison and Xiaobing Lin, International Student Services
- Sharon Stearns, Academic Success Centre
- John Fontaine, Academic Success Centre
- Kate Pratt, Academic Success Centre
- Mebbie Bell, Accommodation & Universal Design
- Lula Adam, Coordinator, Student Equity Diversity and Inclusivity, Dean of Students Portfolio
- Suzanne Butler, Transition Year Program, First Peoples' House
- Darin Mckinley, Office of General Counsel
- Office of the Student Ombuds
- Evelyn Hamdon, Senior Advisor, Equity & Human Rights, Office of the Provost & Vice-President Academic
- Donnell Willis, Safe Disclosure & Human Rights Advisor, Safe Disclosure & Human Rights
- Ada Chan-Cumming, Enrolment Systems & Service Innovation
- Laura Riley and Charlene Scharf, Appeals and Compliance Coordinator, University Governance
- Vanessa Grabia, College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of Education
- College of Natural and Applied Sciences, Department of Education
- Lihong Yang, College of Health Sciences, Department of Education
- College of Natural and Applied Sciences, Faculty Decision Makers
- College of Natural and Applied Sciences, Associate Deans
- College Departments of Education conduct administrators
- College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Undergraduate Associate Deans
- Lisa Purdy, Associate Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
- Rebecca Nagel and Temitope Oriola, Associate Deans (Undergraduate), Faculty of Arts



- Helen Vallianatos, Associate Dean Academic, College of Social Sciences and Humanities
- Hassan Safouhi, Vice-doyen, Campus Saint Jean
- Brandon Alakas, Associate Dean and Stacy Lorenz, Vice-Dean - Augustana Campus
- Sean Robertson, Associate Dean, Faculty of Native Studies
- Christine Whelan, College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Academic Integrity and Discipline Coordinator
- Farha Shariff, Special Adviser EDI to the Dean of the Faculty of Education
- Angela Bayduza, Associate Dean Undergraduate, Faculty of Kinesiology, Sport, and Recreation
- Jane Lee and Judith Odhuno-Were, Office of the Registrar
- Jason Acker and Jacqueline Littlewood, Office of the Vice-President (Research and Innovation)
- Francisco Marquez-Stricker, Office of the Vice-President (Research and Innovation)
- Laura Huxley, Assistant Dean of Students, Student Life
- Association of the Academic Staff of the University of Alberta

Those who have been informed:

- Ahmed Hammad, Faculty of Engineering
- Beverley Temple, Faculty of Nursing
- Bhuva Narayanan, Academic Success Centre
- Bernadette Martin, Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine
- Carrie Smith, Vice-Provost (Equity, Diversity & Inclusion)
- Susan Chatwood, School of Public Health
- Dion Brocks, Faculty of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences
- Brock Debenham, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
- Douglas Gleddie, Faculty of Education
- Donald Raboud, Faculty of Engineering
- Ehab Elmallah, Faculty of Science
- Herb Yang, Faculty of Science
- Janice Causgrove Dunn, Vice-Provost (Programs)
- Jude Spiers, Faculty of Nursing
- James Muir, Faculty of Law
- Katie Burgess, Faculty of Nursing
- Kim Chow, Faculty of Science
- Kimberly Noels, Faculty of Arts
- Matthew Kostelecky, St. Joseph's College
- Katelyn Brown, Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine
- Leluo Guan, Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences
- Maryanne Doherty, Faculty of Education
- Michelle Inness, Alberta School of Business
- Donia Mounsef, Campus Saint-Jean
- Mary Roduta Roberts, Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine
- Nat Kav, Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences
- Nathalie Kermoal, Faculty of Native Studies
- Kara Schick-Makaroff, Faculty of Science



ITEM NO. 6

- Shana Dion, Assistant Dean of Students, Indigenous
- Stephen Kuntz, Academic Success Centre
- Shannon Scott, Faculty of Nursing
- Lesly Wade-Woolley, Faculty of Education
- John-Paul Zonneveld, Faculty of Science

Approval Route:

- Council on Student Affairs (for discussion) September 7, 2023
- Student Conduct Policy Committee (for discussion) September 21, 2023
- GFC Executive Committee (for discussion) October 2, 2023
- General Faculties Council (for discussion) January 29, 2024
- GFC Executive (for recommendation) April 8, 2024
- Student Conduct Policy Committee (for recommendation) April 25, 2024
- General Faculties Council (for approval) April 29, 2024

Supplementary Notes / Context:

The GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee recommended that the General Faculties Council approve the Student Academic Integrity Policy and associated procedures with an amendment to the Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure set out in [Attachment 2](#). The change the committee approved can be found on page 5 under section 5(d)(i) where they changed the word from “elect” to “select”.



Original Approval Date: [date]

Most Recent Approval: [date]

Most Recent Editorial Date: [date]

Student Academic Integrity Policy

Office of Accountability:	Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Vice Provost and Dean of Students
Approver:	General Faculties Council
Scope:	Compliance with this university policy extends to all University of Alberta students as defined in this policy.

OVERVIEW

The value and integrity of University of Alberta **academic credentials**, as well as research and other scholarly and professional activities, rests on **academic integrity** and the fundamental values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage in every aspect of **academic and scholarly activities**.

The university is defined by tradition as a community of people dedicated to the advancement of knowledge, and as a place where there is freedom to teach, engage in research, create, learn, study, speak, associate, write and publish. In addition to these freedoms, the enduring value of university life, the degrees and other credentials the university confers, and the university's reputation for academic and scholarly excellence depend upon trusted teaching and research relationships and, therefore, upon the honesty and integrity of those engaged in academic and scholarly activities.

People with diverse interests and cultures from all over the world and from all walks of life are part of the University of Alberta community and **learning environment**. The university is a

shared space for diverse scholarship, research, and learning communities. The university's faculty, staff, and **students** live, work, explore, teach, and learn alongside each other; those differences are part of the backbone of the institution that gives it strength and supports its central mission. What each individual does affects the other members of our community and everyone must be accountable for their actions.

This policy describes academic supports that enable students to achieve academic success in alignment with the principles of academic integrity. In addition, this policy provides alternatives to a disciplinary response where students take responsibility for their academic misconduct and hold themselves accountable to the community by participating in **non-disciplinary accountability options**. Where non-disciplinary accountability options are not appropriate, this policy provides a disciplinary complaint process.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to:

- set out the conditions under which this policy applies;
- set out the principles that will guide the interpretation and application of this policy;
- identify on-campus academic resources for students;
- situate the academic integrity process in relation to concurrent external and internal proceedings;
- identify behaviours that are unacceptable and constitute academic misconduct;
- provide for non-disciplinary accountability options in appropriate cases;
- outline some aspects of the complaint process, such as the applicable standard of proof and acceptable forms of evidence;
- authorise and set out the principles that will guide the application of sanctions for **academic misconduct** that has been found to have occurred;
- provide clarity on privacy, disclosure and confidentiality;
- stipulate required training for those who administer academic integrity processes;
- articulate the delegated authority under the *Alberta Post-Secondary Learning Act* to discipline students for academic misconduct, subject to a right of appeal;
- provide for periodic review of, and amendments to, this policy and its related procedures; and
- provide definitions which apply to this policy and its related procedures.

POLICY

1. Application

- a. This policy applies to all alleged academic misconduct by a student or students by any means whatsoever (including virtual or online), that has a real and substantial link to university academic and scholarly activities and/or a material effect on the university's academic reputation.
- b. The determination of whether any academic misconduct has a real and substantial link or material effect may be made by any individual or body who has been delegated the authority to make decisions under this policy and its associated procedures.

2. Guiding Principles

This policy and its associated procedures are guided by, and will be interpreted and applied by reference to the following principles:

- a. The university is responsible for taking reasonable steps to maintain academic integrity and protect the integrity and value of University of Alberta degrees and other accreditations, its academic mission, and its reputation for excellence in scholarship and research. Wherever possible, the university should provide both general and program specific educational materials and opportunities to help students learn their individual responsibilities.
- b. All members of the university community are entitled to a fair, vibrant and supportive **learning environment**. Students are expected to conduct themselves with honesty, fairness, trust, respect, responsibility and courage, aligning their behaviour with the principles of academic integrity as defined in this policy.
- c. The university will create a supportive space for students to be accountable, for example by undertaking skill-building and remedial activities to correct their behaviour, taking steps to align future conduct with the principles of academic integrity, and/or repairing harm resulting from their academic misconduct.
- d. Where appropriate, Deans and those involved in addressing academic misconduct are encouraged to explore non-disciplinary accountability options, including remedial, restorative, transformative, or other voluntary facilitated resolution options.
- e. The student life cycle at the university requires that academic misconduct be addressed fairly and in a timely way.
- f. Students who are the subject of a complaint are entitled to an appropriate level of procedural fairness. Students under this policy have the right to:

- i. an impartial and unbiased decision-maker;
- ii. have their case addressed or decided within a reasonable time;
- iii. timely communication;
- iv. be accompanied by an **advisor** throughout their participation in any investigation, meeting, **hearing**, or other aspect of the *Student Academic Misconduct* or *Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedures*, and to be advised of these rights;
- v. reasonable disclosure of the allegations in the complaint;
- vi. reasonable opportunity to respond to the allegations in the complaint;
- vii. reasonable notice of the time, place, and nature of any hearing;
- viii. an opportunity to respond to or explain any evidence that does not support their account of events;
- ix. provide evidence and suggest witnesses or lines of inquiry;
- x. be provided with written reasons for any decision made under this policy; and
- xi. where applicable, be **reasonably accommodated** under the *Discrimination, Harassment and Duty to Accommodate Policy* to ensure equitable access to the complaint process.

3. On Campus Academic Resources for Students

The infodoc *Sources of Student Support for Academic Integrity* describes the academic supports and resources available to assist students in aligning their academic success with the principles of academic integrity.

4. Concurrent proceedings

Internal proceedings

- a. The conduct underlying an alleged violation of this policy may also provide the basis for a violation of another university policy including, but not limited to, the
 - i. *Student Conduct Policy* where, for example, there is an allegation of theft of resources to facilitate cheating.
 - ii. *Practicum Intervention Policy* where, for example, there is an allegation of misrepresentation of facts in the context of a practicum.
 - iii. *Information Technology Use and Management Policy* where, for example, there is an allegation of misuse of university IT resources involved in an academic integrity violation.

- iv. *Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy* where, for example, there is an allegation of plagiarism on a published article.

External proceedings

- b. This policy and its associated procedures are independent of any external professional, regulatory or other proceedings. Any aspect of the complaint process under this policy or its associated procedures may occur concurrently with, prior to, or following any such professional, regulatory or other proceeding. In this regard,
 - i. The university is responsible for determining whether a student has violated this or any other university policy and is not responsible for determining violations of professional, regulatory or other proceedings.
 - ii. Where an incident is also being addressed by another body or authority, the university may, in its sole discretion, proceed with or suspend any aspect of the complaint process under this policy or any other university policy or their associated procedures.

5. Academic Misconduct

The conduct listed in Appendix A is prohibited and constitutes academic misconduct for which a report may be made under this policy.

The Dean has sole discretion to determine whether reports of academic misconduct will be addressed through non-disciplinary accountability options or through the complaint process. The Dean's decision is final and binding.

6. Non-disciplinary Accountability Options

- a. Where non-disciplinary accountability options are determined to be appropriate, their aim is similar to the aim of sanctions set out in 8b below, but in addition, their aims in general are to:
 - i. educate and develop the student's understanding of the harms caused by academic misconduct and the importance of academic integrity;
 - ii. provide them with skill-building resources to enable them to align their behaviour with the principles of academic integrity;
 - iii. create a safer space for students to accept responsibility and be accountable for their academic misconduct and to provide redress to the community affected by the harm resulting from their academic misconduct.

7. Complaint Process

The following applies to complaints.

Procedural Assistance for Students

- a. The Office of the Dean of Students, Office of the Student Ombuds, and Student Legal Services can provide procedural assistance to students involved in processes associated with this policy.

Standard of Proof

- b. All determinations that a violation of this policy has been established will be made on a balance of probabilities standard.

Evidence

- c. The academic integrity process is not bound by the same rules of evidence that apply in a court of law. Decision makers under this policy and associated procedures may accept and consider any credible information that is relevant to the complaint including, for example, hearsay evidence.

Participation in Complaint Process

- d. Students alleged to have engaged in academic misconduct are encouraged to but are not obligated or required to participate in a complaint process. However, where students choose not to participate and/or decline to provide information, they may be prohibited from later attempting to provide that information or evidence to university decision-makers under the *Student Academic Misconduct Procedure* and the *Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure*.

8. Sanctions

- a. The university imposes disciplinary sanctions on students when it has been established through the complaint process that they have violated this policy.
- b. The aim of sanctions in general is to:
 - i. protect the value and integrity of academic credentials, as well as the university's academic mission and reputation for excellence in scholarship and research;
 - ii. foster a safe, supportive and vibrant learning environment;
 - iii. promote accountability to individuals and the community; and/or
 - iv. rehabilitate the student, where possible.
- c. Sanctions are meant to be proportionate based on the nature of the violation and the desire to accomplish the above aims through the least restrictive means. When considering sanction(s), a decision-maker can take into account any relevant factors.

- d. Sanction descriptions and their impact are detailed in Appendix B. Available sanctions include:
- Reprimand
 - Academic integrity conditions
 - Grade sanctions
 - Refusal to consider current and/or future applications
 - Rescission of an admission offer
 - Suspension from academic program
 - Expulsion
 - Suspension of a degree
 - Rescission of a degree
- e. The Faculty Decision-Maker has authority to impose Reprimand, Academic integrity conditions, Grade sanctions, Refusal to consider current and/or future applications, and Rescission of an admission offer. Student Conduct Officers and the Student Misconduct Appeal Panel have authority to impose any of the sanctions set out above in Section 8d.

9. Privacy and Personal Information

- a. Any use and disclosure of personal information contemplated in this policy and the related procedures will be in accordance with the *Alberta Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.
- b. Privacy and the protection of personal information are essential for creating a safe space for students to be accountable and provide redress for the harm resulting from their academic misconduct and to be able to respond to allegations. The university will protect the privacy of a student to a complaint to the extent possible. Possible limits to the University's ability to do so include when:
- i. there is a risk of harm to self or others;
 - ii. as necessary to administer an investigation, hearings, sanctions or other elements of the student academic integrity process; or
 - iii. reporting or action is required or authorised by law, including but not limited to the *Alberta Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.
- c. In such cases, the use or disclosure of information will be limited to that which is reasonably necessary and only to those with a need to know. The extent to which the

university can maintain the privacy of a student to a complaint will be determined on a case-by-case basis. The university will endeavour to inform students of the limits of protection of personal privacy and confidentiality.

10. Confidentiality of the Academic Misconduct Process

- a. University employees and those involved in the academic misconduct process on behalf of the university will only use or disclose personal information that they learn solely as a result of administering or participating in the academic integrity process in accordance with section 9 above. Contact the Information and Privacy Office for guidance about confidentiality and privacy.
- b. Parties and witnesses should not make public another individual's personal information that they learn solely through any university process such as a complaint, investigation, hearing, or non-disciplinary accountability options and should refrain from:
 - i. posting another individual's personal information on social media or online,
 - ii. distributing confidential university documents in whole or in part,
 - iii. sharing another individual's personal information with individuals outside of their immediate circle of support, and
 - iv. prompting or eliciting others to disclose another individual's personal information.
- c. The university does not prohibit parties and witnesses from speaking about their own experiences, including, but not limited to, seeking support for rehabilitation. However, when disclosing another individual's personal information within their immediate circle of support, the party or witness is also responsible for communicating the need to keep the information confidential.
- d. In any event, inappropriate disclosure of another individual's personal information may affect the integrity of a university process, breach another individual's privacy rights, and/or bring about other legal risks for the individual who breaches another individual's privacy rights.

11. Required Training

- a. All individuals involved in administering, advising on or adjudicating academic integrity complaints will be required to have appropriate training as outlined in the *Academic Integrity Training Information Document*, which will include training in procedural fairness, and training to recognize and mitigate biases in processes and decision-making, and other relevant topics.
- b. Members of the Student Misconduct Appeal Panel will additionally be trained in the

standard of review applicable on appeals.

12. Delegation

- a. Section 31 of the *Alberta Post-Secondary Learning Act* gives the General Faculties Council (GFC) general supervision of student affairs including authority over student discipline. The GFC may, subject to an appeal to the Board, discipline students. In addition to this authority over student discipline, the GFC may, under the PSLA, delegate its power to discipline students. The Board may also delegate its authority with respect to appeals and has done so, delegating its authority over appeals to the GFC.
- b. Under this authority, the GFC has adopted and approved this *Student Academic Integrity Policy* and the associated procedures, and has delegated the functions in the student academic integrity conduct process to the persons identified in this policy, the *Student Academic Misconduct Procedure*, and the *Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure*.

13. Review and Amendments

This policy and its accompanying procedures will be reviewed from time to time as necessary, but at a minimum every five years.

- a. Amendments to the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* and *Student Academic Misconduct Procedure* proceed as follows:
 - i. The GFC Executive Committee decides which amendments are editorial.
 - ii. On delegated authority from the GFC, the Committee on the Learning Environment and Student Affairs will approve all editorial amendments to this policy, the *Student Academic Misconduct Procedure*, and the *Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure*.
 - iii. Where the GFC Executive Committee deems amendments to this policy, the *Student Academic Misconduct Procedure*, and the *Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure* to be substantive, it will forward the amendments to GFC.
 - iv. GFC has final authority on amendments to this policy, the *Student Academic Misconduct Procedure*, and the *Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure*.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use.

[▲Top]

Academic and scholarly activities	Includes, but is not limited to, course elements , conferences, presentations, publications, research, training, field work, or any other activity that is part of the academic mission of the university.
Academic credentials	A group of credit courses that, on completion, leads to the granting of a degree, diploma or certificate, along with their associated course designators.
Academic File	The file detailing a student’s academic progress held in the office of the Faculty in which the student is enrolled and, for graduate students, in the office of the Department (or in non-departmentalized Faculties, the Faculty) responsible for delivery of the graduate program.
Academic integrity	<p>Academic integrity refers to the expectation that every member of an academic community will conduct themselves with the highest standards of ethical conduct. A student demonstrates academic integrity in ways that include by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. situating their own work in the larger body of knowledge, properly acknowledging the work of others, 2. accurately distinguishing their own ideas, words, images and data from those developed using other sources, and 3. avoiding any activity that results in unfair academic or other advantage for themselves or others. <p>Failing to align with the principles of academic integrity harms the entire university community, regardless of whether that failure stems from a lack of knowledge or skill, or an attempt to gain unfair academic or other advantage.</p>
Academic misconduct	Prohibited conduct as set out in Appendix A of the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> .
Advisor	An individual who assists a student during an academic integrity process. Assistance may be provided by the Office of the Student Ombuds, Student Legal Services, legal counsel or another advisor chosen by the student.
Application-related misconduct	Misconduct committed by a student while applying to enter a program. The prohibited conduct outlined in the <i>Code of Applicant Behaviour</i> . This policy applies when someone commits an offense in

	the process of applying for admission to the University and is later admitted as a student.
Balance of probabilities	The standard of proof required to find a violation of this policy. This standard requires that it is more likely than not, based on the available evidence, that the student was in violation of this policy.
Central academic record	A continuing record maintained by the Office of the Registrar, where all matters relating to courses, grades, and academic standing and probation are permanently recorded. Transitory notations, such as service indicators are also noted in the central academic record while they are in effect.
Course element	Any activity or work product submitted for evaluation in a course or program of study including, but not limited to, written or oral exams, take home exams, quizzes, assignments, presentations, papers, practicums, theses, dissertations, and labs.
Dean	<p>“Dean” means</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the Dean of the Faculty, or their delegate, in which a course is offered when the allegation of academic misconduct occurs in a course element, or ● the Dean of the Faculty, or their delegate, to which a student applied or has applied, for application-related offences, or ● the Dean of the Faculty, or their delegate, in which the student is enrolled in all other cases, or ● the Registrar or their delegate where a student is enrolled in Open Studies, or ● the Associate Vice-President, Online Learning and Continuing Education where a student is enrolled in Online Learning and Continuing Education.
Faculty Decision-Maker	The individual the Dean has delegated authority to hear and decide an academic integrity complaint.
Hearing	The opportunity for students to provide or respond to information, arguments, and evidence in a complaint process. A hearing can take the form of written document exchange and/or one or more oral meetings, either virtual or in-person, with the decision maker.

Instructor	An individual who is responsible for the administration of a university course or program of study, including but not limited to: the individual who taught the course, a course coordinator, a lab instructor, course captain, graduate supervisor, or supervisory committee chair. "Instructor" should be interpreted broadly to include any individual responsible for the assessment of student academic performance in a course or program of study.
Learning environment	The learning environment is to be understood broadly to encompass all aspects of university life. It includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • physical and virtual spaces where university teaching, learning, work, research, residence, recreational and social activities take place; • university activities, events and functions, including, but not limited to, teaching, research, studying, work, administration, meetings, public service, travel, conferences, training, public lectures, performances, student group events, and social or sports activities.
Negative service indicator	A transitory notation that can be placed on a student's central academic record during the period it is in effect. Service indicators assist staff in the provision or restriction of services but do not appear on a transcript. Negative service indicators can be used for financial, disciplinary or other extraordinary matters. Examples include, but are not limited to: refusal to consider applications, suspension, and expulsion.
Non-disciplinary accountability options	Voluntary, collaborative facilitated processes to explore personal accountability options outside of a complaint. Designed to assist an individual in identifying and ameliorating negative consequences of their behaviour and/or to align their academic success with the principles of academic integrity. Non-disciplinary accountability options are intended to be flexible and creative, and may include, but are not limited to: remedial, restorative, and other facilitated processes to create space for accountability, with or without a complaint.
Procedural fairness	The elements of the process used by a decision-making body authorised by statute or policy to make a decision that affects an individual's rights, privileges, or interests, that give effect to an individual's right to reasonable notice of the case to meet, the opportunity to respond and the right to an impartial decision maker.

Provost	Provost and Vice-President (Academic) or delegate.
Reasonable accommodation/ reasonably accommodated	Accommodation is the process of making reasonable adjustments to the delivery of services and the conditions of employment in order to reduce or eliminate the impact of discriminatory rules, policies, practices, standards, or decisions, which have an adverse impact on an individual or group of individuals based on a characteristic or perceived characteristic referenced in the protected grounds. The university has a duty to reasonably accommodate individuals who experience barriers in their working and learning environment by reason of a protected ground to the point of undue hardship. The threshold of undue hardship is high and implicitly contemplates that some degree of hardship – including labour, resources and challenge – is acceptable. Undue hardship is assessed on a case-by-case basis.
Student	<p>An individual who is or has been registered as a student at the university whether or not for credit and includes current undergraduate and graduate students, postgraduate learners, former students, and graduates who have received a degree, diploma or certificate from the university.</p> <p>An individual ceases to be an applicant, and becomes a student when: 1) they register for courses, and 2) the add/delete deadline, as published in the <i>Calendar</i>, has passed. Application-related offences discovered after the individual becomes a student will be addressed under the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> or the <i>Student Conduct Policy</i>.</p>
Student Misconduct Appeal Panel	The decision-making body authorised to hear appeals of the decisions of the Faculty Decision-Maker or the Student Conduct Officer.
Student Conduct Officer	The person responsible for making a decision on recommendations from Faculty Decision-Makers and other decisions as outlined in the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> and the associated procedures.

RELATED POLICIES, FRAMEWORKS, AND PROCEDURES

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca

[\[▲Top\]](#)

Student Academic Misconduct Procedure
Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure
Student Academic Integrity Policy Appendix A: Academic Misconduct
Student Academic Integrity Policy Appendix B: Sanction Descriptions and Impact
Infodoc Sources of Student Support for Academic Integrity

RELATED LINKS

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca

[\[▲Top\]](#)

Information

- [International Center for Academic Integrity](#)
- [European Network for Academic Integrity](#).
- [Electronic Communication Policy for Students and Applicants](#)
- [University Calendar](#)

Sources of on-campus assistance

- [Academic Success Centre](#)
- [Augustana Students' Association](#)
- [First Peoples House](#)
- [Graduate Students' Association \(GSA\)](#)
- [International Student and Visitor Services](#)
- [l'Association des Universitaires de la Faculté Saint-Jean \(AUFSJ\)](#)
- [Office of the Dean of Students](#)
- [Office of the Student Ombuds](#)
- [Student Legal Services](#)
- [Students' Union \(SU\)](#)

Other related policies

- [Code of Applicant Behaviour](#)
- [Discrimination, Harassment and Duty to Accommodate Policy](#)
- [Information Technology Use and Management Policy](#)
- [Practicum Intervention Policy](#)
- [Protocol for Urgent Cases of Violent, Threatening or Disruptive Behaviour](#)

- [Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy](#)
- [Residence Community Standards](#)
- [Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Policy](#)
- [Student Conduct Policy](#)
- [Student Groups Procedure](#)

Information

- [University Calendar](#)
- [Electronic Communication Policy for Students and Applicants](#)



Original Approval Date: [date]
 Most Recent Approval: [date]
 Most Recent Editorial Date: [date]
 Parent Policy: Student Academic Integrity Policy

Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	University Secretary
Approver:	General Faculties Council
Scope:	This procedure applies to all University of Alberta students as defined in the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> .

OVERVIEW

As an institution of higher learning, the university adopts procedures that reflect its academic mission, that is, it aims to ensure the integrity of grades, credits, credentials, diplomas, certificates, degrees and other accreditations granted by the university, as well as research and scholarly conduct connected to our community. The University is committed to **procedural fairness** and **equity-informed practice** to reduce harm throughout the student **academic integrity** process.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this procedure is to set out:

- the right of appeal;
- the timelines within which to initiate an appeal and the required content of an appeal;
- the composition of the **Student Misconduct Appeal Panel** (the “Appeal Panel”) and the manner in which the Appeal Panel is constituted;
- the required training of the Appeal Panel members;

- the procedures for an appeal;
- the process used to address procedural requests;
- the procedures and powers of the Appeal Panel; and
- the service of documents related to the appeal.

PROCEDURE

1. Right of Appeal

- A student has the right to appeal the **Faculty Decision-Maker's** and, where applicable, the **Student Conduct Officer's** discipline decisions made under the *Student Academic Misconduct Procedure*. Appeals may not be submitted until after the final disciplinary decision has been made by either the Faculty Decision-Maker or the Student Conduct Officer. Where a discipline decision has been made by the Faculty Decision-Maker and not referred to the Student Conduct Officer, the student must submit an appeal within 15 working days of the deemed receipt of the Faculty Decision-Maker's decision. Should a decision by the Faculty Decision-Maker be referred to the Student Conduct Officer, the appeal of the Faculty Decision-Maker's decision will be delayed until the Student Conduct Officer has completed their decision and both decisions will be subject to appeal at the same time.
- Both the Faculty and the student have a right to appeal the final decision of the Student Conduct Officer.
- All appeals to the Appeal Panel must be submitted within 15 working days of the deemed receipt of the relevant decision. Where the student has appealed a decision, the Faculty Decision-Maker who made the original decision will act in response for appeals of both their and the Student Conduct Officer's decisions.
- The student and Faculty Decision-maker may appeal the decision of a decision maker on the following grounds:
 - the Faculty Decision Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer erred in their decision as to whether or not they had jurisdiction to apply the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*;
 - the decision maker made an error in the finding of violation or no violation; and/or
 - the decision maker did not meet the duty of procedural fairness for reasons including, but not limited to:

1. the appellant was not given a reasonable opportunity to provide information to the decision maker;
 2. the appellant was not given a reasonable opportunity to respond to evidence or statements contrary to their account;
 3. the decision maker was biased; and/or
 4. any other denial of procedural fairness.
- e. A student may appeal the decision of the decision maker on any of the grounds set out in (d) above and on any other grounds, including but not limited to:
- i. the sanction is outside of a reasonable range, given the nature of the violation; and/or
 - ii. other specified grounds for the appeal.
- f. The appeal will be based on the **record** that was before the decision maker.
- g. The Appeal Panel will determine whether:
- i. the decision maker's decision contained errors to the extent that those errors would have a material effect on the outcome of the decision; or
 - ii. the sanctions imposed by the decision maker were unreasonable in the circumstances.

2. Initiating an Appeal

- a. An **appellant** or **respondent** may seek assistance from an **advisor** throughout an appeal process.
- b. Any appeal of the decision-maker's decision must be submitted to the **Appeals and Compliance Coordinator** within 15 working days of the deemed receipt of the decision.
- c. The written appeal must state the grounds for the appeal and include all available arguments, evidence or objections in support of the appeal.
- d. A student who seeks to request a hearing in French should contact the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator in advance of submitting their appeal.
- e. An appeal can be withdrawn at any time prior to the **appeal hearing**.

3. Appeal Panel Members

- a. For each appeal hearing the Appeal Panel will consist of one academic staff member as chair and two students. All Appeal Panel members (academic staff members and

students) will be elected by GFC. In selecting members of the Appeal Panel, GFC will attempt to keep the membership of the Appeal Panel as broadly representative as possible given the available pool of candidates.

- b. GFC will elect a roster of up to seven academic staff members to serve as Chairs of particular appeal hearings (“roster of Chairs”). The Appeal Panel Chairs will serve a term of up to four years and are eligible for re-election.
- c. GFC will elect a roster of up to ten undergraduate students and six graduate students (“roster of students”). All student members will be elected to serve a term of up to two years and are eligible for re-election.
- d. When constituting the Appeal Panel, members will be chosen from the rosters listed above. The Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will endeavour to ensure that the Appeal Panel Chair and members are impartial and free from conflicts of interest.
- e. No Appeal Panel member in a hearing will be from a Faculty which is a party to the dispute. Students in any joint degree program will not be called upon to hear appeals that arise from any of the Faculties involved in their joint program
- f. When an appeal hearing involves an undergraduate student, the Appeal Panel will include at least one undergraduate student. When an appeal hearing involves a graduate student, the Appeal Panel will include at least one graduate student. For the purposes of selection and service on the Appeal Panel, graduate students are considered to be from the Faculty where they receive supervision. Students who are in any joint graduate/undergraduate degree program (e.g., the joint MBA/LLB program) are considered to be graduate students for the purpose of service and selection on the Appeal Panel.
- g. Any Appeal Panel member who has been called to serve on the Appeal Panel for a particular case must complete their service on that case even if their term on an Appeal Panel expires or, in the case of student members, a student graduates or changes status from undergraduate to graduate.
- h. If all Appeal Panel Chairs are unable to serve, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator may complete an Appeal Panel by selecting a member of the General Faculties Council Academic Appeals Committee (“GFC AAC”) Panel of Chairs.
- i. If all student members from the roster of students are unable to serve, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator may complete an Appeal Panel by selecting either one full-time undergraduate student or one full-time graduate student, from the GFC AAC Panel of Students.

4. Mandatory Training for Appeal Panel Members

- a. All Appeal Panel Chairs, members and alternates must have completed the training

outlined in the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* before hearing any appeals.

- b. At the discretion of the Chair, having regard to equity-informed practices, new Appeal Panel members may attend any oral appeal hearing as observers for training purposes. Delegates of the Office of General Counsel may also attend any oral appeal hearing as an observer.

5. Procedures for an Appeal

- a. The Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will be responsible for collecting and distributing documents and all relevant issues raised to both parties as part of the appeal process.
- b. On receiving an appeal, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will provide to the appellant and respondent:
 - i. confirmation of receipt of the appeal;
 - ii. a list of on-campus resources;
 - iii. a copy of the record; and
 - iv. the timelines within which the appellant and respondent must provide their written arguments on the appeal, as follows:
 - 1. the appellant must provide their written appeal argument within 15 working days of receiving the record;
 - 2. the respondent must provide their written response argument within 15 working days of receiving the appellants written appeal argument;
 - 3. the appellant must provide any reply, which must be restricted to only new matters arising from the respondent's response argument, within 5 working days of receiving that written response argument;
 - 4. the respondent must provide any reply, which must be restricted to only new matters arising from the appellant's reply, within 5 working days of receiving the appellant's reply.
- c. The appellant and respondent must provide the name of their respective advisors, if any, to the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator as soon as possible.
- d. The Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will
 - i. select a proposed chair and members for the appeal hearing and will:
 - ii. provide the parties with the name of the proposed chair and the names of all

- student members of the Appeal Panel;
- iii. set the date(s) for the appeal hearing in consultation with the Appeal Panel Chair. Normally, appeal hearings will be scheduled within 6 weeks from the date the appeal was received;
 - iv. where the appeal hearing cannot be scheduled within the timeline noted above, give the parties written notice of the anticipated date for the appeal hearing;
 - v. where both parties have appealed the decision, schedule both appeals to be conducted together by the same Appeal Panel at a single appeal hearing; and
 - vi. address any other matter for the purposes of organising and administering the appeal hearing.
- e. The Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will constitute the Appeal Panel and provide its members and the parties with:
- i. the date and time of the appeal hearing;
 - ii. the decision of the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer;
 - iii. the record on which the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer decision was based; and
 - iv. the appellant's written appeal(s), the appellant's and the respondent's written arguments and replies.
- f. The Appeals and Compliance Coordinator may take any other required steps in order to administer the appeal process.

6. Procedural Requests

- a. The Chair will decide any procedural questions that arise both before and during the appeal hearing, in consultation with the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator. Either party may make a procedural request to the Chair. The Chair's decision on a procedural request is final and binding and will be communicated to the parties in writing by the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator.
- b. Procedural requests must be submitted in writing to the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator and include reasons that support the request. The Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will provide the other party with an opportunity to respond in writing to the procedural request within 5 working days of receiving notice of that request.
- c. Procedural requests include, but are not limited to:

- i. Request that an Appeal Panel Chair or member not serve on the Appeal Panel:
 1. after receiving the names of the Appeal Panel members, the parties will have 5 working days to submit a written request that the proposed Appeal Panel Chair or member not serve on the appeal;
 2. these requests may be made only on the grounds that the proposed Appeal Panel Chair or member may have a bias or conflict of interest that would prevent a fair hearing;
 3. if the request is granted, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will replace the proposed Appeal Panel Chair or member with another member who will be selected by rotation wherever possible, from the same constituent group (i.e., academic staff, undergraduate student or graduate student).
- ii. Request that sanctions be withheld until the appeal is decided:
 1. this request must be made within 5 working days from the date the appeal was submitted;
 2. if granted, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will direct the Registrar to:
 - a. remove any sanctions from the **central academic record**; and
 - b. withhold degrees, certification of marks and/or **transcripts** pending the outcome of the appeal.
 3. Sanctions will be reinstated if the appellant withdraws their appeal.
- iii. Requests for the Appeal Panel to consider new evidence or information that was not before the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer in the record:
 1. The onus is on the party making this request to establish that:
 - a. the new evidence or information is relevant; and
 - b. was not reasonably available at the time of the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer hearing; and
 - c. they made the request as soon as possible after becoming aware of the new evidence or information.

2. The Chair may only grant this request where the test set out in (1) has been satisfied on a balance of probabilities.
- iv. Request to vary the format of the appeal hearing(s):
1. Appeal hearings will normally be conducted through an exchange of the parties' written arguments to the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator, but either party can request an opportunity to present their arguments orally before the Appeal Panel.
 2. This request must be made well in advance of the date set for the appeal hearing.
 3. Request that hearing be conducted in French:
 - a. The Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will make reasonable efforts to convene an Appeal Panel to conduct the hearing in French.
 - b. Where there is no capacity to conduct the hearing in French, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will notify the requesting party.
- v. Request to extend any time limit set out in this procedure:
1. These requests must be made as soon as possible and, in any event, before the time limit expires.
- vi. Any other procedural request.

7. Procedures and Powers of the Appeal Panel

- a. The Appeal Panel will consider the entire record, the parties' appeal, response and reply documents, and where applicable, the parties' oral statements made at the appeal hearing before coming to a decision, by majority vote.
- b. In considering their decision, the Appeal Panel will show deference to the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer's decision, particularly with respect to the findings of facts and, accordingly, may only overturn a decision of the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer where it was made on the basis of an error or errors that would have had a material effect on the outcome.
- c. The Appeal Panel has the power to grant an appeal, in whole or in part, only where:
 - i. the appellant establishes that the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer incorrectly

1. found or did not find a real and substantial link to or material effect on the **learning environment**;
 2. acted outside of their authority under the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* and/or the *Student Academic Misconduct Procedure*;
 3. defined the elements of a violation; and/or
 4. other similar grounds related to the application or interpretation of *Student Academic Integrity Policy* and/or *Student Academic Misconduct Procedure*.
- ii. the appellant establishes that the findings of facts made by the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer contain errors, such as
1. making a finding of fact without any evidence;
 2. considering irrelevant facts;
 3. giving undue weight to certain facts;
 4. misapplying the facts to the elements of a violation in the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*; and/or
 5. other similar ground related to the facts.
- iii. the appellant establishes that there was a breach of procedural fairness in the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer hearing, such as
1. the appellant was not provided with the opportunity to respond to an allegation or adverse evidence;
 2. the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer did not provide reasonable disclosure of the investigation report;
 3. the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer was not impartial;
 4. the appellant was not provided with information about or sufficient opportunity to secure an advisor;
 5. there were significant and unjustifiable delays in the process to the extent that the fairness of the process was undermined; and/or
 6. other similar ground related to procedural fairness.
- iv. In addition to (c) above, the Appeal Panel may grant an appeal of sanction

made by the student only where the appellant establishes that the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer assigned a sanction(s) outside of a reasonable range, having regard to the nature of the violation and other relevant surrounding circumstances.

8. Decision of the Appeal Panel

- a. Where the Appeal Panel grants an appeal, they have the power to do the following:
 - i. With respect to an appeal by the Faculty Decision-Maker of the Student Conduct Officer, the Appeal Panel must remit the matter back to the Student Conduct Officer who made the decision or, where appropriate, a different Student Conduct Officer, to remedy the errors and issue an amended or a new decision.
 - ii. With respect to an appeal by the student, the Appeal Panel may:
 1. grant the appeal and overturn the decision;
 2. grant the appeal and remit the matter back to the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer who made the decision or, where appropriate, a different Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer, to remedy the errors and/or issue an amended or a new decision; or
 3. substitute a different sanction.
- b. Decisions of the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer are subject to one appeal only. Amended decisions in which errors have been remedied are not subject to additional appeal. Where a new decision is issued, that decision may be appealed.
- c. The Appeal Panel does not have the power to overturn a consequence resulting from a failure to meet specified conduct conditions (see Student Academic Integrity Policy, Appendix B, "Academic Integrity Conditions"). Any appeal of academic integrity conditions must be made at the time the sanction is imposed and within the time limits set out in the *Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure*. If the conduct conditions are not met, no further appeal is available when the consequence is applied.
- d. The Appeal Panel's decision is final and is not subject to any further review or reconsideration by any University person or body.
- e. The Chair of the Appeal Panel will communicate the decision to the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator, who will, as soon as possible, relay the decision to the

parties and their respective advisors.

- f. The Chair will normally submit the Appeal Panel's written reasons for the decision to the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator within 15 working days of reaching the decision. Where the written reasons are delayed, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will give written notice to the appellant and respondent.

9. Service of Documents

- a. Any notices, communications, and appeal materials will be sent electronically using university accounts. See the *Electronic Communication Policy for Students and Applicants* in the *University Calendar*.
- b. On receiving the written decision, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will send a copy to the following individuals:
 - i. the appellant and respondent, and their respective advisors, Where an advisor does not have a university account, the appellant and respondent may forward the decision to their advisor.
 - ii. the Student Conduct Officer, where the Student Conduct Officer's decision was appealed;
 - iii. the Vice-Provost and Dean of Students;
 - iv. the Office of General Counsel; and
 - v. members on the Appeal Panel.
- c. The Appeals and Compliance Coordinator may provide a copy or excerpts of the decision to any other University unit as may be appropriate to administer the sanction or for other authorised purposes, for example, to units including, but not limited to, the following:
 - i. where a sanction is to be noted on the student's central academic record or transcript, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will notify the Office of the Registrar;
 - ii. where a sanction affects the student's academic program, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will notify the student's home Faculty; and
 - iii. in programs jointly offered with another institution, the Appeals and Compliance Coordinator will provide a copy of the decision to the partner
 - iv. institution when the violation relates to the student's conduct at that partner institution.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use.

[\[▲Top\]](#)

<p>Academic Integrity</p>	<p>Academic integrity refers to the expectation that every member of an academic community will conduct themselves with the highest standards of ethical conduct. A student demonstrates academic integrity by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. situating their own work in the larger body of knowledge, properly acknowledging the work of others, 2. accurately distinguishing their own ideas, words images and data from those developed using other sources, and 3. avoiding any activity that results in unfair academic or other advantage for themselves or others. <p>Failing to align with the principles of academic integrity harms the entire university community, regardless of whether that failure stems from a lack of knowledge or skill, or an attempt to gain unfair academic or other advantage.</p>
<p>Advisor</p>	<p>An individual who assists an appellant or respondent during the appeal process. Assistance may be provided by the Office of the Student Ombuds, Student Legal Services, legal counsel or another advisor chosen by the parties.</p>
<p>Appeals and Compliance Coordinator</p>	<p>The person responsible for administration of the <i>Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure</i>.</p>
<p>Appeal Hearing</p>	<p>The opportunity for appellants and respondents to provide or respond to information, arguments, and evidence in an appeal process. An appeal hearing can take the form of written document exchange and/or an oral meeting, either virtual or in-person, with the Appeal Panel.</p>
<p>Appellant</p>	<p>A person who appeals the decision of the Faculty Decision-Maker or the Student Conduct Officer under this procedure.</p>

Central academic record	A continuing record maintained by the Office of the Registrar, where all matters relating to courses, grades, and academic standing and probation are permanently recorded. Transitory notations, such as service indicators are also noted in the central academic record while they are in effect.
Equity-informed practice	An approach to processes, procedures and service provision that centres equitable and inclusive access, aspires to barrier-free design for learning principles, and supports reasonable accommodation when access to or participation in the learning environment is limited as a result of a protected ground.
Faculty Decision-Maker	The individual the Dean has delegated to hear and decide an academic integrity complaint.
Learning environment	<p>The learning environment is to be understood broadly to encompass all aspects of University life. It includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • physical and virtual spaces where university teaching, learning, work, research, residence, recreational and social activities take place; • university activities, events and functions, including, but not limited to, teaching, research, studying, work, administration, meetings, public service, travel, conferences, training, public lectures, performances, student group events, and social or sports activities.
Procedural fairness	The elements of the process used by a decision-making body authorised by statute or policy to make a decision that affects an individual's rights, privileges, or interests, that give effect to an individual's right to reasonable notice of the case to meet, the opportunity to respond and the right to an impartial decision maker.
Record	The materials on which the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer based their decision. The record includes any materials, statements, or responses provided to the Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer that were relevant to the question of whether an individual was in violation of the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> and any information or

	materials, statements, or responses related to the consideration of appropriate sanction(s).
Respondent	The person who responds to an appeal under this procedure.
Student	<p>An individual who is or has been registered as a student at the university whether or not for credit and includes current undergraduate and graduate students, postgraduate learners, former students, and graduates who have received a degree, diploma or certificate from the university.</p> <p>An individual ceases to be an applicant, and becomes a student when: 1) they register for courses, and 2) the add/delete deadline, as published in the <i>Calendar</i>, has passed. Application-related offences discovered after the individual becomes a student will be addressed under the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> or <i>Student Conduct Policy</i>.</p>
Student Conduct Officer	The person responsible for making a decision on recommendations from Faculty Decision-Makers and other decisions as outlined in the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> and the associated procedures.
Student Misconduct Appeal Panel	The decision-making body authorised to hear appeals of the decisions of the Faculty Decision-Maker or the Student Conduct Officer.
Transcript	A student's official academic record issued by the Office of the Registrar and bearing the signature of the Registrar. Information for the transcript is drawn from the central academic record. Information included on the University of Alberta transcript is found in the <i>University Calendar</i> .

RELATED POLICIES, FRAMEWORKS, AND PROCEDURES

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca	[▲Top]
<p><i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i></p> <p><i>Student Academic Misconduct Procedure</i></p> <p><i>Student Academic Integrity Policy Appendix A: Academic Misconduct</i></p>	

RELATED LINKS

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca

[\[▲Top\]](#)

Sources of on-campus assistance

- [Office of the Dean of Students](#)
- [Office of the Student Ombuds](#)
- [Student Legal Services](#)
- [Students' Union \(SU\)](#)
- [Graduate Students' Association \(GSA\)](#)
- [l'Association des Universitaires de la Faculté Saint-Jean \(AUFSJ\)](#)
- [Augustana Students' Association](#)
- [First Peoples House](#)
- [Academic Success Centre](#)

Other conduct policies

- [Discrimination, Harassment and Duty to Accommodate Policy](#)
- [Information Technology Use and Management Policy](#)
- [Practicum Intervention Policy](#)
- [Protocol for Urgent Cases of Violent, Threatening or Disruptive Behaviour](#)
- [Residence Community Standards](#)
- [Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Policy](#)
- [Student Groups Procedure](#)

Information

- [University Calendar](#)
- [Electronic Communication Policy for Students and Applicants](#)

Original Approval Date: [date]
 Most Recent Approval: [date]
 Most Recent Editorial Date: [date]
 Parent Policy: Student Academic Integrity Policy

Student Academic Misconduct Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Vice Provost and Dean of Students
Approver:	General Faculties Council
Scope:	This procedure applies to all University of Alberta students as defined in the Student Academic Integrity Policy.

OVERVIEW

As an institution of higher learning, the university adopts procedures that reflect its academic mission, that is, they aim to foster a vibrant and supportive **learning environment**, and, wherever possible, encourage rehabilitation, learning, remediation and personal accountability for students who have contravened the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*. The University is committed to **procedural fairness** and **equity-informed practice** to reduce harm throughout the student **academic integrity** process.

Non-disciplinary accountability options for resolution are also available, including remedial, restorative, and other facilitated processes to create space for accountability, with or without a complaint.

The **student** cycle at the university necessitates a timely way to address conduct that negatively affects the university community and the learning environment. Students engaged in a process under this policy need clarity as to outcomes and to have the matter addressed expeditiously and fairly.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this procedure is to:

- set out general responsibilities of students, Instructors, Deans and other decision makers involved in an academic integrity process;
- describe how any person may bring forward a potential academic integrity concern;
- set out the recommendations the **Instructor** may make to the **Dean** for addressing a potential academic integrity concern;
- describe the procedure for the Dean for addressing a potential academic integrity concern, including initiating a complaint;
- set out resources for non-disciplinary accountability options;
- describe the procedures for the **Faculty Decision-Maker**,
- describe the procedures for the **Student Conduct Officer**;
- set out the right to appeal the decision of a Faculty Decision-Maker or Student Conduct Officer to the **Student Misconduct Appeal Panel**
- describe the service of documents related to the complaint.

PROCEDURE

1. Responsibilities

- a. Students are solely responsible for the academic integrity of all work submitted under their name in their courses, programs, and other scholarly activities.
- b. Instructors are responsible for encouraging and promoting academic integrity education as it relates to the **course elements** in their course and identifying potential violations.
- c. Deans, Faculty Decision-Makers, and Student Conduct Officers are responsible for administering and monitoring any non-disciplinary accountability agreements they arrange, or any conditions or sanctions they impose.

2. Raising Academic Integrity Concerns

- a. Anyone may raise an academic integrity concern by bringing the concern to the Instructor or, where an Instructor cannot be identified or is unavailable, to the relevant Dean, and should do so as soon as possible after becoming aware of the concern.

- b. The Instructor may raise an academic integrity concern with a student and make any inquiries about the concern as they deem appropriate.

3. Instructor's Recommendations to the Dean

- a. As soon as possible after becoming aware of a potential violation of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*, the Instructor will provide to the Dean a detailed account of the events that transpired, a brief explanation for their recommendations and supporting documentation or other information relevant to the situation.
- b. The Instructor may recommend to the Dean that the academic integrity concern be addressed through
 - i. non-disciplinary accountability options; or
 - ii. a complaint process.
- c. The Instructor may also include suggestions for specific non-disciplinary or disciplinary outcomes, depending on the overall approach they have chosen to recommend. If a non-disciplinary accountability option is recommended, the Instructor should include any ways in which they would be willing to participate.

4. Procedures to Decide Academic Integrity Pathway

- a. Upon receiving an academic integrity concern, the Dean will consider the information and the Instructor's recommendation as to whether the matter should be addressed through non-disciplinary accountability options or a complaint process.
- b. As soon as possible, the Dean will
 - i. offer the student the opportunity to provide a brief written explanation, in a timely way, of their views on whether the concern should be addressed through non-disciplinary accountability options or through a complaint;
 - ii. offer the student the opportunity to provide any information to the Dean that is relevant to the decision on how to address the concern; and
 - iii. advise the student that they may consult with and be accompanied by an **advisor** at any point during an academic integrity process and provide the student with information about on-campus assistance.
- c. The Dean may also offer to meet with the student, in-person or virtually.
- d. In deciding how to address the academic integrity concern, the Dean may consider
 - i. the information and the Instructor's recommendation, if any, related to the academic integrity concern;
 - ii. the views and information provided by the student;

- iii. the student's participation in a prior non-disciplinary accountability option and/or prior history of academic integrity violations, if any; and
 - iv. any other relevant information.
- e. While the Dean will consider the instructor's recommendation and the views of the student as to how to address the academic integrity concern, the Dean is not bound by that recommendation or those views.
 - f. Notwithstanding the above, students have a right to engage the complaint process. Therefore, where a student wants the academic integrity concern to be addressed through a complaint process, the Dean will follow the procedures under section 6.

5. **Non-Disciplinary Accountability Options**

- a. Where the Dean offers to address the academic integrity concern through non-disciplinary accountability options, the Dean will determine what actions and/or assignments the student will undertake in order to
 - i. educate and develop the student's understanding of the harms caused by academic misconduct and the importance of academic integrity; and
 - ii. develop the student's knowledge, skills and abilities in a matter that aligns their behaviour with the fundamental values of academic integrity.
- b. The Dean may consider the student's views as to the appropriate non-disciplinary accountability options.
- c. Non-disciplinary accountability options are voluntary. As a result, where a student disagrees with the actions and/or assignments determined by the Dean, the student may opt to have the academic integrity concern addressed in a complaint. In that case, the Dean will follow the procedures under section 6.
- d. Where the Dean's proposed actions and/or assignments would require the participation of any university service unit, office or individual, the Dean will ensure those university units, offices or individuals agree to participate before confirming those actions and/or assignments in writing.
- e. Where the student and the Dean agree, the actions and/or assignments and their agreement to them will be confirmed in writing. The actions and/or assignments must be specific and measurable and a date for their completion must be specified in the agreement. The actions and/or assignments should not involve the instructor who raised the academic integrity concern without the instructor's consent.
- f. The Dean will monitor the student's performance of the actions and/or assignments and, where appropriate, may, in writing, agree to extend any timelines or vary the actions and/or assignments set out in the agreement.

- g. The Dean will determine whether and when the student has successfully completed the actions and/or assignments by the timelines in their agreement. If the student disagrees with the Dean's determinations in any of these respects, the student may, within 5 working days of the decision, apply to a Student Conduct Officer for a decision on whether or not the terms of the agreement have been met. The Student Conduct Officer's decision is final.
- h. Where the Dean determines that the student has successfully completed the actions and assignments as agreed, the Dean will confirm in writing the student's successful completion of the non-disciplinary accountability option to the student, the student's Faculty and the instructor who raised the academic integrity concern.
- i. Where the student completes their educational and/or non-disciplinary accountability expectations successfully, the academic integrity concern will be considered resolved and cannot subsequently be referred for a decision under the complaint process.
- j. Where the Dean determines that the student has not successfully completed the actions or assignments as agreed and following a decision by the Student Conduct Officer on any challenge by the student under Section 5g, the Dean will refer the matter to a Faculty Decision-Maker to address the academic integrity concern through the complaint process.
- k. Information gathered in the course of carrying out a non-disciplinary accountability option will not be used as evidence of a violation in a complaint process, but may be considered in determining an appropriate sanction.
- l. A Dean may consider the student's successful completion of the actions and/or assignments in their agreement to determine whether any subsequent allegation of an academic integrity concern should be addressed through non-disciplinary accountability options or a complaint process.
- m. A Faculty Decision-Maker may consider the student's successful completion of the actions and assignment in their agreement when determining a sanction, when a complaint process is used to address a subsequent academic integrity complaint.

6. Complaint Process for Faculty Decision-Makers

- a. Where the Dean decides to address the academic integrity concern through the complaint process, the Dean will inform the student in writing, giving reasons for the decision, and assign a Faculty Decision-Maker.
- b. The Faculty Decision-Maker will offer the student a **hearing** to determine whether the student agrees with or disputes the facts of the academic integrity concern as disclosed by the instructor or Dean;
- c. the offer of a hearing will include

1. the purpose of the hearing,
 2. the student's right to an advisor,
 3. reasonable disclosure of relevant information related to the academic integrity concern, and
 4. choice of hearing format, for example, written document exchange, or virtual or in-person meeting.
- d. If the student disputes the facts, the Faculty Decision-Maker will review the matter further by talking with the relevant parties and completing any necessary investigation to arrive at a finding, on a balance of probabilities, as to whether the student is in violation of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*.
- e. Only where the Faculty Decision-Maker has found the student to be in violation, and then prior to imposing a sanction the Faculty Decision-Maker will
- i. check the student's **academic integrity history**, if it exists, to determine if the student has violated the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* to determine if the student has previously engaged in academic misconduct or is or has been involved in any non-disciplinary accountability options.
 - ii. only consider the student's previous violation or involvement in a non-disciplinary accountability option for the purpose of determining an appropriate sanction.
- f. Where the Faculty Decision-Maker determines, on a balance of probabilities, that the student has violated the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*, or where the student does not dispute the facts, the Faculty Decision-Maker may impose one or more of the following sanctions as set out in Schedule B of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*, and specify any conditions or starting dates required by the following sanctions:
- i. Reprimand,
 - ii. Academic Integrity Conditions,
 - iii. Grade Sanctions,
 - iv. Rescission of Admission Offer,
 - v. Refusal to Consider Application.
- g. In the event that the student refuses or fails to provide a response to the academic integrity concern within a specified period of time, the Faculty Decision-Maker will make a decision, which may include one or more sanctions, taking into account the available evidence.
- h. The Faculty Decision-Maker will communicate their decision in writing to the student,

normally within six weeks of receiving the complaint. The decision will include:

- i. a finding on whether the student is in violation of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*,
 - ii. the sections of Appendix A of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*, if any, the student is found to have violated,
 - iii. which sanctions, if any, are being imposed, as per Appendix B of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*,
 - iv. any conditions imposed as part of those sanctions,
 - v. any recommendation to the Student Conduct Officer, where applicable,
 - vi. the reasons for the findings and sanctions,
 - vii. the student's right to appeal, and
 - viii. the appeal deadline if there is no referral to the Student Conduct Officer.
- i. The Faculty Decision-Maker will refer the case to a Student Conduct Officer where the Faculty Decision-Maker seeks to apply any of the following, either directly or through an Academic Integrity Condition:
 - i. Suspension from an Academic Program,
 - ii. Expulsion,
 - iii. Suspension of a Degree,
 - iv. Rescission of a Degree.
 - j. In making a referral to a Student Conduct Officer, the Faculty Decision-Maker will forward their decision, all relevant information and submissions collected or received by them and reasons for their recommendation of the above sanctions to the Student Conduct Officer.

7. Complaint Process for Student Conduct Officers

- a. After receiving a recommendation from a Faculty Decision-Maker, the Student Conduct Officer will offer the student a hearing. The offer of a hearing will include:
 - i. the purpose of the hearing,
 - ii. the student's right to an advisor,
 - iii. a description of the recommended sanction(s) and their implications, and
 - iv. reasonable disclosure of any information forwarded in support of the Faculty

Decision-Maker's recommended sanctions and the reasons for the recommendation.

- b. Where the student accepts the facts as laid out in the Faculty Decision-Maker's decision, the Faculty Decision-Maker's decision is confirmed and the student may make written or oral submissions about the recommended sanction(s) and their impact.
- c. Where the student disputes facts as laid out in the Faculty Decision-Maker's decision or the Faculty Decision-Maker's interpretation of the facts, the student may provide the Student Conduct Officer with a written or oral response to the Faculty Decision-Maker's decision along with any relevant information or supporting documents.
- d. The Student Conduct Officer may, at their discretion, engage in further investigation as necessary.
- e. When the Student Conduct Officer is satisfied they have access to all of the available evidence, they will determine, on a balance of probabilities, whether the student was in violation of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* ("Violation") or the violation was not established ("No Violation").
- f. If a student declines the hearing, either directly or through missing a reasonable deadline for the hearing, the Student Conduct Officer will confirm the Faculty Decision-Maker's decision and proceed to a consideration of the recommended sanction(s).
- g. Where the Faculty Decision-Maker's decision is confirmed, the Student Conduct Officer will determine sanctions, if any, from the list in Appendix B of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*. The Student Conduct Officer will take into account:
 - i. the recommendation of the Faculty Decision-Maker,
 - ii. what they learned from the student,
 - iii. the available information, and
 - iv. other relevant factors, including applicable prior conduct history.
- h. The Student Conduct Officer will specify any starting dates, conditions or other details required for the sanctions imposed.
- i. Any sanctions imposed by the Faculty Decision-Maker will stand except where
 - i. the Student Conduct Officer finds No Violation of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* or
 - ii. new information or circumstances clearly warrant a variation of the sanctions imposed by a Faculty Decision-Maker.
- j. Where the Student Conduct Officer finds No Violation or varies the sanction imposed by

the Faculty Decision-Maker, the earlier decision by the Faculty Decision-Maker will be set aside and, where applicable, the course element will be marked and factored into the student's final grade.

- k. The Student Conduct Officer will communicate their decision in writing to the student, normally within six weeks of receiving the referral. The decision will include:
 - i. whether the Faculty Decision-Maker's decision is confirmed or set aside,
 - ii. the sections of Appendix A of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*, if any, the student is found to have violated,
 - iii. an overview of the evidence and arguments considered,
 - iv. information, including any history of related violations, that may have been influential in determining the appropriateness of the sanction(s),
 - v. any sanctions imposed, as per Appendix B of the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*,
 - vi. any conditions imposed as part of those sanctions,
 - vii. the reasons for the findings and sanctions,
 - viii. information regarding deadlines and procedures for appeal, and
 - ix. a list of on-campus assistance.
- l. Where the Student Conduct Officer is not able to provide the written decision within the timeline noted above, the Student Conduct Officer will give the student and the Faculty Decision-Maker written notice of the anticipated timeline for the decision.
- m. The Student Conduct Officer's decision is subject to appeal by both the student and the Faculty Decision-Maker, as set out in the *Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure*.
- n. The Student Conduct Officer's decision is final and takes effect immediately, subject to an appeal under the *Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure*.

8. Complaint Service and Notice

- a. The Faculty Decision-Maker and, if applicable, the Student Conduct Officer will send their decision electronically to the
 - i. student,
 - ii. Instructor who raised the academic integrity concern,
 - iii. Dean of the College and/or Faculty in which the student is registered,

- iv. if applicable, student’s advisor and Graduate Coordinator, and
 - v. Appeals and Compliance Coordinator.
- b. In addition, the Student Conduct Officer will provide a copy of the decision for information to the:
- i. Faculty Decision-Maker who referred the matter to the Student Conduct Officer,
 - ii. Office of General Counsel, and
 - iii. Vice Provost and Dean of Students.
- c. All decisions will be communicated using university accounts. See the *Electronic Communication Policy for Students and Applicants* in the *University Calendar*. Where a student’s advisor does not have a university account, the student may forward the decision to their advisor.
- d. The Faculty Decision-Maker and/or Student Conduct Officer may also provide a copy or excerpts of the decision to any other University of Alberta unit as may be appropriate to administer the sanction or for other authorised purposes, for example, to units including, but not limited to, the following:
- i. the Office of the Registrar where a sanction is to be noted on the student’s central academic record or **transcript**,
 - ii. the partner institution for programs jointly offered with that partner institution, when the violation relates to the student’s conduct at that partner institution.

9. Records

- a. The student’s academic integrity history will be kept in accordance with the applicable records retention procedures. Any record of completed expectations as laid out in a non-disciplinary accountability option will be expunged upon completion of the student’s academic program or upon the normal date of file destruction, whichever comes first.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use.		▲Top
Academic integrity	Academic integrity refers to the expectation that every member of an academic community will conduct themselves with the highest standards of ethical conduct. A student demonstrates academic integrity in ways that include:	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. situating their own work in the larger body of knowledge, properly acknowledging the work of others, 2. accurately distinguishing their own ideas, words images and data from those developed using other sources, and 3. Avoiding any activity that results in unfair academic or other advantage for themselves or others. <p>Failing to align with the principles of academic integrity harms the entire university community, regardless of whether that failure stems from a lack of knowledge, skill or an attempt to gain unfair academic or other advantage.</p>
Academic integrity history	<p>The records related to the academic integrity proceedings undertaken in relation to a student, including but not limited to, any non-disciplinary actions and/or assignments and their outcomes, any violations investigated, evidence collected and the findings, if any, of the decision-maker. Academic integrity history records are held electronically and are updated as cases progress through the process described in the <i>Student Academic Misconduct Procedure</i> and the <i>Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure</i>.</p>
Advisor	<p>An individual who assists a student during an academic integrity process. Assistance may be provided by the Office of the Student Ombuds, Student Legal Services, legal counsel or another advisor chosen by the student.</p>
Dean	<p>“Dean” means</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the Dean of the Faculty, or their delegate, in which a course is offered when the allegation of academic misconduct occurs in a course element, or ● the Dean of the Faculty, or their delegate, to which an student applied or has applied, for application-related offences, or ● the Dean of the Faculty, or their delegate, in which the student is enrolled, in all other cases, or ● the Registrar or their delegate where a student is enrolled in Open Studies, or ● the Associate Vice-President, Online Learning and

	Continuing Education.
Equity-informed practice	An approach to processes, procedures and service provision that centres equitable and inclusive access, aspires to barrier-free design for learning principles, and supports reasonable accommodation when access to or participation in the learning environment is limited as a result of a protected ground.
Faculty Decision-Maker	The individual the Dean has delegated authority to hear and decide an academic integrity complaint.
Hearing	The opportunity for students to provide or respond to information, arguments, and evidence in a complaint process. A hearing can take the form of written document exchange and/or one or more oral meetings, either virtual or in-person, with the decision maker.
Instructor	An individual who is responsible for the administration of a university course or program of study, including but not limited to: the individual who taught the course, a course coordinator, a lab instructor, course captain, graduate supervisor, or supervisory committee chair. "Instructor" should be interpreted broadly to include any individual responsible for the assessment of student academic performance in a course or program of study.
Learning environment	The learning environment is to be understood broadly to encompass all aspects of university life. It includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● physical and virtual spaces where university teaching, learning, work, research, residence, recreational and social activities take place; ● university activities, events and functions, including, but not limited to, teaching, research, studying, work, administration, meetings, public service, travel, conferences, training, public lectures, performances, student group events, and social or sports activities.
Non-disciplinary accountability options	Voluntary, collaborative facilitated processes to explore personal accountability options outside of a complaint. Designed to assist a person in identifying and ameliorating negative consequences of their behaviour and/or align their academic success with the

	<p>principles of academic integrity. Non-disciplinary accountability options are intended to be flexible and creative, and may include, but are not limited to: remedial, restorative, and other facilitated processes to create space for accountability, with or without a complaint.</p>
Procedural fairness	<p>The elements of the process used by a decision-making body authorised by statute or policy to make a decision that affects an individual's rights, privileges, or interests, that give effect to an individual's right to reasonable notice of the case to meet, the opportunity to respond and the right to an impartial decision maker.</p>
Student	<p>An individual who is or has been registered as a student at the university whether or not for credit and includes current undergraduate and graduate students, postgraduate learners, former students, and graduates who have received a degree, diploma or certificate from the university.</p> <p>An individual ceases to be an applicant, and becomes a student when: 1) they register for courses, and 2) the add/delete deadline, as published in the <i>Calendar</i>, has passed. Application-related offences discovered after the individual becomes a student will be addressed under the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> or <i>Student Conduct Policy</i>.</p>
Student Conduct Officer	<p>The person responsible for making a decision on recommendations from Faculty Decision-Makers and other decisions as outlined in the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> and the associated procedures.</p>
Student Misconduct Appeal Panel	<p>The decision-making body authorised to hear appeals of the decisions of the Faculty Decision-Maker or the Student Conduct Officer.</p>
Transcript	<p>A student's official academic record issued by the Office of the Registrar and bearing the signature of the Registrar. Information for the transcript is drawn from the central academic record. Information included on the University of Alberta transcript is</p>

found in the *University Calendar*.

RELATED POLICIES, FRAMEWORKS, AND PROCEDURES

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca

[\[▲Top\]](#)

- [Code of Applicant Behaviour](#)
- [Discrimination, Harassment and Duty to Accommodate Policy](#)
- [Information Technology Use and Management Policy](#)
- [Practicum Intervention Policy](#)
- [Protocol for Urgent Cases of Violent, Threatening or Disruptive Behaviour](#)
- [Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy](#)
- [Residence Community Standards](#)
- [Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Policy](#)
- [Student Conduct Policy](#)
- [Student Groups Procedure](#)

RELATED LINKS

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca

[\[▲Top\]](#)

Sources of on-campus assistance

- [Office of the Dean of Students](#)
- [Office of the Student Ombuds](#)
- [Student Legal Services](#)
- [Students' Union \(SU\)](#)
- [Graduate Students' Association \(GSA\)](#)
- [l'Association des Universitaires de la Faculté Saint-Jean \(AUFSJ\)](#)
- [Augustana Students' Association](#)
- [First Peoples House](#)

- [Academic Success Centre](#)

Information

- [University Calendar](#)
- [Electronic Communication Policy for Students and Applicants](#)



Original Approval Date: [date]
 Most Recent Approval: [date]
 Most Recent Editorial Date: [date]
 Parent Policy: Student Academic Integrity Policy

Student Academic Integrity Policy

Appendix A: Academic Misconduct

Office of Accountability:	Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Vice-Provost and Dean of Students
Approver:	General Faculties Council (Committee on the Learning Environment and Student Affairs)

1. Plagiarism

Representing the words, ideas, images, data or other analogous work of another individual or other source as the student's own

- a. in any **course element** in a course or program of study, or
- b. in any other academic and/or scholarly activity.

2. Examination Cheating

In an examination, test, quiz or other similar assessment activity that takes place as part of a course element (including proctored or non-proctored, in-person, take home, or online assessment activities):

- a. obtaining or attempting to obtain information from another student or other unauthorised source,
- b. giving or attempting to give information to another student, or
- c. using, or attempting to use or possessing for the purposes of use any unauthorised material or device, or.
- d. Representing or attempting to represent oneself as another or attempting to

have oneself represented by another in an examination, test, quiz or other scholarly activity.

3. Contract Cheating

Using a service, company, website, or application to

- a. complete, in whole or in part, any course element, or any other academic and/or scholarly activity, which the student is required to complete on their own; or
- b. commit any other violation of this policy.

This includes misuse, for academic advantage, of sites or tools, including artificial intelligence applications, translation software or sites, and tutorial services, which claim to support student learning.

4. Unauthorised Collaboration

Collaborating with others on course elements intended to be completed independently, contrary to the express instructions of the instructor, in order to gain unfair academic advantage. This should not be interpreted as precluding authorised collaboration or cooperation designed to help the student develop or enhance skills to create their own work or to gain insight into potential problems they may need to address. Examples of unauthorised collaboration include, but are not limited to:

- a. Submitting any assignment as the student's own work which contains
 - i. material generated by anyone other than the student named on the assignment, and
 - ii. without acknowledgement and the express permission of the instructor.
- b. Representing another's substantial editorial or compositional assistance on a course element, or any other academic or scholarly activity, as one's own work.
- c. Knowingly advising, encouraging, aiding or assisting another person, directly or indirectly, to commit any violation under this policy.

5. Misrepresentation

- a. Misrepresenting pertinent facts to any member of the university community for the purpose of obtaining unfair academic advantage.
- b. Including in any course element or scholarly activity a statement of fact the

student knows to be false, a reference to a source the student knows to contain fabricated claims (unless acknowledged by the student), or a fabricated reference to a source in any academic submission for assessment or credit.

- c. Failing to provide pertinent information on an application for admission.
- d. Misrepresenting or falsifying academic credentials, or altering an official university certification document or transcript for use in external applications including but not limited to, jobs, grants, co-op, placements, and other professional activities.

6. Unauthorised Resubmission

Submitting in any course or program of study, without the written approval of the course Instructor, all or a substantial portion of any course element which has previously been submitted for credit in another course or which has been or is being submitted by the student in another course or program of study in the university or elsewhere.

7. Misuse of University Academic Materials or Other Assets

- a. Gaining access to, distributing, or receiving any confidential academic material such as pending examinations, laboratory results or the contents thereof from any source without prior and express consent of the instructor.
- b. Selling, taking, distributing or sharing course or research materials not owned by the student, including but not limited to lecture materials, biological, chemical or other assets, handouts, assignment or exam questions, slide presentations and other similar materials without the instructor’s or owner’s consent.

8. Research and Scholarship Misconduct

Committing a violation of the *Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy*.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use.		[▲Top]
Academic misconduct	Prohibited conduct as set out in Appendix A of the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> .	
Course element	Any activity or work product submitted for evaluation in a course or program of study including, but not limited to, written or oral exams,	

take home exams, quizzes, assignments, presentations, papers, practicums, theses, dissertations, and labs.

RELATED FRAMEWORKS, PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca

[\[▲Top\]](#)

Student Academic Integrity Policy
Student Academic Misconduct Procedure
Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure
Student Academic Integrity Policy Appendix B: Sanction Descriptions and Impact

RELATED LINKS

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca

[\[▲Top\]](#)

Sources of on-campus assistance

- [Office of the Dean of Students](#)
- [Office of the Student Ombuds](#)
- [Student Legal Services](#)
- [Students' Union \(SU\)](#)
- [Graduate Students' Association \(GSA\)](#)
- [l'Association des Universitaires de la Faculté Saint-Jean \(AUFSJ\)](#)
- [Augustana Students' Association](#)
- [First Peoples House](#)
- [Academic Success Centre](#)

Other conduct policies

- [Discrimination, Harassment and Duty to Accommodate Policy](#)
- [Information Technology Use and Management Policy](#)
- [Practicum Intervention Policy](#)
- [Protocol for Urgent Cases of Violent, Threatening or Disruptive Behaviour](#)
- [Residence Community Standards](#)
- [Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Policy](#)
- [Student Groups Procedure](#)

Information

- [University Calendar](#)
- [Electronic Communication Policy for Students and Applicants](#)



Original Approval Date: [date]
 Most Recent Approval: [date]
 Most Recent Editorial Date: [date]
 Parent Policy: Student Academic Integrity Policy

Student Academic Integrity Policy:

Appendix B: Sanction Descriptions and Impact

Office of Accountability:	Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Vice-Provost and Dean of Students
Approver:	General Faculties Council (Committee on the Learning Environment and Student Affairs)

1. Reprimand

- a. A reprimand is a disciplinary record that a student has been found responsible for a policy violation. It is noted in the student’s **Academic Integrity History**, according to the established record retention schedule.

2. Academic Integrity Conditions

- a. Academic integrity conditions is a sanction that has two components:
 - i. the sanction requires that students satisfy specific conditions or restrictions, not to exceed the duration of the student’s program, and
 - ii. provides for a specific secondary sanction that will be imposed on the student in the event the student does not satisfy those specific conditions or restrictions.

- b. The conditions and restrictions that may be applied include one or more of the following in order to rectify and or redress the violation:
 - i. not to commit any further violations during the term of academic integrity conditions;
 - ii. to complete a relevant reflection assignment;
 - iii. to complete an academic integrity workshop or activity for intellectual development;
 - iv. rewrite and resubmit the course element in question;
 - v. to meet such other reasonable conditions considered desirable for protecting the integrity and value of the University of Alberta degree or other accreditations.
- c. The secondary sanctions that must be applied, as part of academic integrity conditions, are any of the sanctions set out in this Schedule.
- d. Where the secondary sanction is outside of the Faculty Decision-maker's authority, as set out in section 6d of the Policy, the FDM must refer the issue of sanction to the Student Conduct Officer with a recommendation.
- e. Academic integrity conditions will specify who has the responsibility to ensure compliance with the terms and to certify, when and as necessary, that the conditions have been met to a reasonable standard of performance, or have been breached.
- f. Any appeal of the academic integrity conditions, including the secondary sanction, must be made at the time the initial sanction is imposed and within the time limits set out in the *Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure*. If the conditions are not met, no further appeal is available when the secondary sanction is imposed.
- g. The details of any academic integrity conditions will be kept in the student's Academic Integrity History according to the established record retention schedule.
- h. Any subsequent conduct that constitutes a breach of the prescribed academic integrity conditions during the defined period may lead to additional proceedings under this policy.

3. Grade Sanctions

- a. Marks for an assessment(s) or the grade for a course may be reduced as a sanction for **Academic Misconduct**. The final grade may or may not be accompanied by a **transcript** notation indicating Inappropriate Academic

Behaviour. The student's grade in the course or grade point average (GPA) may, as a consequence, be substantially reduced.

- b. A grade of F for graded courses or NC for non-graded courses may be assigned as a sanction for Inappropriate Academic Behaviour. The grade may or may not be accompanied by a remark, indicating Inappropriate Academic Behaviour.
- c. Grade reductions and a grade of F resulting from discipline decisions will be calculated into the student's GPA. Mark reductions, reductions in final course grades and a grade of F may result in a student being required to withdraw from their program.
- d. The transcript notation indicating Inappropriate Academic Behaviour will remain on the student's transcript for a period of 2 years from the end date of the term for the relevant course. After that time, the notation is removed. The following notations apply:
 - i. '8' for undergraduate students, or for graduate students where the resulting grade is a passing grade
 - ii. '9' for graduate students where the resulting grade is a failing grade
- e. Any documentation relating to grade changes resulting from a sanction under this policy may be retained in the academic file.

4. Refusal to Consider Applications

- a. The university may refuse to consider applications for admission to the university for a specified time period or indefinitely.
- b. Where a sanction of refusal to consider applications has been imposed, it will be noted as a **negative service indicator** on the student's **central academic record** until the sanction expires.
- c. When a refusal to consider applications is for an indefinite period of time, the student may, after no less than five years have elapsed, petition to the **Provost** to be reconsidered for admission. The petition must include a description, with supporting evidence, of how circumstances have changed since the original decision was made. On receiving the request, the Provost will consult with the Student Conduct Officer and the Registrar's Office. The decision is final and not subject to appeal.

5. Rescission of Admission Offer

- a. Rescission of any current offer of admission received by the applicant, whether

conditional or final, and cancellation of any registration. This sanction may only be imposed for application-related offences.

6. Suspension from Academic Program

- a. Suspension is a complete withdrawal from the university, the student's program in the university, and all university activities for a specified period of time, to a maximum of three years.
- b. Suspension will be noted on the student's central academic record, transcript, and in the student's academic file held by the faculty in which the student is enrolled during the period of the suspension. At the discretion of the Student Conduct Officer, the suspension may be noted on the transcript for a further period of up to three years after the end of the suspension.
- c. The student will receive credit for any course passed before the effective date of the suspension.
- d. Withdrawals resulting from a decision of suspension will show as grades of "W" on the student's transcript and will remain part of the central academic record.
- e. A student will be withdrawn from all courses as of the date of a suspension; the fee refund dates outlined in the *University Calendar* will apply.
- f. A student who has been suspended for less than 12 months will be permitted to re-enroll in the program from which they were suspended provided they have not been required to withdraw in accordance with the Faculty's published Academic Standing regulations.
- g. If the suspension is for 12 months or more, the student must apply for readmission to the university. Refer to the *University Calendar* for more information on admission and readmission.
- h. Any course work completed at any institution during the period of suspension will not be accepted as credit towards a student's degree or other accreditation, or for admission to a program, or other certification at this university.

7. Expulsion

- a. Expulsion is a complete withdrawal from the university for an indefinite period of time.
- b. Expulsion will be noted in the student's academic file in the Faculty in which they are registered, as a negative service indicator in the student's central academic record and on the student's transcript in perpetuity.

- c. The student will receive credit for any course passed before the effective date of the expulsion. Withdrawals resulting from a decision of expulsion will show as grades of "W" on the student's transcript and will remain part of their central academic record.
- d. A student will be withdrawn from all courses as of the date of expulsion; the fee refund dates outlined in the *University Calendar* will apply.
- e. The student may, after no less than four years have elapsed, petition the Provost for permission to apply for admission. On receiving the request, the Provost will consult with the Student Conduct Officer and the Faculty/College from which the student was expelled and the Faculty/College to which the student seeks admission. In addition, the Provost may require the student to support their petition with written submissions and evidence. The Provost's decision is final and not subject to appeal.
- f. Any course work completed at any institution during the period of expulsion will not be accepted as credit towards a student's degree or other accreditation, or for admission to a program, or any other certification at the University of Alberta.

8. Suspension of a Degree

- a. Upon suspension of a degree the original award of a degree will be removed from the student's central academic record and the transcript will show that the degree has been suspended until the student meets the requirements of the university to clear the suspension.
- b. If at the end of the time specified by a discipline decision, the student has met the requirements of the Student Conduct Officer or the Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Panel to clear the suspension, the original award will be restored to the student's central academic record with the original date. The record of the suspension will be removed from the transcript.
- c. If, at the end of the time specified in a discipline decision, the student has not met the requirements of the Student Conduct Officer or the Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Panel to clear the suspension, the record of the suspension of the degree will not be removed. The original award will remain perpetually deleted from the student's central academic record.

9. Rescission of a Degree

- a. Rescission of a degree means that the original award of a degree will be perpetually deleted from the student's central academic record. The student's transcript will indicate that the degree has been rescinded.

- b. The Student Conduct Officer may recommend to the Provost that the university publish notification of the rescission of the degree. In the case of a professional degree, this would include notification to the appropriate professional body. The Provost's decision to act on this recommendation shall be deferred until an appeal is heard and decided. The Provost's decision is final and not subject to appeal.

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use.		[▲Top]
Academic Integrity History	The records related to the academic integrity proceedings undertaken in relation to a student, including but not limited to, any non-disciplinary actions and/or assignments and their outcomes, any violations investigated, evidence collected and the findings, if any, of the decision-maker. Academic integrity history records are held electronically and are updated as cases progress through the process described in the <i>Student Academic Misconduct Procedure</i> and the <i>Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure</i> .	
Academic misconduct	Prohibited conduct as set out in Appendix A of the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> .	
Central academic record	A continuing record maintained by the Office of the Registrar, where all matters relating to courses, grades, and academic standing and probation are permanently recorded. Transitory notations, such as service indicators are also noted in the central academic record while they are in effect.	
Negative service indicator	A transitory notation that can be placed on a student's central academic record during the period it is in effect. Service indicators assist staff in the provision or restriction of services but do not appear on a transcript. Negative service indicators can be used for financial, disciplinary or other extraordinary matters. Examples include, but are not limited to: refusal to consider applications, suspension, and expulsion.	
Provost	Provost and Vice-President (Academic) or delegate.	
Transcript	A student's official academic record issued by the Office of the	

	<p>Registrar and bearing the signature of the Registrar. Information for the transcript is drawn from the central academic record. Information included on the University of Alberta transcript is found in the University Calendar.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

RELATED FRAMEWORKS, PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca	[▲Top]
<p><i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> <i>Student Academic Misconduct Procedure</i> <i>Student Academic Misconduct Appeal Procedure</i> <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy Appendix A: Academic Misconduct</i></p>	

RELATED LINKS

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca	[▲Top]
<p>Sources of on-campus assistance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Office of the Dean of Students ● Office of the Student Ombuds ● Student Legal Services ● Students' Union (SU) ● Graduate Students' Association (GSA) ● l'Association des Universitaires de la Faculté Saint-Jean (AUFSJ) ● Augustana Students' Association ● First Peoples House ● Academic Success Centre <p>Other conduct policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Discrimination, Harassment and Duty to Accommodate Policy ● Information Technology Use and Management Policy ● Practicum Intervention Policy ● Protocol for Urgent Cases of Violent, Threatening or Disruptive Behaviour ● Residence Community Standards ● Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Policy ● Student Groups Procedure 	

Information

- [University Calendar](#)
- [Electronic Communication Policy for Students and Applicants](#)

Decision Discussion Information

ITEM OBJECTIVE: Approval of a new exam rescheduling procedure

DATE	April 29, 2024
TO	General Faculties Council
RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO	Provost & Vice-President (Academic)

Motion: THAT the General Faculties Council approve the proposed UAPPOL Exam Rescheduling Procedure, as set forth in [Attachment 1](#), to take effect September 3, 2024.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Background

The approval of the 2024-2025 Academic Schedule required a shift to a new exam scheduling model. To accommodate 63 teaching days per term while maintaining the current number of non-instructional days, we will now schedule three final exams per day, an increase from the practice of two per day. This change will be effective in the Fall 2024 term.

The move to three daily final exams aligns us with the practices of nearly all U15 institutions. This adjustment offers several advantages:

- The final exam period will conclude 1-4 days sooner.
- We will have additional capacity to hold consolidated final exams.
- It expands our capacity to schedule final exams and accommodate growing student enrollments.

To complement the transition to three final exams per day, we are implementing a new procedure designed to support students who are scheduled to write three exams in four consecutive time slots.

Recognizing the potential difficulty of this situation, we will offer students the opportunity to request a rescheduling of one of their exams.

This procedure is designed to ensure that all students have a fair chance to perform at their best during the examinations.

Next Steps

A robust communications plan is being developed to inform students, instructors, and faculties about the new exam scheduling practices and the exam rescheduling procedure.

Attachments

GOVERNANCE OUTLINE

ITEM NO. 5

Attachment 1: Exam Rescheduling Procedure (UAPPOL) (April 17, 2024)

SCHEDULE A:**Engagement and Routing**

Consultation and Stakeholder Participation / Approval Route (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity) <[Governance Resources Section Student Participation Protocol](#)>

Those who are actively participating:

- Office of the Registrar

Those who have been consulted:

- Consultation with Program Support Team, February 29.
- Consultation with Committee on Student Affairs (COSA), March 21.
- Consultation with Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE), March 27.
- Consultation with GFC Executive, April 8.
- Dean of Students
- Office of Education in each college.
- Students' Union
- Program Support Team
- Committee on the Learning Environment
- GFC Executive Committee
- Office of the Provost

Those who have been informed:

- Advisory Committee on Enrolment Management

Approval Route:

- Committee on the Learning Environment, April 24, 2024, for recommendation.
- General Faculties Council, April 29, 2024, for final approval.

Supplementary Notes / Context:

At the April 24, 2024 meeting of CLE, members recommended that the General Faculties Council approve the proposed exam rescheduling procedure. The Committee recognized the need for this procedure and appreciated the ways instructor and students perspectives have been incorporated.

During their deliberations, committee members expressed concerns about the responsibility of instructors to invigilate exams. The following considerations were expressed:

- the instructor might be "unable" to invigilate;
- the role of the faculty, teaching unit, or program in supporting the rescheduling process should be considered; and
- whether invigilation was the responsibility of the instructor.

Given these considerations, CLE:



ITEM NO. 5

- recommended thoughtful communication about these changes with care and attention to the impact on students and instructors;
- endorsed the commitment from the Office of the Registrar to evaluate implementation using data collected from both students and instructors across faculties; and
- asked to receive an update on implementation in the coming year.

Original Approval Date: -
 Most Recent Approval: -
 Most Recent Editorial Date: -
 Parent Policy: [Academic Schedule Policy](#)

Exam Rescheduling Procedure

Office of Administrative Responsibility:	Office of the Registrar
Approver:	Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Scope:	Compliance with this University procedure extends to all academic, support and excluded staff, and academic colleagues as outlined and defined in the Recruitment Policy (Appendix A and Appendix B:Definitions and Categories), undergraduate and graduate students and post-doctoral fellows.

OVERVIEW

The Office of the Registrar recommends on the Academic Schedule to the GFC Executive Committee who approves it. In order to ensure 63 teaching days and schedule final exams within the approved two-week examination period, the Office of the Registrar schedules three final exams per day in that period. Pursuant to subsection 26(1)(e) of the Post-secondary learning Act, General Faculties Council may make decisions as to the conduct of examinations. GFC has set out the following procedure to provide guidelines for students who are scheduled to write three or more final exams within four consecutive time slots, outlining how they can request to have one of these exams rescheduled to a different date and time.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this procedure is to establish the eligibility criteria, application process, and guidelines for rescheduling a final exam when a student is scheduled to write three exams in four consecutive time slots.

PROCEDURE

This procedure is applicable only to final examinations scheduled within the **term's** official final exam period (as defined in the **Academic Schedule**).

1. The University holds three final exams per day during the final exam period, including 8:30 a.m., 1:00 p.m., and 5:30 p.m. When a student is scheduled to write three (3) or more final examinations within four consecutive time slots, they are eligible to request rescheduling of one of the exams.

For example, a student is eligible if they are scheduled to write one exam at 8:30 a.m. and one exam at 5:30 p.m. on one day, and another exam at 8:30 a.m. the next day.

A student is not eligible if they are scheduled to write one exam at 8:30 a.m. and one exam at 5:30 p.m. on one day, and another exam at 1:00 p.m. the next day.

2. Efforts will be made to hold rescheduled exams no later than December 22 in the Fall Term and April 30 in the Winter Term. However, in some cases, exams may be rescheduled beyond the end of the Final Exam period. Reasons may include, but are not limited to: using a faculty's pre-established common deferred exam date for the purpose of rescheduled exams and constraints such as exam venue availability or instructor availability.
3. Students who are eligible to reschedule an exam may submit their application through Bear Tracks. Applications for rescheduling in the Fall Term must be received by mid-November, and by mid-March for the Winter Term (specific dates will be provided in the University's Academic Schedule). Opting to reschedule an exam is discretionary; students retain the option to write all three exams at their initially scheduled times.
4. The Office of the Registrar will review and approve or deny applications based on the student's final exam schedule.
5. Students may select which eligible exam they wish to reschedule and submit their request to the Office of the Registrar. The Office of the Registrar will select a new date, time, and venue for the rescheduled exam, and inform the instructor. If the instructor is unable to invigilate the exam during the new date/time, they may select a different day/time and inform the Office of the Registrar no later than two weeks before the final exam period begins. Rescheduled exam dates, times, and locations will be made available for students in Bear Tracks at least two weeks before the commencement of the official examination period.
6. If a student's rescheduled exams lead to another instance of three exams within four consecutive time slots, or an exam conflict, the Office of the Registrar and the instructor will work with the student to make alternate arrangements.

7. If a student has an approved exam accommodation, they must work with the Academic Success Centre to make arrangements for their rescheduled exam.
8. The course instructor is responsible for invigilating the rescheduled exam. Should the instructor be unable to perform this role, the respective teaching department or faculty will appoint an alternative invigilator. The invigilator's duties include providing the exam papers, overseeing the exam session, and collecting the completed papers at the end of the exam.
9. If a student misses their rescheduled final exam and is eligible for a deferred exam (see [Absence from Final Exams](#) in the University Calendar), they must follow all established policies and procedures related to exam deferrals. (See [Deferred Final Exams](#) in the University Calendar).

DEFINITIONS

Any definitions listed in the following table apply to this document only with no implied or intended institution-wide use. [▲Top]	
Term	The Academic Year is divided into four (4) (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer) terms for the purposes of registration and the scheduling of classes and examinations.
Academic Schedule	The Academic Schedule is the listing of important dates and deadlines for the University of Alberta, and is published in the University Calendar each year.

RELATED POLICIES, FRAMEWORKS, AND PROCEDURES

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca [▲Top]
Academic Schedule Policy

RELATED LINKS

If any links are broken, please contact uappol@ualberta.ca [▲Top]
Absence from Final Exams Deferred Final Exams



Decision **Discussion** **Information**

ITEM OBJECTIVE: TO approve:

1. proposed revisions to:
 - (a) the GFC Academic Planning Committee (the “**APC**”) Terms of Reference (the “**Revised APC ToR**”) stemming from the work of the GFC Executive Governance and Procedural Oversight Committee (the “**GPO**”);
 - (b) the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment (the “**CLE**”) Terms of Reference (the “**Revised CLE ToR**”) stemming from the work of GPO; and
 - (c) the GFC Programs Committee (the “**PC**”) Terms of Reference (the “**Revised PC ToR**”) and together with the Revised APC ToR and the Revised CLE ToR, the “**Revised ToRs**”) stemming from the work of GPO;
2. the dissolution of:
 - (a) the GFC Facilities Development Committee (the “**FDC**”) as a result of the approval of the Revised APC ToR and further to a tabled motion proposing such an action; and
 - (b) the GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee (the “**SCPC**”) as a result of the approval of the Revised CLE ToR.

DATE	April 29, 2024
TO	General Faculties Council
RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO	General Faculties Council (GFC)

MOTION 1: THAT the General Faculties Council approve the proposed revisions to the GFC Academic Planning Committee Terms of Reference as set forth in Attachment 1, to take effect upon approval.

MOTION 2: THAT the General Faculties Council take the following motion, dated June 6, 2022, from the table:

*“THAT the General Faculties Council approve the proposed changes to the terms of reference for the GFC Academic Planning Committee, as set forth in attachment 1, and the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment, as set forth in attachment 2, and the concurrent disbanding of the GFC Facilities Development Committee, all to take effect on July 1, 2022.” (the “**2022 Motion**”)*

MOTION 2A: THAT the General Faculties council amend the 2022 Motion to read as follows:



ITEM NO. 8

"THAT the General Faculties Council approve the disbanding of the GFC Facilities Development Committee, to take effect upon approval."

MOTION 3: THAT the General Faculties Council approve the proposed revisions to the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment Terms of Reference as set forth in Attachment 2, to take effect upon approval.

MOTION 4: THAT the General Faculties Council approve the dissolution of the GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee as a result of the approval of the Revised GFC Committee on the Learning Environment Terms of Reference as set forth in Attachment 2, to take effect upon approval.

MOTION 5: THAT the General Faculties Council approve of the proposed revisions to the GFC Programs Committee Terms of Reference as set forth in Attachment 3, to take effect upon approval.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

GFC has committed to reviewing each of its standing committee's Terms of Reference on a three year cycle. The Revised ToRs have been drafted using a template that articulates decision-making authority in relation to the powers, functions, and duties as set out in the *Post-secondary Learning Act* (Alberta) (the "PSLA").

1. Revised APC ToR

The Revised APC ToR has focussed on:

- (a) aligning the committee's delegated authority with power, duties and functions held by the GFC and set out in the PSLA (primarily Sections 19 and 26),
- (b) removing words, terms and provisions from APC's current terms of reference that are unnecessary for the committee or outside of the GFC's scope of authority, and
- (c) updates and additions to the definitions for the terms of reference (as necessary or appropriate).

The objective is to enhance decision making by making explicit the authority delegated to the committee by GFC and through precise definitions of terms.

The Revised APC ToR include changes to the committee composition, removal of responsibilities that are outside APC's scope of authority, and the addition of new authority in alignment with the committee's mandate.

Changes to delegated authority

GOVERNANCE OUTLINE



ITEM NO. 8

The current APC terms of reference give APC the authority to approve name changes to departments and divisions, to recommend to GFC on name changes of faculties, and to receive for information name changes to units on campus. These three responsibilities have been removed because the PSLA does not confer upon GFC the power to approve name changes to departments and divisions, or faculty names, and because GFC cannot compel administration to report them. It is therefore not a power GFC can delegate to APC and has been omitted from the Revised APC ToR.

The Revised APC ToR clarify the delegated authority to APC over budget matters as the PSLA expressly provides that GFC has the authority to make recommendations to the Board of Governors (the “**Board**”) with respect to, among other things, the budget. However, the authority to make recommendations on fees to be levied upon a “substantial group of students” has been removed as this power is within the Board’s authority.

The Revised APC ToR clarifies authority over facilities and contemplates new authority to have APC review and approve proposed General Space Programs for academic units. Currently, this power is within FDC’s scope of authority. In addition to the foregoing, the Revised APC ToR contemplates that APC will consider:

1. the Long Range Development Plan (with regards to subsections 19(b) and (c) of the PSLA);
2. the planning and use of physical facilities, and
3. the use of land owned by or leased to the University.

Currently, FDC is responsible for making recommendations to APC concerning policy matters with respect to the foregoing.

2. Dissolution of FDC

The 2022 Motion included proposed changes to the APC Terms of Reference and the Terms of Reference for the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment. Members discussed the cancellation of FDC meetings, the difficulties in constituting and situating committees that had very little work to do, the importance of GFC weighing in on facilities related matters, and the authority of the Office of the Vice-President (Facilities and Operations) related to space management.

GFC members debated a proposed amendment to the motion and there was a significant amount of uncertainty expressed by members so the [decision was made to table the item](#).

If Motion 1 is approved, the Revised APC ToR would leave FDC with the limited scope of responsibility to make recommendations to the APC concerning policy matters with respect to the matters set out in [sections 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 in its Terms of Reference](#).

It is proposed that FDC does not need to serve this role and the committee can be dissolved as contemplated in the 2022 Motion.

3. Revised CLE ToR



ITEM NO. 8

CLE has delegated authority from GFC to review policies on student evaluation of teaching and assessment policies. The Revised CLE ToR seek to:

- (a) more closely connect the committee's authority to the PSLA;
- (b) provide clear definitions of authority over assessment;
- (c) subsume delegated authority over the supervision of students affairs currently held by the Student Conduct and Policy Committee; and
- (d) make requisite changes to committee composition in light of the foregoing.

Connecting with the PSLA

The Revised CLE ToR makes clear connections between the powers, functions, and duties assigned to GFC in the PSLA and the corresponding responsibilities delegated by GFC to CLE. Specifically:

1. GFC's authority over academic affairs has been delegated to CLE for the committee to make recommendations to GFC with respect to amendments to the Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy.
2. The authority of the committee to make recommendations on university-wide strategies for the learning environment is now connected to GFC's authority over academic and campus planning.
3. CLE's relationship to University Libraries is articulated in relation to GFC's authority to make rules and regulations for the management and operation of libraries.

Clearly connecting CLE's responsibilities to the powers, duties and functions conferred to GFC under the PSLA serves to better highlight the importance of the committee's work and clarifies the scope of its authority.

Authority over assessment

The current CLE terms of reference lack defined terms to differentiate between evaluation of teaching, assessment of student learning, and authority over regulation of evaluation and assessment. Proposals that are deemed "**substantial**" will continue to be approved by GFC, while minor and major proposals are delegated to the committee for approval.

To remedy this, a clear connection to the powers of faculty councils and GFC is established and defined terms with references to University regulations are articulated in definitions. In deference to the authority of faculty councils, approval of minor, faculty specific assessment regulations has been sub-delegated for approval by the Provost.

These changes clarify that determining regulations related to evaluation and examinations is foundational to the learning environment.

Addition of delegated authority over student affairs



ITEM NO. 8

The Student Conduct and Policy Committee (“**SCPC**”) currently holds delegated authority from GFC to set regulations for the University’s codes of student conduct and academic integrity. As the University shifts its approach to student discipline towards a focus on prevention and restorative justice, moving SCPC’s authority to CLE will ensure decision-making is holistic and takes into account a multifaceted learning environment. The additional authority led to a proposed name change for the committee, adding “**student affairs**”, or CLESA.

Many meetings of SCPC have been cancelled in the past five years presenting challenges for engagement of members and orientation. Integrating the delegated authority into the CLE will ensure more engaged decision making aligned with regulation on assessment and in consideration of the learning environment.

Currently, SCPC reviews changes to the Code of Student Behavior (“**COSB**”), the Code of Applicant Behaviour (“**COAB**”), and the Practicum Intervention Policy. The recently approved Residence Community Standards Policy and Student Conduct Policy and the forthcoming Student Academic Integrity Policy reduce the need for a stand-alone GFC committee devoted to regular review of the COAB and COSB.

Composition

In light of the additional authority on student affairs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Students and a representative from Student Residences, appointed by the Students’ Union will be added as *ex officio* members. The Associate Chair representative has been removed because these roles have been eliminated across the University. A seat formerly filled by a Vargo or other teaching award winner has been removed to keep committee size manageable. At the request of student members, the elected student representative from residence associations will be replaced by the UASU’s Vice-President (Student-Life). New resource members with expertise on student affairs and discipline will also be added.

4. Dissolution of SCPC

The University is shifting its student discipline approach towards prevention and restorative justice. The transferring of SCPC’s authority to CLE allows for more holistic decision-making, considering the learning environment. Many SCPC meetings were canceled in the past five years, hindering member engagement. Integrating authority into CLE will ensure aligned decision-making with regulations and learning environment considerations.

5. Revised PC ToR

The Revised PC ToR includes new definitions and interpretation to clarify authority and provide a framework for appropriate levels of scrutiny by GFC. PC’s role to recommend and approve regulations related to academic programs and online and continuing education programs is clarified. Proposed changes to sub-delegate authority are intended to streamline program approvals through deference to faculty council authority over programs of study and regulation



ITEM NO. 8

for admissions, transfer and academic standing. Changes to the committee composition align with GFC principles of committee composition and look to strengthen the link to GFC.

Definitions and interpretation

The Revised PC ToR includes 24 new definitions that help to clarify the scope of the committee's authority. Definitions clarify terms like "academic program" and "online and continuing education" and relate them to functions, duties and powers set out in the PSLA. A revised framework for interpretation allows for proposals to be qualified as "**minor**", "**major**" and "**substantial**" with major proposals stopping at PC and substantial proposals continuing on to GFC.

Additional delegated authority

The current terms of reference are silent on the role of PC to recommend and approve on regulatory frameworks that guide program development such as the Embedded Certificate Framework or the Non-Credit Programming Framework. The proposed revisions clarify that PC has delegated authority to approve regulation on academic programs and online and continuing education.

Sub Delegation of authority

Currently, PC reviews hundreds of reports of decisions made by Faculty Councils using power articulated in the PSLA and approves course and minor program regulation changes. Approval of a new sub-delegation to the Provost would mean that only proposals qualified as "major", meaning those that could be reasonably expected to lead to significant administrative and/or academic impacts on the proposing Faculty or other Faculties or the University, would require PC approval. This change demonstrates deference to Faculty Councils authority who are best placed to determine their courses and minor program regulation changes.

The PC has already sub-delegated authority to the Vice-Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies to approve graduate second-level specialisations. These are academic programs that fall under graduate first-level specialisations in each discipline, providing an additional level of focus. The proposed changes include an equivalent sub-delegation for undergraduate second-level specialisations. Revisions to language outlining limitations on delegated authority clarify that, notwithstanding an approved sub-delegation for approval by the Provost, GFC has retained authority to approve substantial proposals related to the creation, modification or suspension and/or termination of Academic Programs.

Together, these changes will increase efficiency of decision making by PC and by GFC.

Composition

The proposed removal of three appointed academic administrators from stand-alone faculties reflects the approved Principles of GFC Committee Composition which state that wherever possible, the majority of elected members of each standing committee should be drawn from the membership of GFC to provide tangible links between GFC and its standing committees. In



ITEM NO. 8

addition, because the majority of appointees have been academic administrators, ex officio perspectives have outweighed those of elected GFC representatives.

Supporting Materials:

- [GFC Facilities Development Committee Terms of Reference](#)
- [GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee Terms of Reference](#)

Attachments

1. GFC APC ToR
2. GFC CLESA ToR
3. GFC PC ToR



SCHEDULE A:

Engagement and Routing

Consultation and Stakeholder Participation / Approval Route (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity) <[Governance Resources Section Student Participation Protocol](#)>

APC ToR Engagement and Consultation

Those who are actively participating:

- GPO - Apr 4, 2022, Jan 23, 2023, October 23, 2023, November 27, 2023, January 22, 2024, February 5, 2024, March 4, 2024

Those who have been consulted:

- Academic Planning Committee - September 14, 2022

Those who have been informed:

- The Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
- The Office of the Vice-President (Research and Innovation)
- The Office of the Vice-President (Facilities and Operations)

Approval Route:

GFC Executive Committee (for recommendation)
GFC (for approval)

CLE ToR Engagement and Consultation

Those who are actively participating:

- GFC - March 18, 2024
- EXEC - March 11, 2024
- Email Consultation with SCPC and CLE
- GPO - January 23, 2023, October 23, 2023, January 22, 2024, February 5, 2024, March 4, 2024
- CLE - March 30, 2022, February 8, 2023, March 27, 2024
- SCPC - January 24, 2022, February 7, 2022, email consultation March 2024

Those who have been consulted:

- The Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
- The Office of the Vice-Provost and University Registrar



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vice-Provost (Learning Initiative) • The Vice-Provost and Chief Librarian • The Office of the Dean of Students • The Chair of SCPC • The Chair of CLE • Student Conduct Officer (Discipline Officer) • Appeals and Compliance Officer • The Office of the Student Ombuds
<p><u>Those who have been informed:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeals Coordinator • Director of the University of Alberta Protective Services • Assistant Dean of Students (Residence) • Office of the Student Ombuds • Vice-Provost and Dean of Students
<p><u>Approval Route:</u></p> <p>GFC Executive Committee (for recommendation) GFC (for approval)</p>

<p><u>PC ToR Engagement and Consultation</u></p>
<p><u>Those who are actively participating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GPO - October 23, 2023, January 22, 2024, February 5, 2024, March 4, 2024
<p><u>Those who have been consulted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) • The Office of the Vice-Provost and Dean (FGPS) • The Office of the Vice-Provost and University Registrar • The Office of the Senate and Chancellor • Deans and Appointed Members from Campus Saint-Jean, Native Studies, Augustana Campus • Graduate Program Support Team • Program Support Team • GFC PC (March 14, 2024; September 14, 2024; March 14, 2024)
<p><u>Those who have been informed:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Calendar Community
<p><u>Approval Route:</u></p> <p>GFC Executive Committee (for recommendation)</p>



GFC (for approval)

Supplementary Notes / Context:



1. Purpose of the Committee

The purpose of the General Faculties Council (“**GFC**”) Academic Planning Committee (the “**Committee**”) is to consider certain academic planning matters for the University, make certain decisions related to the academic affairs of the University and make recommendations to GFC with respect to academic planning.

2. Delegated Authority from GFC

In furtherance of the purpose of the Committee, and as permitted by the PSLA, GFC has delegated to the Committee the following powers, duties and functions:

2.1. Academic Planning - PSLA s. 26(1)

GFC is responsible for the academic affairs of the University and, pursuant to subsection 26(1)(o) of the PSLA, can make recommendations to the board of governors of the University (the “**Board**”) with respect to academic planning. GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to:

- (a) consider and, if deemed appropriate, advise GFC as to recommendations to be made by GFC to the Board concerning academic planning, including:
 - (i) specific goals and priorities for:
 - 1. internationalisation;
 - 2. Indigenous initiatives;
 - 3. information technology;
 - 4. equity, diversity and inclusion;
 - (ii) trends revealed or disclosed in quality assurance reports of Academic programs and/or Academic Units;
- (b) receive and discuss reviews of Academic Units and Academic Service Units; and
- (c) receive, discuss, and provide feedback on processes for quality assurance of Academic Units and Academic Service Units.

2.2. Academic Awards - PSLA s. 26(1)(m)

Pursuant to subsection 26(1)(m) of the PSLA, GFC has the authority to make rules and regulations respecting academic awards. GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to:

- (a) consider and advise GFC as to recommendations to be made by GFC to the Board on policies concerning awards, subject to paragraph 4.2, below;
- (b) regularly review policies on awards and bursaries and to make recommendations to GFC as to changes to the same where required; and

- (c) regularly consider reports on student financial supports for the purpose of identifying trends and gaps in the financial supports available to students of the University.

2.3. Affiliations, Academic Planning & Budget - PSLA s. 26(1)(o)

Pursuant to subsection 26(1)(o) of the PSLA, GFC can make recommendations to the Board with respect to affiliations with other institutions, academic planning, the budget, and any other matters considered by GFC to be of interest to the University.

(a) Academic Centres and Institutes

GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to:

- (i) consider and advise GFC as to recommendations to be made by GFC to the Board on new policy and procedures concerning Academic Centres or Institutes;
- (ii) approve the establishment of Academic Centres or Institutes;
- (iii) receive notifications of the suspension or termination of Academic Centres or Institutes from the Vice-President (Research and Innovation) following consultation with the relevant Dean(s), and to report these suspensions and/or terminations to GFC; and
- (iv) receive, discuss and provide feedback on the Academic Centres or Institutes Annual Report.

(b) Enrolment Management

Pursuant to subsection 60(1)(d)(i) of the PSLA, the Board is required to make and publish rules respecting the enrolment of students to take courses, programs of study or training provided by the Board. GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to:

- (i) consider and advise GFC as to:
 - 1. recommendations to be made by GFC to the Board on the Enrolment Management Policy;
 - 2. the approval of procedures concerning enrolment management;
- (ii) receive, discuss, and provide feedback on enrolment reports; and
- (iii) consider and, if deemed appropriate, make recommendations to GFC on enrolment management processes, subject to paragraph 4.4, below.



(c) Research

GFC has delegated to the Committee the function of:

- (i) considering and advising GFC as to recommendations, if any, to be made by GFC to the Board on:
 - 1. new research policies and revisions to existing research policies;
 - 2. research initiatives; and
- (ii) receiving, discussing, and providing feedback on research performance summaries.

(d) Budget

GFC has delegated to the Committee:

- (i) the power to make recommendations to the Board with respect to:
 - 1. the academic and research implications of the University's annual budget, excluding budgets for Ancillary Units;
 - 2. University budget principles;
 - 3. new resources required in proposals for the establishment of Academic Units, Faculties, Schools, Departments, Academic Programs and Chairs; and
- (ii) the function of receiving and discussing matters regarding tuition and fees for consideration or advice, subject to paragraph 4.5, below.

2.4. Facilities - PSLA s. 19

Pursuant to section 19 of the PSLA, the Board is obligated to consider the recommendations of GFC, if any, on matters of academic import prior to the Board providing for, among other things:

- (a) the support and maintenance of the University;
- (b) the betterment of existing buildings;
- (c) the construction of any new buildings the Board considers necessary for the purposes of the University; and/or
- (d) the furnishing and equipping of the existing and newly erected buildings.

GFC has delegated to the Committee the power to consider and, if deemed appropriate, prepare recommendations to the Board on matters of academic import prior to the Board providing for anything set out in subparagraphs 2.4(a) through (d) above.



In considering and preparing recommendations to the Board as contemplated above, it is expected that the Committee will consider, among other things:

- (e) the Long Range Development Plan (with regards to subsections 19(b) and (c) of the PSLA);
- (f) planning and use of Academic Physical Facilities; and
- (g) the use of land owned by or leased to the University as contemplated in subsection 121(2) of the PSLA, which includes, but is not limited to, considerations with respect to any land proposed to be transferred to the University of Alberta Properties Trust.

2.5. Faculties, Schools, Departments and Chairs - PSLA ss. 26(1)(l) and 19(e)

Pursuant to subsection 26(1)(l) of the PSLA, GFC may recommend to the Board the establishment of Faculties, Schools, Departments and Chairs. Pursuant to subsection 19(e) of the PSLA, the Board must consider the recommendations of GFC, if any, on matters of academic import prior to providing for, among other things, the establishment of Faculties, Schools, Departments and Chairs. GFC has delegated to the Committee:

- (a) the function of considering and advising GFC as to recommendations to be made by GFC to the Board on matters of academic import relating to the establishment or closure of Faculties, Schools, Departments and/or Chairs; and
- (b) the authority to establish or terminate endowed and/or funded Chairs,

subject always to paragraph 4.1, below.

3. **Sub-delegated Authority from GFC**

In furtherance of the purpose of the Committee, GFC has sub-delegated to the Committee the following powers, duties and functions delegated to GFC by the Board:

3.1. General Space Programs

The power and duty to review and approve proposed General Space Programs for Academic Units.

(collectively, the powers, duties and functions set out in paragraphs 2.1 through and including 3.1 is the “**Delegated Authority**”)



4. Limitations on Delegated Authority

- 4.1. Recommendations made pursuant to paragraph 2.5 are subject to the Collective Agreement, and, specifically, Article A10 (Academic Reorganization) of the Collective Agreement. In the event there is a conflict or inconsistency between one or more recommendations made pursuant to paragraph 2.5 and the Collective Agreement, the terms of the Collective Agreement will prevail.
- 4.2. Recommendations made pursuant to subparagraph 2.2(a) are limited to policies on awards. The creation of new student financial supports and revisions to existing awards has been delegated to the Office of the Registrar for new undergraduate student financial supports and to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies for new graduate student financial supports.
- 4.3. Approvals made pursuant to subparagraph 2.3(a)(iv) are limited to Academic Centres or Institutes. Any affiliation agreements required for the creation of Academic Centres or Institutes will be entered into in the name of "The Governors of the University of Alberta" and will be executed in accordance with the Contract Review and Signing Authority Policy.
- 4.4. Recommendations pursuant to subparagraph 2.3(b)(iii) are limited to policy with respect to enrollment management. The Provost and Vice-President (Academic), as chief academic officer of the University, oversees all academic matters of a significant nature that have an impact on the University as a whole, and as such, is accountable for ensuring appropriate enrolment at the University.
- 4.5. The PSLA and the Tuition Regulation gives the Board full authority to approve tuition and fees at the University. In rendering advice under subparagraph 2.3(d)(ii), APC may consider the fact that GFC may make recommendations on any matter it considers to be of interest to the University, including tuition and fees.

5. Reporting Obligation(s)

A written report will be put before GFC by the Committee at each regularly scheduled meeting of GFC, which shall summarise the activities and decisions of the Committee since the last meeting of GFC.

6. Composition of the Committee

Voting Members (18)

Chair (1)

- Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

Ex-officio (5)

- Vice-President (Research and Innovation)
- Vice-President (University Services and Finance)
- Vice-Provost and University Registrar
- President, Students' Union
- President, Graduate Students' Association



Elected by GFC (12)

- 7 Academic Staff from Category A elected by GFC, at least five of which are Elected Academic Staff members of GFC. One member, ideally a member of GFC, will be elected by the committee to serve as Vice-Chair
- 1 Faculty Dean
- 1 Department Chair-at-large
- 1 Non-Academic staff member from at-large (S1.0, S2.0)
- 1 undergraduate student from at-large
- 1 graduate student from GFC

Non-Voting Members

- University Secretary
- GFC Secretary

The Committee may, in its sole discretion, and at any time, appoint one additional member to the Committee where the Committee is of the opinion that such additional member will bring a particular perspective, expertise and/or knowledge to the Committee that will serve to enhance its work. The procedure for such an appointment is within the discretion of the Committee, provided that the procedure is demonstrably fair and transparent.

7. Definitions and Interpretation

7.1. In these Terms of Reference, and in addition to terms otherwise defined in these Terms of Reference, the following terms have the following meanings:

- (a) **“Academic Centre or Institute”** means an academic centre or institute that exists at the University and is controlled by the University, and, for greater certainty:
 - (i) an academic centre or institute may exist solely within the University or may be created by one or more partnerships between the University and one or more entity or entities; and
 - (ii) such other entity or entities may include other universities, governments, public authorities (such as health authorities), and/or non-profit organizations;
- (b) **“Academic Physical Facilities”** means facilities that primarily support the University’s teaching, learning, and research activities;
- (c) **“Academic Program”** means a group of credit Courses that, on completion, leads to the granting of a degree, diploma or certificate, along with their associated Course Designators;
- (d) **“Academic Staff”** has the meaning set out in the [Recruitment Policy \(Appendix A\) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff, Administrators and Colleagues](#) as filed and located in UAPPOL;



- (e) **“Academic Units”** include Faculties, Departments, and Schools;
- (f) **“Academic Service Units”** means administrative units of the University that have an academic impact on the University, exclusive of Ancillary Units (including Colleges);
- (g) **“Ancillary Units”** means self-funded business units of the University that must generate sufficient revenue to (i) cover all of their respective operational costs and fund deferred maintenance; (ii) minimize future maintenance costs, and (iii) cover long-term capital investments;
- (h) **“Awards and Bursaries”** has the meaning set out in the [Student Financial Support Policy](#), as filed and located in UAPPOL;
- (i) **“Academic Centres and Institutes Annual Report”** means the Centres and Institutes Annual Report as drafted by the Centres and Institutes Committee;
- (j) **“Chairs”** refers to academic entities that may include professorships, lectureships and fellowships, established for the purpose of teaching and research;
- (k) **“Collective Agreement”** means the then-current collective agreement between the University and the Association of the Academic Staff of the University of Alberta;
- (l) **“Department”** means an academic department established within a Faculty and which is empowered to determine such policy as may come within its purview by delegation of a faculty council subject to the policies and regulations of the University;
- (m) **“Enrolment Management Policy”** means that certain policy suite filed and located in UAPPOL, as may be amended from time to time, that articulates the University’s approach to managing institutional enrolment, including enrolment targets, in alignment with short and long-term objectives;
- (n) **“Faculty”** means a division of the University governed by a faculty council that is entitled, among other things, to determine the Academic Programs for which the faculty is established;
- (o) **“Long Range Development Plan”** means the then-current long-range land use and development plan relating to land owned by or leased to the University, as required to be prepared by the Board pursuant to the PSLA;
- (p) **“Ministry”** means the Government of Alberta’s Ministry of Advanced Education, which is responsible for the adult learning system in the Province of Alberta;
- (q) **“PSLA”** means the *Post-secondary Learning Act* S.A. 2003, c. P-19.5, as may be amended from time to time;
- (r) **“Quality Assurance of Academic Units and Programs”** refers to the reviews administered in accordance with the guidelines set by the Campus Alberta Quality Council and by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic);



- (s) **“Research Policies”** includes the Animal Ethics Policy, the Human Research Ethics Policy, the Patent Policy, the Research and Scholarship Integrity Policy, and the Research Policy as the same are filed and located in UAPPOL;
- (t) **“School”** means: (i) a Faculty which, as a matter of common parlance at the University, is called a “school”; (ii) a Department that performs or is designed to perform the functions of a “school”; or (iii) an Academic Centre or Institute which holds the title of “school”;
- (u) **“Support Non-Academic staff”** are as defined in the [Recruitment Policy \(Appendix B\) Definition and Categories of Support Staff](#) as filed and located in UAPPOL;
- (v) **“Tuition Regulation”** means the *Tuition and Fees Regulation* Alta. Reg. 228/2018 promulgated under the PSLA and as may be amended from time to time; and
- (w) **“University”** means the University of Alberta, a comprehensive academic and research university continued under the PSLA and legally referred to as “The Governors of the University of Alberta”.

7.2. For the better understanding and interpretation of these Terms of Reference:

- (a) Article A10 of the Collective Agreement states: *“Academic planning, including but not limited to academic planning in accordance with the normal authority and procedures of GFC, may result in revisions to programs or restructuring of Departments or Faculties. For Academic planning which may result in the lay off of Academic Faculty members, the procedures of this Article A10 shall apply.”*
- (b) The Board has the authority to make regulations respecting the enrolment of students and considers recommendations from GFC in doing so. The Board has delegated to GFC the authority to approve procedures for enrolment management and hold the office of the Provost to account for approving enrolment plans.
- (c) A General Space Program describes the current state of an academic, research and/or administrative unit's activities in terms of their space needs, including student, staffing and support requirements. A space program includes a space budget that outlines how much space the unit has currently, how much it will require in the near future, and also predicts what amount of space may be required over a long-term planning period.
- (d) The word **“planning”** includes frameworks for campus and building design, development, and maintenance.
- (e) Words importing the singular number include the plural and *vice versa*.
- (f) The authority conferred upon GFC by virtue of subsection 26(1) of the PSLA is, in all respects, subject to the authority of the Board, and, where the context requires, these Terms of Reference shall be read with awareness and recognition of the foregoing.



8. Supplemental Information

[Centres and Institutes Policy](#)

[Creation of New Student Financial Supports Procedure](#)

[Graduate Student Financial Supports Procedure](#)

[Long Range Development Plan](#)

[Planning and Renovation of Existing Facilities Policy](#)

[Space Management Policy](#)

[Student Financial Supports Policy](#)

[Undergraduate Student Financial Supports Procedure](#)

DRAFT



1. Purpose of the Committee

The purpose of the General Faculties Council (“**GFC**”) Committee on the Learning Environment and Student Affairs (the “**Committee**”) is to consider matters related to the Learning Environment and student affairs and make decisions regarding Student Accountability.

2. Delegated Authority from GFC

In furtherance of the purpose of the Committee, and as permitted by the PSLA, GFC has delegated to the Committee the following powers, duties and functions:

2.1. Academic Affairs - PSLA s. 26(1)

GFC is responsible for the academic affairs of the University and, pursuant to subsection 26(1)(o) of the PSLA, can make recommendations to the Board with respect to the Learning Environment. GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to:

- (a) consider and, if deemed appropriate, advise GFC as to recommendations to be made by GFC to the Board concerning the Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy; and
- (b) approve revisions to and creation of procedures and appendices associated with the Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy.

2.2. Academic and Campus Planning - PSLA s. 19 and 26(1)(o)

GFC has the authority to make recommendations to the Board with respect to academic planning and campus planning. GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to consider and, as appropriate, advise GFC as to recommendations to be made by GFC to the Board on:

- (a) the Learning Environment;
- (b) University-wide strategies for learning and teaching; and
- (c) the furnishing and equipping of existing and newly erected buildings.

In addition, GFC has delegated to the Committee the responsibility to receive reports concerning:

- (d) pedagogy, teaching and learning; and
- (e) administrative units which support Teaching related activities.

2.3. Libraries - PSLA s. 26(1)(k)

Pursuant to subsection 26(1)(k) of the PSLA, GFC has the authority to make rules and regulations for the management and operation of libraries. GFC has delegated to the Committee the power and duty to:

-
- (a) consider and make recommendations to GFC as to regulations for the management and operations of libraries;
 - (b) receive annual reports concerning:
 - (i) University museums and collections; and
 - (ii) library services.

2.4. Evaluations and Examinations - PSLA s. 26(1)(e)

Pursuant to subsection 26(1)(e) of the PSLA, GFC has the authority to consider and make decisions on the reports of faculty councils as to the appointment of examiners and the conduct and results of examinations in the Faculties. GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to approve:

- (a) Evaluation Procedures and Examinations Regulations set out in the University Calendar or elsewhere; and/or
- (b) the Assessment and Grading Policy; and
- (c) Faculty-level policies and regulations for final examinations; and
- (d) receive, discuss, and provide feedback on reports related to evaluations and examinations.

2.5. Supervision of Student Affairs - PSLA s. 31(1)

Pursuant to subsection 31(1) of the PSLA, GFC has general supervision of student affairs at the University and in particular, but without restricting the generality of the foregoing, GFC may, subject to a right of appeal to the Board, discipline students attending the University. GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to approve recommended changes to policies and procedures for:

- (a) student conduct and student academic integrity;
- (b) conduct in student residences; and
- (c) practicum intervention.

In addition, GFC has delegated to the Committee the responsibility to:

- (d) receive, discuss, and provide feedback on reports concerning:
 - (i) student engagement, student educational experience, and support for teaching;

-
- (ii) the Office of the Student Ombuds;
 - (iii) student conduct and student academic integrity;
 - (iv) statistical summaries on cases of Student Accountability dealt with by:
 - (1) Faculties,
 - (2) the Student Conduct Officer,
 - (3) the Vice-Provost and University Registrar,
 - (4) the UAB,
 - (5) the SMAP,
 - (6) the AAC, and
 - (7) the PRB,
 - (8) residences

and forward such reports to GFC for information.

3. Limitations on Delegated Authority

3.1. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the following powers, duties and functions are expressly reserved by GFC and have not been delegated to the Committee as part of the Delegated Authority:

(a) All proposed amendments to the following are forwarded to GFC for recommendation to the Board for approval:

- (i) Section 11.8.9 of the COAB; and
- (ii) Sections 87.5 through and including 87.10 of the PIP.

(b) Substantial proposals related to Evaluation Procedures, Examinations Regulations or the Assessment and Grading Policy.

(c) Substantial proposals for changes to:

- (i) student conduct and student academic integrity;
- (ii) conduct in student residences; and
- (iii) practicum intervention.



3.2. Recommendations made pursuant to these Terms of Reference are subject, where applicable, to the Collective Agreement. In the event there is a conflict or inconsistency between one or more recommendations made pursuant to these Terms of Reference and the Collective Agreement, the terms of the Collective Agreement will prevail.

4. Sub-delegation of Authority

Pursuant to subsection 26(3) of the PSLA, GFC may prescribe conditions governing the exercise or performance of any delegated power, duty or function, including the power of subdelegation. GFC hereby authorizes the Committee to sub-delegate to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) of the University the approval of Minor changes to faculty-level policies and regulations for final examinations.

5. Reporting Obligation(s)

A written report will be put before GFC by the Committee at each regularly scheduled meeting of GFC, which shall summarise the activities and decisions of the Committee since the last meeting of GFC.

6. Composition of the Committee

Voting Members (19)

Chair (1)

- Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

Ex-officio (7)

- Vice-Provost and University Registrar
- Vice-Provost and Chief Librarian
- Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies
- Vice-Provost and Dean of Students
- Vice-President (Academic), Students' Union
- Vice-President (Student-life), Students' Union
- President, Graduate Students' Association

Elected by GFC (11)

- 4 academic staff from Category A from GFC – one of whom will be elected by the committee to serve as Vice Chair
- 1 academic teaching staff (A2.1, A2.2) from at-large
- 1 non-academic staff (S1.0, S2.0) from at-large
- 1 librarian from at-large
- 1 Chair
- 1 Faculty Dean
- 1 undergraduate student from at-large
- 1 graduate students from GFC



Non-Voting/Resource Members

- University Secretary
- GFC Secretary
- Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President and Chief Information Officer (Information Services and Technology)
- Executive Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning
- Manager, Student Conduct and Accountability
- Appeals and Compliance Coordinator as defined in policy
- Director of University of Alberta Protective Services
- Director, Residence Occupancy, Life, Education, and Services
- Representative from the Office of the Student Ombuds
- Lead, Sexual and Gender-based Violence Response

The Committee may, in its sole discretion, and at any time, appoint one additional member to the Committee where the Committee is of the opinion that such additional member will bring a particular perspective, expertise and/or knowledge to the Committee that will serve to enhance its work. The procedure for such an appointment is within the discretion of the Committee, provided that the procedure is demonstrably fair and transparent.

7. Definitions and Interpretation

7.1. In these Terms of Reference, and in addition to terms otherwise defined in these Terms of Reference, the following terms have the following meanings:

- (a) **“AAC”** means the Academic Appeals Committee, as established by GFC;
- (b) **“Academic Staff”** has the meaning set out in the [Recruitment Policy \(Appendix A\) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff, Administrators and Colleagues](#) as filed and located in UAPPOL;
- (c) **“Assessment and Grading Policy”** means the *Assessment and Grading Policy* as filed and located in UAPPOL;
- (d) **“Board”** means the board of governors of the University;
- (e) **“COAB”** means the *Code of Applicant Behaviour* as filed and published in the University Calendar;
- (f) **“COSB”** means the *Code of Student Behaviour* as filed and published in the University Calendar;
- (g) **“Collective Agreement”** means the then-current collective agreement between the University and the Association of the Academic Staff of the University of Alberta;



- (h) **"Discipline"** is as understood in the PSLA, and means:
 - (i) to fine a student of the University;
 - (ii) to suspend the right of a student to attend the University or to participate in student activities, or both; and/or
 - (iii) to expel a student from the University;
- (i) **"Evaluation Procedures"** means the regulations for evaluation and grading system weighting of term work, final examinations, course requirements, evaluations of students, requirements for course outlines, graduate examinations, as set out in the *University Calendar* and approved by GFC;
- (j) **"Examinations regulations"** means the procedures for the conduct of exams, term examinations, final examinations, notification of results, reexaminations, and deferred final exams as set out in the *University Calendar* and approved by GFC;
- (k) **"Faculty"** means a division of the University governed by a faculty council that is entitled, among other things, to determine the programs of study for which the faculty is established;
- (l) **"Learning Environment"** means Physical and virtual support systems including the:
 - (i) suitability of physical and virtual environments and use of education technology;
 - (ii) availability of teaching assistants, accessibility accommodations and other supports; and,
 - (iii) scheduling of course meeting times and/or online module availability;
- (m) **"PIP"** means the University's *Practicum Intervention Policy*;
- (n) **"PRB"** means the Practice Review Board, as prescribed within the PIP;
- (o) **"PSLA"** means the *Post-secondary Learning Act* S.A. 2003, c. P-19.5, as may be amended from time to time;
- (p) **"SAIP"** means the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*;
- (q) **"SCP"** means the *Student Conduct Policy*;
- (r) **"SMAP"** means the Student Misconduct Appeal Panel as prescribed within the Student Conduct Policy and the Student Academic Integrity Policy;



- (s) **“Student Accountability”** means the processes to hold students accountable for behaviour that is contravention of the SCP, SAIP, and the Residence and Community Standards and includes Discipline as defined by the PSLA.
- (t) **“Student Conduct Officer”** formerly known as the “Discipline Officer” means the role defined in the Student Conduct Policy and the SAIP and previously defined in the COSB for making decisions on student conduct appropriate sanctions;
- (u) **“Support Non-Academic staff”** are as defined in the [Recruitment Policy \(Appendix B\) Definition and Categories of Support Staff](#) as filed and located in UAPPOL;
- (v) **“Teaching and Learning Technologies”** means, collectively, communication, information and technological tools used to enhance learning, teaching and assessment at the University;
- (w) **“Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy”** means the GFC approved principles that will apply to teaching and learning and to the evaluation of teaching and learning at the University;
- (x) **“UAB”** means the University Appeal Board as prescribed within the COSB; and
- (y) **“University”** means the University of Alberta, a comprehensive academic and research university defined under the PSLA and legally referred to as “The Governors of the University of Alberta”.

7.2. For the better understanding and interpretation of these Terms of Reference:

- (a) proposals for recommended changes to Evaluations and Examinations, or others changes within the scope of the authority of the Committee, may be characterized as **Substantial**, **Major** or **Minor** in nature:
 - (i) a **“Substantial”** proposal:
 - (1) contemplates a significant change to existing practice, regulation and/or technology that could be expected to have an impact on students in one or more Facilities; or
 - (2) requires an assessment of reputational or academic risks to the University;
 - (ii) a **“Major”** proposal:
 - (1) contemplates significant modifications to substantive content; and/or
 - (2) requires the establishment of, or modifications to, regulatory content,

reasonably expected to lead to significant administrative and/or academic impacts on the proposing Faculty or other Faculties or the University;

- (iii) a “**Minor**” proposal:
- (1) contemplates minimal modifications to substantive content; and/or
 - (2) requires the establishment of, or modifications to, regulatory content,
- not reasonably expected to lead to significant administrative and/or academic impacts on the proposing Faculty or other Faculties or the University. If there is any dispute or question as to which of the above categories a proposal falls under, the GFC Executive Committee will decide.
- (b) As used in these Terms of Reference the term “**student**” has the meaning given to such term in the PSLA.
- (c) The term “**regulation**” includes rules, procedures, policies, standards, frameworks and other regulatory content approved by GFC and articulated in the University Calendar or UAPPOL policies.
- (d) Words importing the singular number include the plural and *vice versa*.
- (e) All references in these Terms of Reference to any legislation, rule, regulation or code shall be read inclusive of amendments, reenactments, consolidations or replacements to the same as may be made from time to time, and reference herein to a particular provision of any legislation, rule, regulation or code shall be read as referring to such amended, reenacted, consolidated or replaced provision.
- (f) Section 3.2 of these Terms of Reference is subject to the Board having delegated its power, duty and function to administer and adjudicate appeals of student discipline decisions. As of the date of approval of these Terms of Reference, the Board has delegated said power, duty and function to GFC in accordance with section 62 of the PSLA.
- (g) The authority conferred upon GFC by virtue of subsection 26(1) of the PSLA is, in all respects, subject to the authority of the Board, and, where the context requires, these Terms of Reference shall be read with awareness and recognition of the foregoing.

8. Supplemental Information

[Assessment and Grading Policy and Procedures](#)
[Academic Regulations](#) – University of Alberta Calendar
[Centre for Teaching and Learning](#)
[Code of Student Behaviour](#)
[Code of Applicant Behaviour Examination Regulations](#)



[Course Requirements, Evaluation Procedures and Grading](#) – University of Alberta Calendar
Framework for Effective Teaching (see the [Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy](#))
[Office of the Student Ombuds](#)
[Practicum Intervention Policy](#)
[Residence Community Standards Policy](#)
[Student Conduct Policy](#)
[Student Input to the Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Procedure](#)
[Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy](#)

DRAFT

1. Purpose of the Committee

The General Faculties Council (“GFC”) Programs Committee (the “Committee”) approves:

- (a) the creation, modification, suspension and/or termination of Academic Programs and Online and Continuing Education Programs; and
- (b) modifications to admissions, Transfer Credit, and Academic Standing regulations.

The Committee also provides oversight on regulatory matters related to its purpose.

2. Delegated Authority from GFC

In furtherance of the purpose of the Committee, and as permitted by the PSLA, GFC has delegated to the Committee the following powers, duties and functions:

2.1. Creation, Modification and Suspension and/or Termination of Academic Programs and Online and Continuing Education Programs - PSLA ss. 26(1)(a) and (b) and (c)

Pursuant to subsection 29(1)(a) of the PSLA, a Faculty council may determine the programs of study for which such Faculty is established, subject to any conditions or restrictions that are imposed by GFC. In addition, pursuant to subsection 26(1)(b) of the PSLA, GFC has the authority to consider and make decisions on the reports of the Faculty councils as to the programs of study in such Faculties. Subsection 26(1)(c) of the PSLA provides that GFC has the authority to determine all programs of study to which subsection 26(1)(b) of the PSLA does not apply and that are to be offered by the University for credit toward the requirements for any Credential. Subject to sub-paragraph 3.1 and paragraph 4, GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to approve the creation, modification, suspension and/or termination of:

- (a) Academic Programs; and
- (b) Online and Continuing Education Programs.

GFC has also delegated to the Committee the duty to receive and discuss Quality Assurance Reports on an annual basis and receive, discuss and provide feedback on processes for the quality assurance of Academic Programs.

2.2. Regulation - PSLA ss. 26(1)

Further to GFC’s responsibility for the academic affairs of the University, GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to approve regulations as set out in the University Calendar, or elsewhere, regarding:

- (a) Academic Programs; and
- (b) Online and Continuing Education Programs.



2.3. Regulations for Admission and Transfer - PSLA ss. 26(1)(a), (n) and 29(1)(c)

Subsection 26(1)(n) of the PSLA provides that GFC has the authority to determine regulations respecting the admission of persons to the University as students. Pursuant to subsection 29(1)(c) of the PSLA, a Faculty council may provide for the admission of students to that Faculty. Subject to sub-paragraph 3.3, GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to:

- (a) make modifications to University admission and Transfer Credit regulations;
- (b) determine Transfer Credit equivalency for Courses and Block Transfers; and
- (c) approve Physical Testing and Immunization of Students.

GFC has also delegated to the Committee the duty to receive and discuss the Report of the Senate Lay Observers concerning their observations of Undergraduate Quota Program admission processes.

2.4. Academic Standing Regulations - PSLA ss. 26(1)(a) and (e) and 29(1)(b) and (d)

Subsection 29(1)(b) of the PSLA accords to a Faculty council the power to appoint the examiners for examinations in that Faculty, conduct the examinations and determine the results of them. Subsection 29(1)(d) of the PSLA accords to a faculty council the power to determine the conditions under which a student must withdraw from or may continue in an Academic Program in that Faculty. Further, pursuant to subsection 26(1)(e) of the PSLA, GFC may consider and make decisions on the reports of faculty councils as to the appointment of examiners and the conduct and results of examinations. GFC has delegated to the Committee the authority to approve:

- (a) modifications to Academic Standing regulations as set out in the University Calendar, or elsewhere; and
- (b) modifications to International Baccalaureate and Advanced Placement regulations in the University Calendar.

Collectively, the powers, duties and functions set out in paragraphs 2.1 through and including 2.4 is the “**Delegated Authority**”.

3. Limitations on Delegated Authority

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the following powers, duties and functions are expressly reserved by GFC and have not been delegated to the Committee as part of the Delegated Authority:

3.1. Creation, Modification, and Suspension and/or Termination of Academic Programs

- (a) Substantial proposals relating to the creation, modification, or suspension and/or termination of Academic Programs; and



- (b) the receipt and discussion of Quality Assurance Reports that merit consideration with regards to the academic mission of the University.

3.2. Regulations

- (a) the establishment of Major regulations regarding Academic Programs and Online and Continuing Education Programs; and
- (b) Major modifications to existing regulations regarding Academic Programs and Online and Continuing Education Programs.

3.3. Admissions, Transfer and Academic Standing Regulations

- (a) Proposals for Substantial modifications to admissions, Transfer Credit, and Academic Standing regulations; and
- (b) the determination of regulations for the admission of Indigenous students to the University, including the documentation of Indigenous identity.

3.4. Collective Agreement

In the event there is a conflict or inconsistency between one or more recommendations or decisions made pursuant to these Terms of Reference and the Collective Agreement, the terms of the Collective Agreement will prevail.

4. Sub-delegation of Authority

4.1. Pursuant to subsection 26(3) of the PSLA, GFC may prescribe conditions governing the exercise or performance of any delegated power, duty or function, including the power of subdelegation. GFC hereby authorizes the Committee to sub-delegate to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) of the University the approval of:

- (a) the creation, suspension and/or termination of:
 - (i) Graduate Second-Level Specializations; and
 - (ii) Undergraduate Second-Level Specializations;
- (b) the modification, suspension and/or termination of Online and Continuing Education Programs;
- (c) proposals for Minor modifications to:
 - (i) Academic Programs; and
 - (ii) University admission and Academic Standing regulations,



with the condition that the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) shall document any such approvals and/or modifications and report to the Committee with respect to the same at the earliest opportunity for the inclusion of such report in the Committee's publicly available meeting materials and approved minutes.

- 4.2. Any member of the Committee or the University Community may identify to the Committee an issue with any approval made pursuant to sub-paragraph 4.1 that, in the opinion of such individual, acting reasonably, warrants review and discussion by the Committee. In such circumstances, the Committee shall engage in a review and discussion of the identified issue at its next scheduled meeting. Following such review and discussion, and if deemed necessary, the Committee is authorized, in its sole discretion, to approve a course of action for rectifying the identified issue.
- 4.3. In addition, and in accordance with the *Transfer Credit Procedure*, it is acknowledged and understood that the Transfer Credit equivalency for Courses and Block Transfers has been sub-delegated to individual Faculties.

5. Reporting Obligation

A written report will be put before GFC by the Committee at each regularly scheduled meeting of GFC, which shall summarise the activities and decisions of the Committee since the last meeting of GFC.

6. Composition of the Committee

Voting Members (16)

Chair (1)

- Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

Ex-officio (6)

- Vice-Provost and University Registrar
- Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate & Postdoctoral Studies
- Vice-Provost (Indigenous Programming and Research)
- Associate Vice-President (Online and Continuing Education)
- Vice-President (Academic), Graduate Students' Association
- Vice-President (Academic), Students' Union

Elected by the GFC (9)

- 5 Academic Staff from Category A elected by GFC, at least three of whom are elected Academic Staff members of GFC, at least one of whom will have graduate program administration experience. One member, ideally a member of GFC, will be elected by the committee to serve as Vice-Chair
- 2 Academic and/or Non-Academic Staff members from at-large (Category A and/or S1.0, S2.0)
- 1 graduate student, preferably from GFC



- 1 undergraduate student from at-large

Non-Voting /Resource Members

- GFC Secretary
- University Secretary
- Associate Dean of Students
- Director Student Ombuds (or delegate)

The Committee may, in its sole discretion, and at any time, appoint one additional member to the Committee where the Committee is of the opinion that such additional member will bring a particular perspective, expertise and/or knowledge to the Committee that will serve to enhance its work. The procedure for such an appointment is within the discretion of the Committee, provided that the procedure is demonstrably fair and transparent.

7. Definitions and Interpretation

7.1. In these Terms of Reference, and in addition to terms otherwise defined in these Terms of Reference, the following terms have the following meanings:

- (a) **“Academic Program”** means a group of credit Courses that, on completion, leads to the granting of a Credential, along with their associated Course Designators;
- (b) **“Academic Staff”** has the meaning set out in the [Recruitment Policy \(Appendix A\) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff, Administrators and Colleagues](#) as filed and located in UAPPOL;
- (c) **“Block Transfer”** refers to a block of Courses completed as part of a Credential (e.g. diploma or certificate) that transfers into an Academic Program;
- (d) **“Board”** means the board of governors of the University;
- (e) **“Collective Agreement”** means the then-current collective agreement between the University and the Association of the Academic Staff of the University of Alberta;
- (f) **“Course”** means a unit of study usually undertaken to complete the requirements of an Academic Program;
- (g) **“Course Designator”** means the abbreviation designating a group of Courses or subject names;
- (h) **“Credential”** refers to the types of Credentials defined in the [Alberta Credential Framework](#) including but not limited to certificates, diplomas, bachelor’s and master’s degrees;
- (i) **“Faculty”** means a division of the University governed by a faculty council that is entitled, among other things, to determine the Academic Programs for which such faculty is established;



- (j) **“Graduate Second-Level Specializations”** means Academic Programs that fall under graduate first-level specializations in each discipline, providing an additional level of focus;
- (k) **“Ministry”** means the Government of Alberta’s ministry responsible for the post-secondary education system in the Province of Alberta;
- (l) **“Non-Credit Programming Framework”** means the approved framework defining non-credit credentials including micro-credentials, events, Courses, certificates and diplomas that make up the University’s Online and Continuing Education Programs;
- (m) **“Online and Continuing Education Programs”** means programs that fit the criteria set out in the Non-Credit Programming Framework;
- (n) **“Physical Testing and Immunization of Students”** means, collectively, regulations for testing and/or immunization of students as a precondition to admission to, or a condition to continuation in, individual programs within Faculties;
- (o) **“PSLA”** means the *Post-secondary Learning Act* S.A. 2003, c. P-19.5, as may be amended from time to time;
- (p) **“Quality Assurance Reports”** means reports issued following cyclical reviews of Academic Programs administered in accordance with the guidelines set by the Campus Alberta Quality Council and by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic);
- (q) **“Report of the Senate Lay Observers”** means a summary of the activity, observations, and feedback of the Senate Lay Admissions Observers who are assigned to Undergraduate Quota Programs in the University in order to observe the admissions process to such programs;
- (r) **“Senate Lay Observers”** means the University senators assigned by the Office of the Senate to observe the admissions process in Undergraduate Quota Programs or to other program admissions committees at their request;
- (s) **“Transfer Credit”** means certain credits accepted by the University in respect of previous learning represented in Course units or credits applied and denoted on a student’s academic transcript;
- (t) **“Undergraduate Quota Programs”** means any undergraduate program that has a limited number of admissions and requires a selection process to fill them;
- (u) **“Undergraduate Second-Level Specializations”** means Academic Programs that fall under undergraduate first-level specializations, providing an additional level of focus;
- (v) **“University”** means the University of Alberta, a comprehensive academic and research university continued under the PSLA and legally referred to as “The Governors of the University of Alberta”;



- (w) **“University Calendar”** means the document that sets out the most current information on students rights and responsibilities and information on the degrees, programs, and Courses offered in the University, as well as rules and regulations; and
- (x) **“University Community”** means all academic staff, administrators, colleagues, and support staff as outlined and defined in [Recruitment Policy](#) ([Appendix A](#) and [Appendix B: Definitions and Categories](#)); and emeriti, undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows.

7.2. For the better understanding and interpretation of these Terms of Reference:

- (a) As used in these Terms of Reference:
 - (i) the term **“Academic Standing”** encompasses continuation and/or promotion in an Academic Program, graduation, and the requirement for a student to withdraw from the University;
 - (ii) the term **“regulation”** includes rules, procedures, policies, standards, frameworks and other regulatory content approved by GFC; and
 - (iii) the term **“student”** has the meaning given to such term in the PSLA.
- (b) Proposals for the creation, modification, suspension or termination of an Academic Program, or for the creation or modification of admission or Academic Standing regulations, are characterized as **Substantial, Major** or **Minor** in nature:
 - (i) a **“Substantial”** proposal:
 1. contemplates a significant financial investment in one or more Facilities and/or technology; or
 2. requires an assessment of reputational or academic risks to the University;
 - (ii) a **“Major”** proposal:
 1. contemplates significant modifications to substantive content; and/or
 2. requires the establishment of, or modifications to, regulatory content, reasonably expected to lead to significant administrative and/or academic impacts on the proposing Faculty or other Faculties or the University;
 - (iii) a **“Minor”** proposal:
 1. contemplates minimal modifications to substantive content; and/or
 2. requires the establishment of, or modifications to, regulatory content,



not reasonably expected to lead to significant administrative and/or academic impacts on the proposing Faculty or other Faculties or the University.

If there is any dispute or question as to which of the above categories a proposal falls under, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) (or delegate) will decide.

- (c) For clarity, the “**suspension**” of an Academic Program refers to the temporary closure of an Academic Program to new admissions, while the University continues to deliver such Academic Program to current students and to issue parchments to graduates of such Academic Program.
- (d) Academic Programs include Ministry approved Credentials.
- (e) Words importing the singular number include the plural and *vice versa*.
- (f) Pursuant to subsection 26(1)(a) of the PSLA, GFC has the authority to exercise any power of a Faculty council that GFC considers desirable to exercise. In these Terms of Reference where it is noted that GFC is delegating to the Committee a power that is, *prima facie*, a power given to a Faculty council under the PSLA, it should be understood that GFC has elected to exercise such power, and to delegate the exercise of such power to the Committee.
- (g) The authority conferred upon GFC by virtue of subsection 26(1) of the PSLA is, in all respects, subject to the authority of the Board, and, where the context requires, these Terms of Reference shall be read with awareness and recognition of the foregoing.

8. Supplemental Information

[Academic Standing Policy](#)

[Academic Standing Regulations Procedure](#)

[Admissions Policy](#)

[Alberta Credential Framework](#)

[Non-Credit Programming Framework](#)

[Transfer Credit Articulation Procedure](#)

[Undergraduate Admissions Procedure](#)



Decision **Discussion** **Information**

ITEM OBJECTIVE: To inform GFC of the purpose of GFC appointed Senators and recruit to the position.

DATE	April 29, 2024
TO	General Faculties Council
RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO	Office of the Chancellor and Senate

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Background

The Post-Secondary Learning Act, Sec 11(3)(b)(iii) requires ‘3 members of the general faculties council, appointed by the general faculties council’ to be appointed to the University of Alberta Senate. Currently two academic GFC members and one undergraduate student GFC member fill these three positions. One GFC Senator’s term is ending this year leaving a vacancy to be filled through the GFC nominations process.

Analysis / Discussion

Academic perspectives help the Senate to fulfil its duty to ‘inquire into any matter that might benefit the university and enhance its position in the community’ and the GFC appointment route is the only way these perspectives are represented. Note that four undergraduate students are appointed by the Students’ Union and one graduate student is appointed by the Graduate Students Association.

Risk Discussion / Mitigation of the Risk

None.

Where applicable, list the legislation that is being relied upon

Post-Secondary Learning Act

Next Steps

Apply to be a U of A Senator, appointed by GFC, today!

Supporting Materials:

Attachment 1 - 2024 Senator Constituency Recruitment Summary

BECOMING AN APPOINTED U OF A SENATOR

What is a U of A Senator?

The [Senate](#) of the University of Alberta is an [independent body of diverse community leaders and university representatives](#). It is valued for the role it plays in successfully examining, fostering, and celebrating the achievements and excellence of the University, resulting in an enhanced relationship with the community.

NOTE: University Senates in Alberta are different from others across Canada. At most other Canadian institutions, the Senate serves the same function as the [General Faculties Council](#) at the U of A.

What do U of A Senators Do?

Senate work is guided by the [Senate Strategic Plan](#) which embodies the following:

- INQUIRE - Identify and explore issues, ask questions, seek community input, and offer recommendations based on experiences and initiatives both within and beyond the focus of post-secondary education.
- PROMOTE - Advance the reputation of the University of Alberta through informal advocacy and celebration within circles of personal, professional, and community influence.
- CONNECT - Build bridges, connecting University of Alberta programs and people with initiatives and peers in the community while also engaging community leaders in University opportunities.

What is the time commitment?

Typically Senators volunteer between 50 and 150 hours per year (Jan-June: 6-14 hrs/month; Jul-Aug: 1-10 hrs/month; Sept-Dec: 4-12 hrs/month). This time is spent:

- Attending [Senate Plenary Meetings](#);
- Attending [Senate Standing Committee](#) meetings, in person or by video/teleconference;
- Attending University of Alberta ceremonial events, including [Convocation](#) in June and November; and
- Attending community events as an ambassador for the University of Alberta.

Senators can choose to be as engaged as they wish. The above represents the **minimum** time commitment.

Who would make a good U of A Senator?

The Ideal Candidate for Senator of the University of Alberta will be...

- A principled and highly respected individual who acts with integrity and embraces cultural diversity.
- An advocate, willing and able to contribute to building an equitable and diverse University of Alberta community for students, staff and faculty in the interest of the public good.
- An inspiring and engaging individual who will work to promote the University of Alberta as a leading Canadian teaching and research institution that is admired, respected, and trusted locally, nationally, and internationally.
- Respectful of and able to act in accordance with established Senate operational and communication guidelines and protocols; and willing to support other Senate members to consolidate a consistent understanding of the senate mandate and processes.
- A passionate ambassador and connector who seeks to create an open, inclusive, and welcoming community capable of building and growing relationships with both internal and external communities.
- An effective communicator able to speak to and engage with a wide range of audiences as may be required.
- Able to work both independently and collaboratively, as the situation dictates, to fulfil the senate mandate.

- A catalyst in support of the University's commitment to leading widespread social, cultural, and economic change for the public good.
- A connector, collaborator, and consensus-builder willing and able to challenge conventional thinking.
- A creative and innovative advisor, willing to put forward or consider novel approaches to problem solving and issue resolution; able and willing to provide original insight and share his/her environmental scans.
- Reasonably available to attend Senate Plenary in person, and committee meetings in person or electronically; and have available discretionary time, flexibility, and energy to carry out the broader responsibilities of a Senator, including reasonable attendance at University Convocation exercises.

The Ideal Candidate for Senator of the University of Alberta will have...

- Respect for and the willingness to promote stewardship of the University's rich history and traditions.
- An understanding of and commitment to equity and diversity as central to a strong University of Alberta.
- A profound respect for the importance of the university's efforts in building bridges with Indigenous communities, including an understanding that the University of Alberta has made its home on traditional lands.
- The demonstrated ability and willingness to create community connections and build relationships supportive of the University.
- Reasonable digital proficiency, and able and willing to use social media in accordance with Senate and University guidelines.
- A genuine interest in and connection to University of Alberta students and alumni.
- The commitment to the University's role as a leader in economic and environmental sustainability and social justice.
- A clear understanding of the role of the Senate and Senators within the University community.
- The ability to partner with other key stakeholders in pursuit of the goals of the Senate and the University.
- A presence and integrity that reflects the importance of the role of Senator, including a willingness to honour Senate and University traditions and ceremonies.
- An ability and willingness to encourage and engage in healthy and constructive debate on an issue, listen actively, respect diverse opinions, and view constructive disagreement and discussion as positive and necessary to effective decision-making; and stay focused on the issue being debated.
- A commitment to achieving results of the [University's Strategic Plan](#).

If you have questions about the opportunity of being a U of A Senator, please contact the [Senate Office](#)!

- If you are interested in applying through one of the [various appointment bodies](#), we can help direct you to the appropriate contact person.
- Each appointment body uses their own process to appoint U of A Senators.

Decision Discussion Information

ITEM OBJECTIVE: To present for discussion the recently launched preliminary draft of the People Strategy, which identifies the major themes, goals, and priority areas for action.

DATE	April 29, 2024
TO	General Faculties Council (GFC)
RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO	Provost & Vice-President (Academic) Vice-President (University Services and Finance)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:Background

To achieve the broad vision of [SHAPE: A Strategic Plan of Impact](#), the University of Alberta is developing its People Strategy, a plan that places our people at the foundation of everything the university does, by creating an organizational culture and environment where our people can flourish and succeed.

The People Strategy will sit alongside [Braiding Past, Present and Future: Indigenous Strategic Plan](#), the refreshed Integrated Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan, [Igniting Purpose: Student Experience Action Plan](#) and the [Culture of Care Safety Action Plan](#) as organization-wide pillars that support the work done at the University of Alberta. The People Strategy is intended to underpin the institution-wide efforts made together as a university community to address the opportunities and concerns heard from the 2023 Faculty and Staff engagement survey.

The development of the People Strategy launched in October 2023 and is guided by a Steering Committee drawn from across the university and co-chaired by the Provost & Vice-President (Academic) and the Vice-President (University Services & Finance). Membership is available [here](#). The role of the Steering Committee is to oversee the consultation process, review consultation input, and present a proposed strategic plan for consideration by the General Faculties Council and the Board of Governors.

Development Process

Broad consultation occurred across the university in November and December 2023, with additional consultation concluding in January 2024. Consultations included roundtable discussions, online input, discussions with governance bodies and discussion with other formal bodies within the university. A What We Heard report was released in February 2024, and additional consultations were held to validate the high-level themes that were identified in the report.

GOVERNANCE OUTLINE

ITEM NO. 11Consultation on the Draft People Strategy

Earlier this month, the Steering Committee released a draft of the strategy for consultation with the university community. Input is being gathered online and through a town hall session, as well as through discussions with governance bodies. The document is available as Attachment One.

The consultation draft identifies suggested themes, goals and priority actions. Measures for success will be developed in the next iteration of the strategy, informed by input from the university community.

Any input on the draft strategy is welcome, and the Steering Committee particularly welcomes input on the following questions:

1. The People Strategy will only succeed if it is embraced across the university. Are these themes the right major areas of focus as we strive to create a culture and environment in which our people can flourish?
 - Creating Connection
 - Prioritizing Health and Well-being
 - Enabling and Empowering our People
 - Outstanding Leadership in an Environment of Shared Responsibility
2. What goals and priority actions in the Draft People Strategy resonate with you most strongly?
3. Are there goals or priority actions that are missing or that should be elevated?
4. How should we think about measuring success under the People Strategy, and how will we know when the People Strategy has succeeded?

Risk Discussion / Mitigation of the Risk

There are several risks associated with the People Strategy. Low employee engagement presents risks to the university's ability to deliver on its academic mission and to achieve strategic goals – the People Strategy is intended in part to mitigate these risks by positioning our people to flourish in their careers and succeed in their roles.

The breadth of the People Strategy is considerable, and there is a risk that its scope will raise concerns about the effort required for implementation. However, the People Strategy is being created at the heart of how the University of Alberta will deliver on all its multiple institutional plans – including [Forward with Purpose: A Strategic Plan for Research and Innovation](#); [Braiding Past, Present, and Future: Indigenous Strategic Plan](#); Integrated EDI Action Plan (in development); [Culture of Care Safety Action Plan](#); and [Igniting Purpose: Student Experience Action Plan](#). Leveraging this ongoing work and aligning with current plans can highlight the focus on integration rather than addition to avoid overwhelming our community.

The People Strategy will set the direction towards an effective work environment and a thriving culture through a phased implementation approach that manages resource capacity, adapts to

ITEM NO. 11

emerging needs and feedback, and makes ambitious goals achievable, sustainable, and meaningful for the entire university community.

Next Steps

Online input on the consultation draft remains open until the end of April. The Steering Committee anticipates submitting a proposed strategic plan for GFC and Board consideration in the May/June governance cycle with a full launch in June 2024.

SCHEDULE A:
Engagement and Routing

Consultation and Stakeholder Participation / Approval Route (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity) <[Governance Resources Section Student Participation Protocol](#)>

<p><u>Those who are actively participating:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Office of the Provost & Vice-President (Academic) · Office of the Vice-President (University Services & Finance) · People Strategy Steering Committee
<p><u>Those who have been consulted:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Consultation with faculties, colleges, and service units · Deans' Council · Provosts' Council · Chairs' Council · Academic Planning Committee · General Faculties Council · Board Learning, Research, and Student Experience Committee · Board Human Resources and Compensation Committee · Members of the University of Alberta community
<p><u>Those who have been informed:</u></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><u>Approval Route:</u></p> <p>N/A</p>

Supplementary Notes/Context:


[Attachment One](#)



UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

April 2024

PEOPLE STRATEGY **DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION**



APRIL 18, 2024



The University of Alberta respectfully acknowledges that we are located on Treaty 6 territory, a traditional gathering place for diverse Indigenous peoples including the Cree, Blackfoot, Métis, Nakota Sioux, Iroquois, Dene, Ojibway/ Saulteaux/Anishinaabe, Inuit, and many others whose histories, languages, and cultures continue to influence our vibrant community.

Contents

Indigenous Teachings	3
A Note On Language	3
Introduction	4
Vision Statement	5
Values	5
Themes	6
Theme: Creating Connections	8
Theme: Prioritizing Health and Well-being	10
Theme: Enabling and Empowering Our People	12
Theme: Outstanding Leadership in an Environment of Shared Responsibility	14

Indigenous Teachings

This strategy is animated by the Cree teaching of wîcihîtowin. It recognizes that humans are a collective and that we flourish when we offer each other mutual understanding and help.

We are also individuals, with our own values and perspectives, striving to find expression within the whole. Wîcihîtowin teaches us that empathy and kindness help us to navigate our differences to make our shared community strong. At the University of Alberta, we aim to model this understanding, nurturing one another in our individuality while also embracing our collective and shared responsibilities and aspirations.

A Note On Language

Language is important, and it is important to find the right language that makes all people at the University of Alberta feel included and seen. Several key terms appear in this document to describe the University of Alberta community.

- **“People”** means everyone who works at the university: faculty, instructors, researchers, academic and support staff, post-doctoral fellows, graduate and undergraduate student employees.
- **“We”** means all of us: not just senior leadership or an abstract concept, but our whole interconnected community of people. This strategy intends to articulate a truly shared vision for the university’s culture and environment.
- **“Leader”** does not just mean the president, vice-presidents, deans and chairs. These roles have critical responsibilities, but every single member of the university community can exercise leadership competencies: supporting others, mentoring, creating welcoming environments and taking shared responsibility. Where we say “executive leadership,” we mean the president and vice-presidents. Sometimes we refer to “senior leadership,” which generally means administrators (whether academic or non-academic) at the level of president, vice-president, dean, vice-provost or associate vice-president, or equivalents.

Introduction

In *Shape: A Strategic Plan of Impact*, the University of Alberta places our people at the foundation of everything that we do. The core of our mission – education, research and engagement – depends on all of us working together and contributing in our own roles. Supporting people is absolutely central to the university’s mission and vision.

We cannot achieve our goals without creating an organizational culture and environment where our people can flourish and succeed. The People Strategy sets out a path for the university to realize such an environment.

The People Strategy will sit alongside *Braiding Past, Present and Future: Indigenous Strategic Plan*; our refreshed Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan; *Igniting Purpose: Student Experience Action Plan*; as well as the *Culture of Care Safety Action Plan* as organization-wide pillars that underpin our work. Much like *Braiding Past, Present and Future*, the People Strategy will be a crucial lens and point of reference for everything we do, and for all individuals – from the highest level of leadership to people on the front lines of our work. We know that understanding the employee experience is key to our vibrant future. The People Strategy is intended to underpin the institution-wide efforts we make as a university to address the opportunities and concerns we heard from the 2023 Faculty and Staff Engagement Survey.

The People Strategy is not about layering another set of commitments and responsibilities onto existing roles. It is about cultivating a vibrant and inclusive community where people at all levels thrive professionally and personally. Through the People Strategy, the university aims to attract, develop and retain top talent while promoting a supportive environment that values collaboration, well-being and continuous learning in the service of teaching, research and engagement. It is about refocusing on our culture and environment in ways that make us feel empowered, energized and supported – and that will make the U of A an employer of choice that supports its people to create long and rewarding careers.

Vision Statement

The vision statement for the People Strategy sets out an aspirational vision for the University of Alberta's future, guided by this strategy and the university's other foundational goals. Achieving this vision is a long-term journey, and we need to move forward together as a community.

The University of Alberta is an inspiring workplace where high-performing people create flourishing careers. People are connected to one another and empowered, and are supported to innovate and grow. Senior leaders inspire trust, display integrity and cultivate an energized community where people at all levels are able to exercise leadership and can feel a shared responsibility for the university's future.

Values

The U of A has values set in multiple places: *Shape* sets out core commitments; *Braiding Past, Present and Future* includes guiding values and principles; *Forward with Purpose: A Strategic Plan for Research and Innovation* articulates guiding principles; and the university's Statement on Free Expression sets out some of our academic values.

In developing the People Strategy, the university community has expressed a major opportunity: to engage the university community to develop an enduring statement of values, which will sit alongside our mission and vision at the core of who we are as a university. These values will extend beyond the time horizon of any individual strategy or plan. The People Strategy has this as one of its key goals.

The People Strategy itself is guided by the core commitments articulated in *Shape: A Strategic Plan of Impact*:

- **Indigenization and decolonization:** We incorporate Indigenous identities, languages, cultures and worldviews across the university. This includes working to dismantle systemic barriers and celebrating the diversity, strength, complexity, resilience and beauty of Indigenous Peoples, cultures, languages and knowledge systems. *Braiding Past, Present and Future: University of Alberta Indigenous Strategic Plan* is a crucial foundation for our next decade.
- **Equity, diversity and inclusion:** We work to achieve a more diverse, equitable, accessible and inclusive environment for all who work, learn and live within our community. We value academic freedom, and welcome and celebrate a diversity of perspectives and experiences.
- **Safety:** We are committed to the physical, psychological and cultural safety of people at the University of Alberta, and to providing a safe and healthy work and study environment that facilitates high-quality education and research.
- **Sustainability:** We strive to be a sustainable institution because we know the well-being of our people depends on our long-term viability. We lead through the prudent stewardship of resources, and by stewarding our environment and the lands on which we reside.

- **Creativity:** We embrace opportunities to innovate to make things better. While coming together as one university to reach new heights, we break down barriers, transform systems and remain flexible to create the conditions that support all members of the university community to flourish.
- **Collaboration:** We succeed by working together, within and beyond the university and across traditional boundaries. We prize relationships and we create opportunities for mutual benefit. We celebrate each other's achievements and help each other to thrive.

Themes

The remainder of this document presents the People Strategy's major themes, goals and priority areas for action. The strategy has four themes:

- Creating connection
- Prioritizing health and well-being
- Enabling and empowering people
- Outstanding leadership in an environment of shared responsibility

Two points are essential to understanding the People Strategy's goals and how they will be achieved:

- First, as with *Shape*, the goals sit at the institution-wide level and reflect areas for targeted, university-wide focus at the highest levels. This in no way diminishes the central importance of local action within departments, faculties, colleges and units. We will only succeed if our People Strategy vision cascades through the whole organization and is embraced across the university.

So we invite all areas of the university to reflect – and then act – on how they can support the kind of culture and environment in which we all want to work.

- Second, under each theme, the People Strategy distinguishes between two different, but equally important, areas of emphasis.

Under each theme, the document describes characteristics of our desired culture and environment. This outlines the norms we want to create, the behaviours we want to see, and the practices we want embedded in our everyday work– across the university, from the adoption of this strategy forward. We know that in many areas of the university, we are not there yet, and we know that these ideas will be realized differently in different settings. But we have also heard that it is important to articulate our expectations and desired norms as the basis for shared responsibility going forward.

Separately, we identify our goals and priority actions. These are more time-delimited and indicate specific areas for dedicated action. Accountabilities are defined at the vice-president level, but we know that participation at all levels will be essential to success.

The People Strategy is a long-term journey. The following goals and actions are intended to embed this work into the university over multiple years. Some actions can be achieved in the short term, while others require us to build foundations for the future. We welcome community input on the top priorities for immediate action.

Measures of success are to be added in the next iteration of the plan – we welcome community input on what success under these goals looks like and how we will know when we get there.

THEME:

Creating Connections

People want to feel connected to each other, to the university and its mission, to our students and to the external community.

Connection is about a sense of belonging, which means that we need to feel valued in our work. Connection is also about forming real, tangible relationships with immediate colleagues and with colleagues across the university. These relationships take time and effort to nurture, and we need an organization-wide commitment to making space for the work of connection. We also need a particular focus on building relationships and bridging perspectives between long-standing employees and those who have joined the university more recently.

Connectedness depends on, and also fosters, well-being, empowerment and enablement.

Defining our culture and environment

Within a more connected University of Alberta:

- We are a community that values interpersonal relationships, both among each other and with the university.
- We make the effort to cultivate a shared work culture and to treat each other with respect, within the context of our commitment to excellence and authenticity.
- We understand and value building a positive team-based culture, underpinned by mutual trust.
- We are grounded in the more than 100-year history of the University of Alberta – and we value that the U of A is a space where we can pursue passions and make a difference.

Goals and priority actions

GOAL	PRIORITY ACTIONS	ACCOUNTABILITY
Articulate clear values for the University of Alberta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and disseminate a clear set of values for the University of Alberta that support people in making a personal connection to the university, and to establish a common basis for all work across the university. 	University-wide

GOAL	PRIORITY ACTIONS	ACCOUNTABILITY
Promote and facilitate community connectedness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and support the scaling up of positive local practices. Review administrative service processes to identify opportunities for increased personal connection (e.g. use of names and individual addresses where possible). Create opportunities for connection both within individual teams and to the broader U of A community. 	<p>University-wide</p> <p>VP (USF) Provost & VP(A)</p> <p>University-wide</p>
Enhance recognition, both formal and informal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase resources for formal recognition programs and awareness of existing programs. Establish support program for innovative and informal recognition of staff and colleagues, and tools to support supervisors in making recognition a regular practice within teams. 	<p>VP (USF) Provost & VP(A)</p> <p>VP (USF)</p>
Establish a culture of inclusion and respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish an institution-wide charter outlining expectations of behaviour, which members of the community can commit to upholding. Encourage the implementation of the EDI Action Plan at all levels of the university. Expand awareness of resources for disclosure and resolution of workplace concerns. 	<p>President</p> <p>Provost & VP(A)</p> <p>VP (USF)</p>

THEME:

Prioritizing Health and Well-Being

We need to ensure as an organization we prioritize the health and well-being of our people, including supporting people by providing sustainable workloads, resources to mitigate work-related stress, and broad-based support for people experiencing difficulties both inside and outside of work. If we want people to flourish, we need to support them through challenges – both formally and informally.

Promoting well-being requires a systemic approach, not just an individual one. It is difficult for individuals or even teams to adopt well-being-oriented practices in isolation – success requires the whole university to commit to creating a better environment. Our health and well-being depend on positive work environments, but also on managing priorities and workload differently. This includes improving systems and support services to reduce areas of inefficiency and enable people to focus on the most rewarding aspects of their roles

Defining our culture and environment

In a University of Alberta that prioritizes the health and well-being of its people:

- Organization-wide, we display positive support for sustainable workloads, and the well-being of our people is a fundamental part of our daily operations. We lead and work with compassion and balance, grounded in purpose.
- People enjoy networks of support – including functional support from people in similar roles and in partner units, and are connected meaningfully as collaborators and knowledge sharers. This networking function is recognized and rewarded.
- People are encouraged to set healthy boundaries – examples include the opportunity to be open about capacity constraints without fear of reprisal; facilitating conditions so people can use their vacations and breaks; and encouraging teams to set practices around effective use of time to support well-being (such as meeting- or email-free times).
- Across the university, we reject the “do more with less” mentality. We acknowledge that to take on something new, we may need to re-prioritize or reduce work in another area. This means that, as an organization, we set clear priorities.

Goals and priority actions

GOAL	PRIORITY ACTIONS	ACCOUNTABILITY
Adopt organizational- and system-level solutions to mitigate excessive workload	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize process and system improvements with greatest impact on employee workloads, including through the Continuous Administrative Service Improvement Project (CASIP). • Tie healthy practices into performance reviews – linking recognition, performance and well-being as core leadership responsibilities. • Ensure we are leaving appropriate time and space for people to do the value-added work that drives engagement. 	VP (USF) Provost & VP(A) VP (USF) Provost & VP(A) University-wide
Establish practices for team- and individual-level priority setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement tools for team- and individual-level priority setting to support employees in setting priorities and managing workloads. • Renew college, faculty and unit plans to align with Shape, set clear priorities, then ensuring that team- and individual-level work plans align with these priorities. 	Executive leadership Provost & VP(A)
Empower individuals to access resources to mitigate stress and burnout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue ongoing implementation of Culture of Care Safety Action Plan. • Continue to develop and deliver professional development on well-being for supervisors and teams. 	University-wide VP (USF)

THEME:

Enabling and Empowering Our People

For our people to thrive, they need to be – and feel – empowered and enabled. This means having the support to perform, the tools to succeed, and the safety and autonomy to creatively solve problems.

Empowerment has an organizational dimension. Our people are more empowered when we have high-functioning systems and processes that enable them to focus on their core roles, and when our roles and responsibilities are designed to allow and reward a solution-oriented mindset. Empowerment also drives the broader organizational culture in which we work, and feeling empowered depends in part on how we interact, support and celebrate one another to succeed. In an empowered and enabled environment, our people can see pathways to creating long and rewarding careers at the U of A.

Defining our culture and environment

In a University of Alberta that prioritizes the health and well-being of its people:

- Our organization is geared to attract and retain great people and see them succeed. We support people to act, make decisions and exercise creativity within the parameters of their roles. We work with colleagues who are both competent and invested in the university and its mission.
- We streamline review and decision processes with a view to empower review and decisions at the appropriate level.
- We support each other through informal and formal communities of practice, and we recognize and reward the effort that such communities take to nurture.
- We are solution oriented – within a standardized structure, we recognize the need for and value of local innovation. We place enabling the academic mission at the centre of our work design.
- Everyone understands that safety comes first and underpins all other decisions. If it's not safe, we don't do it.

Goals and priority actions

GOAL	PRIORITY ACTIONS	ACCOUNTABILITY
Improve supports, systems and processes to empower people to succeed in their roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to implement the Continuous Administrative Service Improvement Project (CASIP) to enhance quality of administrative supports. 	VP (USF)

GOAL	PRIORITY ACTIONS	ACCOUNTABILITY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with Chairs’ Council to develop an updated “roles and responsibilities” framework for chairs and staff supporting departments, in order to align with the new organizational structure and better support core academic functions. 	Provost & VP(A)
Empower employees to innovate and create solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a university-wide decision-making framework articulating principles for decision making at all levels, aiming to reduce redundancy and facilitate more efficient decision-making processes 	Executive leadership and university-wide
Increase access to and support for professional development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require supervisors to elevate the importance of advancing career development for their direct reports as part of the annual performance reporting process – including prioritizing resources for training in core job functions. • Develop guidelines to support enhanced succession planning to support long-term career development. • Explore developing institutionally recommended training curricula for specific roles. • Develop and launch a formal mentorship program. • Facilitate support for communities of practice in specific function areas, to support functional skill development. 	University-wide VP (USF) Provost & VP(A) VP (USF) VP (USF) University-wide
Enhance the university’s safety culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to implement the <i>Culture of Care Safety Action Plan</i>. 	University-wide

THEME:

Outstanding Leadership in an Environment of Shared Responsibility

Leadership at the University of Alberta is both formal and informal. It includes the positional responsibilities of formal leaders, as well as the competencies and behaviours that can be exhibited at all levels of the organization.

Leadership is intertwined with each of the themes above, and supportive leadership is a critical success factor for every goal in this strategy. There are also specific actions and commitments required by formal leaders (those in executive or senior leadership roles) to build trust and to help people flourish, which are expressed in this theme. These actions and commitments do not obviate the need for shared responsibility across the university, recognizing that people at all levels of the organization need to participate in creating a flourishing culture and environment.

Defining our culture and environment

Within a University of Alberta characterized by outstanding leadership:

- We understand that leadership competencies are fundamental to supporting and empowering people.
- We communicate clearly and transparently about our processes, priorities and roles. We are consultative and collaborative.
- We cultivate a sense of shared responsibility for the university's goals and success by empowering leaders at all levels of the organization to exercise judgment and creativity, to solve problems and to inspire others.
- Our senior leadership embraces its accountability to the university community, and acts at all times in a manner consistent with university values.

Goals and priority actions

GOAL	PRIORITY ACTIONS	ACCOUNTABILITY
Rebuild trust in senior leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize visibility and availability of senior leaders (deans, vice-provosts, vice-presidents, president). 	Senior leadership

GOAL	PRIORITY ACTIONS	ACCOUNTABILITY
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a clear accountability framework for implementation of <i>Shape</i>, with cascading accountabilities at the college/faculty/unit levels. Support formal leaders to clearly articulate priorities for their responsible areas, aligned with the university's broader strategic direction. Empower department chairs as a critical leadership level within the organization. 	<p>Provost & VP(A)</p> <p>Executive leadership</p> <p>Provost & VP(A)</p>
<p>Develop leadership competencies at all levels of the organization</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue investment in leadership development, including academic leadership, with emphasis on developing skills and competencies in mentorship and coaching. Review performance-review process and criteria for formal leaders with the intention of embedding university values. 	<p>VP (USF) Provost & VP(A)</p> <p>Executive leadership</p>



**UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA**

**Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Office of the Vice-President (University Services & Finance)**
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB
Canada T6G 2R3



General Faculties Council Standing Committee Report

GFC Executive Committee

- Since last reporting to GFC, the GFC Executive Committee met on April 8th, 2024.
- Items Approved with Delegated Authority
 - Draft Agenda for the Next Meeting of General Faculties Council
- Items Recommended to GFC
 - Student Academic Integrity Policy Suite
 - Proposed revisions to the Terms of Reference for the GFC Academic Planning Committee, Committee on the Learning Environment, and Programs Committee and Proposed Disbanding of the Student Conduct and Policy Committee and Facilities Development Committee

Terms of reference and records of meetings for this committee can be found at:

https://www.ualberta.ca/governance/member-zone/gfc-standing-committees#GFC_EXEC

Submitted by:

W Flanagan, Chair

GFC Executive Committee

General Faculties Council Standing Committee Report

GFC Academic Planning Committee

1. Since last reporting to GFC, the GFC Academic Planning Committee met on April 10, 2024.
2. Items Discussed
 - College Model Update
 - Centres and Institutes Annual Report

Terms of reference and records of meetings for this committee can be found at:

https://www.ualberta.ca/governance/member-zone/gfc-standing-committees#GFC_APC

Submitted by:
Verna Yiu, Chair
GFC Academic Planning Committee

General Faculties Council Standing Committee Report**GFC Programs Committee**

1. Since last reporting to GFC, the GFC Programs Committee met on April 11, 2024.
2. Items Approved with Delegated Authority from GFC
 - Course, Minor Program, and Minor Regulation Changes
 - Augustana
 - Campus Saint-Jean
 - Native Studies
 - Science
 - Suspension
 - Augustana Faculty: Undergraduate Embedded Certificate in Community Mental Health - Theory and Practice
 - Termination
 - Augustana Faculty: Bachelor of Arts – Specialization in Art
 - Faculty of Science: Proposed Name Change and Program Change to the Master of Science in Integrated Petroleum Geosciences (IPG) (Motion Failed)
 - Faculty of Education: Program Change to the Master of Education in Health Sciences Education (MHSE) (Motion Tabled)
 - College of Health Sciences: Team-Based Collaborative Care Non-Credit Certificate (Motion Carried)

Terms of reference and records of meetings for this committee can be found at:

https://www.ualberta.ca/governance/member-zone/gfc-standing-committees/index.html#GFC_PC

Submitted by:

Janice Causgrove Dunn, Chair
GFC Programs Committee

General Faculties Council Standing Committee Report

GFC Committee on the Learning Environment

1. Since last reporting to GFC, the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment met on March 27, 2024.
2. Items Approved with Delegated Authority from GFC
 - Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy: Appendix B: Multifaceted Evaluation of Teaching and Learning
3. Items Discussed
 - Exam Rescheduling Procedure
 - Revised Terms of Reference GFC Committee on the Learning Environment
 - Update on the New Learning Management System
 - Update on the Review of the Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy: Appendix A: Student Perspectives on Teaching (SPOT) Survey
 - Learning Environment of the Future

Terms of reference and records of meetings for this committee can be found at:

https://www.ualberta.ca/governance/member-zone/gfc-standing-committees#GFC_APC

Submitted by:
Karsten Mündel, Chair
GFC Committee on the Learning Environment

FOR THE GFC MEETING OF APRIL 29, 2024

I am pleased to report on the following Board of Governors' Open Session meetings:

The Board of Governors and the Board Human Resources and Compensation Committee (BHRCC) held a special joint meeting on January 30, 2024. At the meeting, they jointly approved, on the recommendation of the Board Chair:

- the appointments of Guy Bridgeman and Margot Ross-Graham to the Presidential Review Committee; and
- the Presidential Review Committee Guidelines and Procedures, and authorized the Board Chair, in her capacity as chair of the Presidential Review Committee, to provide the Guidelines and Procedures to the Presidential Review Committee.

The Board of Governors held a regular Open Session meeting on March 22, 2024.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Board Chair Kate Chisholm acknowledged the observers attending the open session, noting that she had received over 900 emails from students asking the Board of Governors to reject the tuition increases, and thanked the students for their engagement. At the request of the Chair, Yasmeen Abu-Laban, Professor and Canada Research Chair in the Politics of Citizenship and Human Rights, Department of Political Science, provided a learning moment on her research, entitled *Immigration and Citizenship in the 21st Century: Pushing the Boundaries of Research and Knowledge*.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

In addition to his written report, President Flanagan provided verbal updates on the January 26, 2024 Joint Summit of the Board of Governors, General Faculties Council, and Senate, with keynote speaker Jeffrey Buller, President and CEO of ALPHA Leadership Programs, on the cultures of higher education and working together as governance bodies; discussion on the People Strategy "What We Heard" document; and a showcase from Lisa Mayes, an intermedia graduate student in Art and Design. President Flanagan also highlighted the recent launch of the Student Experience Action Plan, a first-of-its-kind initiative for the university, which affirms a commitment to delivering a positive student experience.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

The Board discussed the following items:

- a briefing from Provost and Vice-President (Academic) Verna Yiu, Vice-President (University Services and Finance) Todd Gilchrist, and Vice-President (Facilities and Operations) Andrew Sharman, on the University of Alberta's 2024-25 Consolidated Budget and its component operating, ancillary, research, capital and special purpose budgets, including revenues and expenses, historical and current provincial grant amounts, enrolment growth, the opportunity to access operating reserves ("carryforward" funds), and an overview of maintenance, repair, and capital projects.
- the tuition and fee proposals, including an overview of tuition consultations, proposed domestic and international tuition increases, the effects of increases on students, a series of proposals put forward by the Students' Union to mitigate those effects, and the impact to the institution if tuition was not increased.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS' MOTION SUMMARY

On the recommendation of the Finance and Property Committee and General Faculties Council Academic Planning Committee, the Board of Governors approved:

- the Fall 2024 domestic tuition proposal, including a set-aside for student financial support; the Fall 2025 international tuition proposal for new students, as outlined in the motion; an increase to the student financial offset for international students from 7.55% to 8.55% of total international tuition revenue; and an increase from \$4000 to \$5000 for the international graduate student thesis-based price adjustment;
- the 2024-25 Consolidated Budget as set forth in the proposal; and
- a new fee assessment structure for the Athletics and Recreation Mandatory Non-Instructional Fee (“MNIF”), as described in the proposal.

On the recommendation of the Finance and Property Committee, the Board of Governors approved the 2024/25 – 2026/27 Capital Plan, as set out in the proposal.

On the recommendation of the Finance and Property Committee and the Governance Committee, the Board of Governors approved amendments to the Articles for the University of Alberta Properties Trust Inc. (“UAPTI”); and the resetting of the terms of office and revised terms of office for the directors of UAPTI.

On the recommendation of the Learning, Research and Student Experience Committee and General Faculties Council, the Board of Governors approved the new Master of Management Analytics (MMA) program in the Alberta School of Business.

On the recommendation of the Learning, Research and Student Experience Committee, the Board of Governors delegated to General Faculties Council its powers, duties and functions related to student misconduct appeals, as detailed in the proposal.

The Board received reports from its standing committees, the Chancellor, Alumni Association, Students’ Union, Graduate Students’ Association, Association of Academic Staff of the University of Alberta, Non-Academic Staff Association, General Faculties Council, and the Board Chair.

Prepared for: Dilini Vethanayagam, GFC Representative on the Board of Governors

By: Erin Plume, Associate Board Secretary

Please note: official minutes from the open session of the March 22, 2024 Board of Governors’ meeting will be posted on the [University Governance website](#) once approved by the Board at its June 2024 meeting.

ITEM NO. 17

 Decision Discussion Information

ITEM OBJECTIVE: Review and discuss the Annual Ombuds Report, as set forth in Attachment 1, in relation to student conduct.

DATE	April 29, 2024
TO	General Faculties Council
RESPONSIBLE PORTFOLIO	Office of the Student Ombuds

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the casework that the Office of the Student Ombuds engages in connected to student conduct on campus. We highlight the casework done in relation to academic offenses, non-academic offenses, in addition to cases related to discrimination and harassment.

Our office would like to highlight key contextual information regarding our work to impartially, confidentially, and independently advocate for fairness on campus.

The Office of the Student ombuds' annual reports are available on our website linked here: <https://www.ualberta.ca/current-students/ombuds/about/index.html>

Attachments

Attachment 1: 2022 – 2023 The Office of the Student Ombuds - Annual Report

SCHEDULE A:
Engagement and Routing

Consultation and Stakeholder Participation / Approval Route (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity) <[Governance Resources Section Student Participation Protocol](#)>

<p><i><u>Those who are actively participating:</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p><i><u>Those who have been consulted:</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p><i><u>Those who have been informed:</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
<p><i><u>Approval Route:</u></i></p>



Supplementary Notes / Context:



UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

2022-2023

OSO Annual Report

The Office of the Student Ombuds

The Art of Being Here and
There helps us to be a Flexible,
Hybrid Ombuds Delivery

Natalie Sharpe, Director, OSO



OCTOBER 2023

Table of Contents

Territorial Acknowledgement	3
Introduction – Hybrid delivery – Natalie Sharpe	4-5
Notes from our Students	6
Ombuds Staff 2022-2023	7-20
Ombuds Activity Summary 2022-2023	21
Demographics of OSO 2021-2023 (3 years)	22-23
Graphs/Charts	24-25
OSO Recommendations and Responses Last Year 2021-2022	26-28
OSO Recommendations and Rationales This Year 2022-2023	29-31
Visuals on Workshops/Presentations/Conferences	32-33
Photos of OSO Staff and Activities 2022-2023	34-35



Territorial Acknowledgement

The University of Alberta, its buildings, labs, and research stations are primarily located on the traditional territory of Cree, Blackfoot, Métis, Nakota Sioux, Iroquois, Dene, and Ojibway/Saulteaux/Anishinaabe nations; lands that are now known as part of Treaties 6, 7, and 8 and homeland of the Métis. The University of Alberta respects the sovereignty, lands, histories, languages, knowledge systems, and cultures of First Nations, Métis and Inuit nations.



INTRODUCTION

Natalie Sharpe, Director

“The Art of Being Here and There helps us to be a Flexible, Hybrid Ombuds Delivery.”

The delivery of Office of the Student Ombuds (OSO) services changed dramatically at the beginning of the pandemic (2020). The return to our onsite activities has been an incremental process of deliberate caution as we transitioned from a remote (“secure”) to hybrid model of service delivery. We learned a great deal about what we lost, but we found that there were some unexpected gains by working remotely with students. For instance, we realized it was unnecessary to attend late night hearings on an empty, dark campus. We found some flexibility in being able to continue many of our appointments, investigations and hearings through virtual meetings. However, OSO staff recognized it was important for us to be able to meet at least twice weekly in our offices, as well as online, to engage in work discussions, staff training/mentoring. In the past, the ombuds spent a lot of time, like students, traversing campus, and rushing from appointment to appointment, sometimes on opposite sides of campus. The pandemic gave us some flexibility in planning our schedules and attending to the needs of students, many continuing studies several time zones away. We adjusted accordingly and found that sometimes it is best for students to be able to meet us at hours after the regular work schedule. One of the most dramatic changes was adapting hearings to a virtual environment. This continued, offering safety and convenience to students, staff, and of course to the ombuds. Throughout this year, 85 to 90% of our appointments, investigations, and hearings were held virtually. Similarly, committee meetings were often virtual, or allowed the option for onsite and virtual. We were mindful of checking in on each other’s wellness when working remotely. We need to focus on each other, perhaps even more so than onsite in the past, for the pandemic has forever shifted our focus on caring for others by attending to self-care first. At least for our staff, in our discussions with faculty, administration and our student clients, we continue to deliver the important message of relationship building in the University community, i.e., relational fairness.

Did our case numbers decrease throughout this period of time? No, they held steady. We also were very productive as a staff, focusing on collaborative work with faculties, departments, etc., to promote relational and equitable fairness in the classroom, in the lab, in clinicals, in practicums, and when deliberating petition and appeal decisions. We used the power of education and moral suasion, the very skills of ombudsing that help individuals to move toward restorative solutions. We recognize that we may be a small office, but we are mindful of keeping a steady focus on the values of the University to resolve conflicts and misunderstandings that may arise because of divergent views. We ask the University to critically examine how its hierarchies divide and disempower the marginalized populations on our campus, setting up barriers (sometimes

unconsciously) and opening doors for only some (based on unconscious biases and privilege). These are realities that need to change, and the ombuds must use their voice to promote collaborative change.

As to who we are, here is a brief description of the Office of the Student Ombuds (also in the DOS MNIF report 2022-2023).

As advocates for fairness and equity, the Office of the Student Ombuds (OSO) is confidential, impartial, accessible and independent. We offer advice and support on academic policies and procedures, and issues around conflict and discipline. We focus on early intervention and resolution to strengthen collegial relationships within the university, whenever possible without compromising equity principles. We listen to and support the sharing of multiple perspectives to help parties expand their options for mutual, fair and achievable resolution.

We offer information and advice to faculty, staff and students as they deal with academic, discipline, interpersonal, and financial issues...(Our ongoing feedback and recommendations to faculties are based on direct reflection of casework, investigations, and formal appeal hearings. Each year we offer (formal) recommendations (in our Annual Report) to (recognize and close) ... systemic gaps and inequities...(thereby making) the university accountable to its members. (In addition to our casework), ... the OSO offers tailor-made skill development sessions and support for faculties/departments/professor/supervisor and peer conflicts as requested throughout the year; the sessions vary from year to year depending on their needs.

The OSO has an internationally recognized professional paid internship program which includes training and mentoring of two undergraduate student interns and one graduate student intern each year.

The Office of the Student Ombuds has ties to regional, national and international communities of practice. It has an Alberta provincial network, a western ACCUO regional network, and is an institutional member of the Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons (ACCUO/AOUCC). The OSO adheres to the ACCUO/AOUCC professional Standards of Practice: Confidentiality, Independence, Impartiality and Accessibility. OSO has ties to international higher education ombuds networks and organizations in the United States, Mexico, Europe, Australia, Central and South America, and most recently to Africa.

NOTES FROM OUR STUDENTS ARE A GIFT!

Thanks for meeting with me today and helping me understand plagiarism.

I had no idea that the ombuds service was available until I found myself with an academic conflict. Your ongoing support really helped me feel more comfortable and informed about the university process I was facing, which allowed me to better prepare and actually advocate for myself. Thank you so much!

I think I have clarity and peace now, and I am comfortable with the decision. I wanted to let you know that I really appreciate your help and your kindness in guiding me through an unfamiliar process. Thank you very much.

I wanted to start by thanking you for your assistance throughout this process and let you know that my appeal was approved. I am extremely grateful for all of the help you gave me, and the time you dedicated to my appeal.

WE DID IT!!! I can't even start to thank you enough for all the help and support. There were so many times I was ready to give up but you kept giving me options....

I would like to thank you again for your support during the hearing. I received the formal decision of the appeal panel today. I am feeling so relieved after this. You have helped me a lot. It was not possible without your support and guidance.

Thank you so much for all your help! Words cannot express my gratitude! Please continue being so good at what you do.

Thank you so much for helping me to advocate for myself and being beside me to support, guide and help me gain a better understanding of the whole situation....(Just wanted to express my gratitude and once again thank you so much for everything.)

I wanted to thank you again for all your support and feedback throughout this process, it has been extremely helpful!

My appeal was accepted and I am being allowed to continue. Thank you so much for your help and guidance; it was amazing to have your support and guidance....

OMBUDS STAFF 2022-2023

The year 2022 will be remembered for major staff renewal. The positions of Undergraduate Ombudsperson and Graduate Ombudsperson had been filled on an interim basis. Remonia Stoddart-Morrison who had served in both roles after completing a year internship with the OSO, was the successful candidate for the Graduate Ombudsperson.

At the beginning of April, Sylvie Vigneux stepped into the role of Undergraduate Ombudsperson. In 2022, Ms. Vigneux resigned from the position. By winter term January 2023, former Graduate Ombuds Intern, Laurel Wilkie, was appointed the Undergraduate Ombudsperson.

This period was marked by intensive training for the successive Undergraduate Ombuds staff members. They were also trained to engage in mentoring the interns. The OSO staff speak about their work in this following section.

Natalie Sharpe, Director of the OSO



Natalie Sharpe, BA Hon, MA (she, her) is the Director of the Office of the Student Ombuds and Past-President of the Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons (ACCUO/AOUCC).

Ms. Sharpe holds professional certificates in negotiation, mediation, arbitration and the Osgoode/Forum of Canadian Ombudsman “Essentials for Ombuds”. Ms. Sharpe has worked for over three decades as ombuds, mediator and educator in the social sciences and alternative dispute resolution. She received the auspicious Pete Small Award (California Caucus of College and University Ombudspersons) in 2019 for her contributions to the field of higher education ombudsing and has presented at higher education ombuds conferences globally.

“As the Director of the OSO, it is important to bring the unique strengths of the ombuds team together to make their vital contribution to this University community. Our ombuds work with a large student population and engage frequently with university staff, bringing a fairness focus on policies and processes affecting student lives. You often see them at orientations, faculty tabling events, the Fairness Day booth on the main floor of SUB in mid-October, and at specific training sessions as requested. They also serve in an advisory capacity on many University committees, and attend as impartial supports for students at private, formal investigations and appeal hearings. The bulk of their work is the tedious, detailed confidential one-on-one meetings with students, to examine their issues from an institutional as well as personal context and to explore ways that students may gain agency to voice their concerns, viable options, and find informed decisions.

Ombuds are curious, creative and caring in their approach to working with students so as to better understand and respect their social location. Ombuds work to ensure that the University is accountable and proactive in building relationships and making

equitable and just decisions. The ombuds' power is to convince, not tell others what to do, but what is fair and the right thing to do. We engage in the art of moral suasion, recognizing the need to focus on rebuilding and repairing relationships. Our work is not easy, but is necessary, as we work for equitable change.

"In addition to overseeing our ombuds' work on campus, I have been active on the national and international scene with ombuds colleagues in higher education. In June, 2022, I presented and co-presented two sessions at the European Network of Ombuds in Higher Education Conference in Athens, Greece. In October and November, 2022, I was a panel member at the joint Forum of Canadian Ombudsman and Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons Conference in Ottawa; with the International Ombudsman Association on Ombuds Day, an annual international event, and with faculty ombuds colleagues at the California Caucus of College and University Ombudspersons in Pacific Grove, California.

The professional discussions of higher education ombuds focus on the future challenges we are facing in higher education globally. We have begun a self-reflective ombuds practice known as intervisioning with higher education ombuds nationally and abroad. Ombuds are often referred to as "the canary in their institution's coalmine" but unlike the canary we work to ensure we are not placed in such a fragile or precarious position to be harmed or destroyed in delivering our message."

Remonia Stoddart-Morrison, Graduate Ombudsperson



Remonia Stoddart-Morrison, BSc, MEd (she, her) is a PhD candidate in Education and has worked at the OSO for many years. Remonia was an international student and our second Graduate Ombuds Intern. Subsequently she moved back and forth in two interim positions, Undergraduate Ombudsperson and Graduate Ombudsperson. Remonia was permanently appointed as the Graduate Ombudsperson in March 2022. With her academic and teaching background, she can relate to students and faculty with a focus on strengthening their relationships.

“As the Graduate Ombudsperson an important element that I believe must always be kept at the forefront as I do this work is that no student, no case, no situation is ever the same. They may be similar but never the same and thus each case needs to be treated as unique. I entered the 2022-2023 reporting year continuing the work of advocating for fairness by helping to provide a fairness lens through which students, faculty members and university administrators can view and consider when they are developing policies and making decisions.

I provide students, especially graduate students, medical residents and postdoctoral fellows, with the information, advice and support that can assist them in empowering themselves to understand their rights and responsibilities, voice their concerns, and exercise agency at the university.

I provide workshops and presentations, with students and faculty in areas related to early resolution and intervention, conflict management and resolution, discrimination and bias and building caring, collegial and collaborative relationships and environments. I consider these workshops and presentation sessions integral in providing information and helping to ensure early resolution of issues; I also encourage individuals to do their part in enriching the shared working space. I invite graduate departments who have yet to hold these sessions, for graduate students and/or faculty members, to reach out to our office for these sessions.

Remonia's work with faculty is highly valued. One Associate Dean writes to Remonia:

"Thank you on behalf of all the faculty members for your...Teaching and Learning presentation on Getting to Know Our Biases: How Your Self-Awareness Supports Your Student's Success & Wellbeing. The session provided an overview of a key area for our faculty instructors and was very thought-provoking...."

As a PhD candidate, Remonia is acutely aware of the need for a strong, collaborative network of services:

"Establishing and maintaining a university environment where graduate students are being set up for success, where they feel they belong and where they are able to interact, collaborate and work without fear, is not the role of just one unit or department on campus. With this knowledge, I collaborate (whilst maintaining independence) with departments, the GSA, FGSR and various student services to ensure that students have access to advice in not only understanding their rights and responsibilities but also understanding the policies and procedures surrounding their case and the options that may be available to them.

Each year, as a part of my role, I train interns to be able to take on cases throughout their time with the office I also assist the Director in the training of our new Undergraduate Ombudsperson (twice this year)"

Sylvie Vigneux, Undergraduate Ombudsperson (Apr-Nov 2022)



Sylvie Vigneux, BA Hon, MA, JD (she, her) Undergraduate Ombudsperson, joined the OSO in April 2022 after practicing law in the areas of labour, employment, and human rights.

Sylvie operationalized her expertise in principles of administrative law and procedural fairness to support undergraduate students in resolving disputes and navigating university policies related to discipline and academic standing. Sylvie proactively connected with service providers across campus and conducted training and orientation sessions for students, as well as drafting policy reviews, internal OSO protocols, and an office hazard assessment. Sylvie represented the OSO as a non-voting member on several university committees, including the GFC Student Conduct Policy Committee, the Dean of Students' Health, Safety and Environment Committee, Program Support Team, and Programs Committee. She was also an active participant in the Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons (ACCUO), attending the biannual FCO/ACCUO conference and serving as the co-chair of ACCUO's Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion ad-hoc committee.

Laurel Wilkie, Undergraduate Ombudsperson (Jan-Mar 2023)



Laurel Wilkie, BA, MEd (she, her) became the Undergraduate Ombudsperson in January of 2023, and had previously completed an internship with the OSO as the Graduate Ombuds Intern while completing her Master's degree. Laurel serves on the Student Conduct Policy Committee, the Program Support Team and Programs Committees, and the DoS Health, Safety and Environment Committee.

"I primarily work with undergraduate students who are engaging in various academic and non-academic processes on campus. I have also worked very closely with students experiencing different types of conflict and provide conflict coaching to help students navigate their situations. Some of the frequent situations our office helps students navigate are academic standing concerns, allegations under the Code of Student Behaviour, grade appeals, as well as interpersonal/intrapersonal conflicts on campus. As an advocate for fairness, I strive to help students better understand their rights and responsibilities within the various structures at the University of Alberta so that they may best advocate for their unique situation.

A large portion of my work is directly with students but I also get to engage in various orientation sessions, tabling, or other projects in collaboration with other departments or faculties. Empowering students with information on topics such as managing difficult conversations with supervisors or around the unique services that ombuds provides allows us to continue engaging with the university community through a fairness lens. I am very excited to continue engaging in equity and fairness work at the University of Alberta."

OSO Ombuds Interns 2022-2023

This was the 8th internship year of the OSO Ombuds Internship program, a highly successful program that helps develop student leadership and skills for future professional endeavours, including contributing to the broader human community. The internship program consists of several learning modules around ombudsing practice-taught by the Ombuds staff. The interns receive incremental training on being an ombuds by first observing the senior staff with full consent from the student clients, then practice casework under the observation of the senior staff before taking on cases of their own. Their skills are developed through reflective practices with their mentors and at case debriefings of generic issues at the twice weekly OSO staff meetings. The Undergraduate Ombuds Interns may also earn credits for their internship in a faculty internship program after completing additional assignment requirements. The interns and Director meet with the faculty Intern Program Coordinator shortly after the internship begins to monitor their professional and personal development based on their goals and objectives in the internship program (these vary with each intern as they reflect on their professional and personal interests). The OSO Director as their supervisor provides guidance and rates their performance as they gain new skills and hone them throughout the year. The intern may meet with the supervisor to discuss these goals and reflect on their development throughout the year. This culminates in a final assignment and final reflection by the intern and OSO supervisor evaluation on their overall professional and personal development as an individual worker and as a team player. Each year, we ask the mentors to provide their observations on the interns' development and for each intern to reflect on their OSO experience.

As the Director and Supervisor for the program, Natalie Sharpe views this as a unique experience for ombuds staff and students to build the quality of OSO service for their University community. As an ombuds career is often a mid or later life career change, the internship provides students an intensive year of skill-building and experience learning through the lens of an ombuds. This allows those interested in the ombuds profession to start a career much earlier, and/or use these skills in a number of closely-related professions that require conflict management and diplomacy skills.

Remonia Stoddart-Morrison reflects on her roles as a mentor for the interns, and in particular her close work with the Graduate Ombuds Intern.

"Mentoring of interns is an ongoing process throughout the intern's time with the office. There are formal training sessions, discussions/reflections on casework at staff meetings, online chats, telephone calls, etc. OSO interns know they are able to reach out to ask any question; it doesn't matter how small. I find it most rewarding to have informal discussions with the interns to hear about their background, lived experiences and getting to know them. This gives a lot of insight into the best way to support the intern in their work. Given that the students we see in our office are different and their cases vary, the mentoring I provide interns occurs daily, not just during their initial training. Ongoing mentoring helps with focusing and understanding the uniqueness of

each case and provides the support interns need to handle specific difficulties in these cases. Using a hybrid model, we were in the office together for two days of the week. This allowed us the opportunity to interact in person to build the connection and camaraderie in the office. Our social gatherings such as our potluck lunches and evening winter event, bonds us as staff, thereby strengthening the work interns do.”

Sylvie Vigneux as Undergraduate Ombudsperson (2022) worked closely with the 2022-2023 Undergraduate Ombuds interns, Andrew Schultz and Navneet Chand. In particular, she developed and delivered training modules on the topics of Maintaining Professional Boundaries, Empathetic Listening, Working with Students in Crisis, and Equitable Fairness. She also provided one-on-one coaching to the interns and encouraged them to find their individual voice and approach to ombuds work. A highlight of her mentoring role was working collaboratively with Andrew to create a new OSO protocol for records retention and disposal. The internship program represents a core component of the OSO’s operations and Sylvie was honoured to take a role in mentoring and training the student interns.

Laurel Wilkie, Undergraduate Ombudsperson (2023) provides these observations.

“Our internship program is one of the most rewarding experiences as an ombuds as we support the professional growth and development of our interns. Through our close mentorship our interns get to build their capacity to navigate institutional policies, engage their interpersonal skills as they support students, learn about fairness and equity within the institutional structure, as well as connect with both national and international ombuds partners through conferences or committee work. As a previous U of A ombuds intern, the skills gained and honed throughout the internship were invaluable to my professional practice, so I am thrilled to be able to give back to this program.”

Eric Awuah, Undergraduate Ombuds Intern



Eric Awuah, BFA, MA (he, him, Yaman) Eric earned a bachelor's degree in dance and theater studies and later pursued a master's degree in dance and Heritage Studies in Europe through an Erasmus-Mundus scholarship.

Following the completion of his graduate studies, he served as a lecturer at both the University of Ghana-Legon and the University of Education-Winneba. Presently, Eric is a doctoral candidate in the Anthropology Department at the University of Alberta. As an experienced University instructor, Eric is an asset to the internship program; he provides leadership to his intern peers and has a keen interest in the value the ombuds brings to relational and equitable fairness in the classroom. His expertise in the professional arts, in the field of dance, helps us examine the importance of all modes of communication, verbal and non-verbal. He is a valuable contributor to our staff discussions and a strong supporter of his colleagues.

"I am currently pursuing my Ph.D. in the Anthropology Department, and I am also serving as a Graduate Ombuds Intern. This internship has been incredibly valuable to me, fostering a deeper respect and appreciation for student support and the importance of collaborative problem-solving approaches. The Ombuds office has been exceptionally supportive of intern development, consistently offering assistance and guidance. They regularly check in on interns and provide the necessary support to enhance our ability to serve the University of Alberta students effectively."

Andrew Schultz, Undergraduate Ombuds Intern



Andrew Schultz (he/him) is an undergraduate at the University of Alberta studying Psychology with a minor in Philosophy and has had previous experience in student governance. Andrew served on the Association of Canadian College and University Ombudspersons Communications Committee and conducted an interview with Dr. Wolf Hertlein from Damstadt University, Germany on the reflective practice with higher education ombuds colleagues known as intervising (European Network of Ombuds in Higher Education).

“My year at the Office of the Student Ombuds was a year of both personal and professional growth. Although initially I was unsure of how the position might relate to my future aspirations in psychology, I quickly saw how much value this position offered me. I gained a much greater understanding and appreciation of how the university operates at large, and further, the role of the Ombudsperson within that ecosystem. Through the thorough training provided by the team, I developed the skills necessary to support students in all situations. I began to look at situations from multiple perspectives and began to see the importance of being as impartial as possible. Additionally, given my status as a student, I was able to bring a unique perspective to the team which would not be available without the internship. Early on in my internship I was presented with the opportunity to attend the ACCUO-FCO conference in Ottawa.

After applying and receiving the Green and Gold Student Leadership and Professional Development grant, I was able to attend the conference and engage in the Ombuds world at a national (and international) scale. I gained further insight on how important the work of Ombuds is, not only in the Higher Education context, but in many others as well. Later in my internship, I was able to share much of what I learned as an Ombudsperson by presenting with my colleagues at the Alberta Student Leadership Summit. This opportunity allowed me to develop my presentation skills, as well as engage with the campus community in a meaningful way, as our presentation focused

on resolving conflict within student groups. All in all, my experience at the Office of the Student Ombuds has proven to be an invaluable one.”

Navneet Chand, Undergraduate Ombuds Intern



Navneet Chand (he/him) is a senior undergraduate student in Political Science, Women's and Gender Studies, specializing in Indigenous legal politics, labour ethics, and public policy development; he also does student programming development and government policy analysis.

"My internship as an Undergraduate Ombudsperson with the Office of the Student Ombuds has been a masterclass in developing greater emotional intelligence, mediating complex disputes with a restorative mindset, and critically responding to institutional policy structures. Upon entering the role, I could not begin to fathom everything that the multidisciplinary and rewarding field of ombuds work would have in store for me.

My internship has revealed the relevant sector of ombuds work that builds upon my academic and professional interests. Each student I have worked with has entrusted the Office and I with their conviction in our ability to support them in nurturing their skills as a self-advocate. I have learned alongside them with my own circle of support from the rest of the impeccable ombuds team. The Office provided me with the space to effectively comprehend the dynamics of post-secondary policy and how this applies to the myriad of conflicts and decisions students face. A key objective of mine in this role has been to ensure that the Office continues to amplify the relevance of our services to students, particularly international and junior undergraduate students, especially before they find themselves in the throes of difficult academic situations.

As such, I championed our intern group's return involvement in this year's Alberta Student Leadership Summit, discussing a comprehensive and applicable framework of fairness for students. The multitude of networking and collaborative opportunities in the field of ombuds work also provided me with the rare chance to attend the European Network of Ombuds in Higher Education annual conference held in Prague, Czechia this June (2023), where I was invited to present my research on effective practices for building student involvement in higher education governance. This was a definite

highlight of my internship, providing me with the space to make international connections with ombuds practitioners that have graciously extended invitations to me for internships at their respective institutional offices.

I could not have asked for a more comprehensive and dynamic internship experience. I will cherish this role and the learnings I have gleaned from it forward into my professional career, now with the foresight to understand the opportunity the field of ombuds work has for me.”

OMBUDS ACTIVITY SUMMARY 2022-2023

- ❑ Orientations on the Role of the OSO for the Transition Year Program, Augustana Indigenous, Graduate Student Association, International Student Services Tabling (Fall/Winter), 10 Graduate Department Presentations, e.g., MLCS, Neuroscience
- ❑ GSA All Candidates Meeting
- ❑ FGSR Council Presentation
- ❑ Arts Leadership Council – Managing Conflict and Responding to Allegations
- ❑ Faculty of Arts Advisors Meeting
- ❑ Workshop with Students Identifying and Addressing Bias and Discriminatory Behaviours for students in Faculty of Nursing
- ❑ Workshop with students on Managing Difficult Conversations in Your Practicum for Faculty of Kinesiology, Sport and Recreation (KSR) (Fall/Winter)
- ❑ Workshop for Faculty of Nursing Faculty members on Creating a Culturally Responsive and Safe Environment for Graduate Students
- ❑ Workshop for Faculty of Rehab Medicine to Faculty members on Getting to Know our Biases: How Self-Awareness Supports Your Students’ Success and Well-being
- ❑ Workshops on Mitigating Conflicts in the Supervisory Relationship for several departments.
- ❑ OSO Fairness Day in SUB – Activities to promote fairness and understanding all forms of fairness in situations of conflict and decision-making processes
- ❑ Faculty of Arts Chairs Retreat on Conflict Management and Resolution
- ❑ Osgoode Professional Development Facilitator on Responding to Sexual Violence course
- ❑ First and Second Congress Ombuds – contributed to setting up the Ombuds function at Congress, Canada’s largest Humanities and Social Science Conference, to ensure fairness at proceedings
- ❑ “Intervisioning” Case Self-Reflective meetings with international higher education ombuds members (European Network and Canadian associations)

DEMOGRAPHICS OF OSO OVER THE 3-YEAR PERIOD FROM 2020-2023

Reporting Years Comparison (Apr 1-Mar 31)	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023
Clients	1498	1438	1466
Undergraduate	1170	1236	1259
Graduate (includes Med Residents and Postdoctoral Fellows)	296	198	187
Others (parents, admin, outside inquiry)	1	4	20
International*	547	466	520
Domestic	918	938	876
Residence Status Unknown	77	34	79
Contacts and Visits	6996**	14274****	16348
Average Number of Visits per Client	3.5	2.0	2.0
Issues***	1761	1600	1643
Academic	435	820	957
Conflict	177	121	104
Academic Offence	1011	496	440
Non-Academic Offence	13	25	14
Discrimination/Harassment Allegations	35	50	52
Miscellaneous	90	88	76
Activities			
Investigative Meetings	926	421	303
Committee Meetings, Staff Consults, Orientations, Presentations	863	974	836
Formal Hearings	31	32	49
Informal Resolution/Appreciative Inquiries	6	11	10

* Proportionately, international students visit the ombuds more frequently than domestic students.

** Contact hours are typically scheduled for 1 hour but may vary from ½ hour (RTW) to 2 hours.



*** Clients often present more than one issue.


**** While working remotely, we tracked meetings, emails scheduling and responses.

Glossary:


Academic includes required to withdraw (academic standing), grade appeals, exam deferrals and re-examinations. Conflict may involve interpersonal, supervisory, student-professor. conflicts. Academic Offence includes plagiarism, cheating, misrepresentation of facts. Non-Academic Offences include online bullying, discrimination, different forms of harassment and inappropriate behaviours. Discrimination/Harassment allegations related to sex, gender, racial, disability, family status discrimination, duty-to-accommodate violations. Miscellaneous includes residence conflicts, etc., Investigative Meetings include Instructor, Chair, Associate Dean, Discipline Officer, Protective Services; Formal Hearings are Formal University Tribunal hearings; Informal Resolution include Conflict Management Coaching, Mediation, Appreciative Inquiry

GRAPHS/CHARTS FOR 2022-2023





U of A's population data source:
<https://www.universitystudy.ca/canadian-universities/university-of-alberta/>



OSO RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2022-2023

RECOMMENDATION ONE:

The OSO recommends to various stakeholders, including Dean of Students and University Administration, the need to expedite the implementation of the OSO strategic plan. This recommendation has been in our annual report for the past three years.

Response: In March 2022, OSO was informed that it would begin a new reporting relationship to the Vice-Provost of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion on April 1st, 2023.

As noted in our 2021-2022 Annual Report, “The view of the OSO is that our work is more aligned with offices such as OSDHR and HIAR. The OSO view the work of an ombuds office as necessary for faculty, staff and students, as it is at many other Canadian post-secondary institutions. We are hopeful that this need would be realized as it was in the original model of the University of Alberta Ombudsman in the early 1970s. The OSO strategic plan will be revised into a document titled Declaration of Best Practices for the University of Alberta Ombuds (Office of the Student Ombuds), to strengthen the OSO capacity to deliver the highest quality of services to the University community, as outlined in last year’s recommendation. The OSO Mandate and Terms of Reference would then be aligned with the national guidelines of the Association of Canadian College and University Ombudsperson’s Standards of Practice: independence, confidentiality, impartiality and accessibility. Working closely with the EDI team and other equity-focused offices at the University, the OSO visibility and practices will be enhanced at the University of Alberta.

RECOMMENDATION TWO:

The OSO continues to promote the visibility and availability of ombuds services for Augustana and CSJ students. One example of commitment would be to provide OSO information and university appeal and complaints processes in French for CSJ students. The OSO therefore promotes in collaboration with the Dean of Student and the AD of CSJ, the provision of ombuds services, appeal hearings, and appeal information in French.

Response: The OSO, among other services focused on equity, supports students from Campus St. Jean. With the move to the VP, EDI we are focused on ensuring that our written materials be available to CSJ students in their spoken and written language (French). This will be an ongoing collaborative initiative with all areas

within EDI serving CSJ. In addition, the OSO works collaboratively with Augustana student service administration and units to ensure effective ombuds' referrals.

RECOMMENDATION THREE:

The OSO promotes a continuing hybrid model of onsite and remote delivery to increase accessibility to its clients as aligned to ACCUO Professional Standards of Practice.

Response: The OSO believes that the hybrid model has merits in increasing accessibility for students during and after regular work hour meetings, especially evening appeal hearings (most evening hearings are conducted remotely.) An additional benefit is cutting commuting time to and from campus and across various areas of campus. Comfort and safety (physical and mental, especially during the winter and dark evenings) are important factors for students and staff. This also cuts costs for university services such as protective services surveillance when walking to and from evening campus hearings, and food/beverages for onsite meetings. Students feel more comfortable meeting with their ombuds in a remote breakout room, and procedures for hearings are more carefully monitored by the appeal administrator and chair.

RECOMMENDATION FOUR:

The OSO, in collaboration with professional and graduate faculties, recommends more restorative practice sessions with special focus on equity, diversity and inclusiveness. The OSO in collaboration with other units on campus will promote earlier restorative practice sessions, as requested.

Response: Professional faculties are encouraged to schedule these requests with the OSO Director and/or Graduate Ombudsperson as needed. The Graduate Ombudsperson offers these with the assistance of the Undergraduate Ombudsperson and the Graduate Ombuds Intern.

RECOMMENDATION FIVE:

The OSO recommends continued development and facilitation of presentations and workshops addressing EDI issues and the promotion of EDI in all of our presentations and collaborative work with departments and faculties, student associations and as a self-reflective practice in the ombudsing profession.

Response: Workshops for Nursing and Kinesiology, Sport and Recreation, expanded this year with more self-reflective practices on EDI, tailored information for instructors, students, practicum professionals, etc. There were ongoing discussions with Rehab Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, Education and Pharmacy for the need to prepare students and staff around EDI issues, for practicum settings.

RECOMMENDATION SIX:

The OSO promotes the initiatives of the new Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV) Advisory Council and will collaborate in all its initiatives as an advisory member.

Response: The OSO is now a team member, working closely with the SGBV Coordinator and will continue to provide critical commentary on the implementation of new policies and practices. As the OSO serves those who have been alleged to be perpetrators of SGBV, it recognizes the support needs for all parties, and will provide ongoing feedback to ensure safety and fairness for all parties.

OSO RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2023-2024

RECOMMENDATION ONE:

That the OSO Director in consultation with the VP, EDI team develop a Declaration of Best Ombuds Practices Document implementing the OSO strategic plan to meet the ACCUO Standards of Practice of Independence and Impartiality. As of April 1, 2023, OSO's reporting structure has changed to an independent structure – reporting to the Vice Provost, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion. This meets the ACCUO Standards of Practice of Independence and Impartiality. One of the main goals of our strategic plan was to have more independence in our structure and with that the perception of impartiality. We are hoping to work on the other goals outlined in the strategic plan to be implemented, such as working on establishing the ability to investigate as part of our mandate.

Rationale: One of the main goals of our strategic plan was to have more independence in our structure and with that the perception of impartiality. We are hoping to work on the other goals that are outlined in the strategic plan to be implemented, for example, establishing the ability to investigate as a part of our mandate.

RECOMMENDATION TWO:

The OSO recommends that faculties introduce a policy on Undergraduate Leave of Absence similar to that under FGSR for graduate students.

Rationale: At least ten major universities in Canada have a clause on Undergraduate Leave of Absence whereas the U of Alberta does not. In our ombuds casework, we have recognized that the lack of such policy ignores structural barriers to students who may need to take leave for health, financial, and other reasons. In our casework we see students may have to apply for readmission, a costly process and an additional barrier. Given that such an Undergraduate Leave of Absence policy exists at other Canadian institutions, it may be a best practice to follow.

RECOMMENDATION THREE:

The OSO recommends that faculties review and revise academic policies older than five years, and encourages faculties to invite feedback from the OSO on these revisions. The OSO acknowledges that some faculties practice regular updates of their academic policies and often request feedback from the OSO for revisions. We consider this a good practice for all appeals such as those related to grades, practicum interventions, as well as the faculty appeal committee and practicum appeal board procedures.

Rationale: The OSO believes that policies should reflect the ongoing changes in the faculty for the students it serves. We are hopeful that processes can be streamlined to reduce anxiety and confusion. These include current practices such as 'parallel proceedings' (for grade appeal, letter of concern, request for interim measures, etc.), as well as corrective measures of a formal sanction without a full investigation. Regular scheduled reviews of policies and procedures contribute to a fair process that meets the needs of the current environment. The OSO will provide procedural, substantive, relational and equitable fairness feedback as requested.

RECOMMENDATION FOUR:

The OSO encourages instructors, investigators and decisionmakers to embrace the language of restorative measures and learning opportunities when questioning students at investigations, at appeal board hearings, as well as when framing their decision letters. One method is by refraining from language that labels individuals; this may occur through privilege and unconscious bias (making assumptions or speculating about a person's motivation) rather than focusing on the actual incident, issues and concerns. It is important to understand that negative labels can further stigmatize, marginalize and oppress those who have faced and continue to face additional barriers in life.

Rationale: During investigations and decision making, there are occasional references made to the Code of Student Behaviour as a "crime and punishment manual" and the use of outmoded and pejorative guilt and innocence language. It is important for instructors, deans and all decisionmakers to be mindful of the power they wield in their use of language. Corrective measures and sanctions need to focus on learning opportunities, rather than further stigmatizing students with labels. As the University embraces restorative methods of academic accountability, this paradigm will shift the discourse with EDI sensitive, relationship-building/restoring language. Ombuds recognize that emotions are strong for all parties and the stakes are high when there is an accusation of an alleged offence. Hence, there is a need for parties to engage in language that focuses on care and dignity (rather than accusatory language that escalates harm and fear) when working toward a resolution.

RECOMMENDATION FIVE:

For many years the OSO has advocated for a complete review of the Code of Student Behaviour and a development of a new policy regarding academic misconducts that would incorporate a restorative and educative approach instead of a punitive one as is currently in the Code of Student Behaviour. The OSO has a representative on the Academic Integrity Working Group which has been tasked with the development of the new Academic Integrity Policy. Our continued work in this area ensures that the ombuds lens of fairness and equity is put forward so that the developed policy is fair and equitable. The OSO will also provide supports to faculties and all university community members as this policy and procedures are implemented.






Rationale: This restorative approach will influence how decisionmakers make their decisions. The policy will ensure the student's voice is heard and their circumstances are uniquely considered and treated. The input of the OSO in policy development and this committee helps to ensure that the values of fairness are embedded in University policies and procedures. When policies are not fair and equitable, we run the risk of students not trusting and/or being frustrated with the process. This is compounded by the stress of the time it takes away from their academic work. There is also the potential for unfairness in decision making.

RECOMMENDATION SIX:

The OSO recommends that all professional faculties and graduate departments promote restorative practice sessions for students, student groups, faculty and administrators around the principles of EDI. The OSO provides facilitation and tailor-made sessions for parties who make a request.

Rationale: Restorative practices are used as both proactive and reactive strategies to help address conflict or harms that have occurred in relationships in an effort, where possible, to restore the relationship so both parties can move forward in a caring, collaborative and collegial manner. This is important for graduate students and students in professional faculties who occupy the space as both colleague and student, where power differentials between students and supervisors exist and where the building of these relationships are crucial to the success of students. These restorative practice sessions can be used as early intervention strategies; to help parties develop a healthy foundation and build collegial relationships, leading to academic success.

VISUALS OF PRESENTATIONS





Identifying and Addressing Biased and Discriminatory Behaviours

Presenter:
Remonia Stoddart-Morrison
Office of the Student Ombuds

Creating a Culturally Responsive and Safe Environment for Graduate Students

Presenter: Remonia Stoddart-Morrison
Office of the Student Ombuds

Mitigating Conflicts in the Supervisory Relationships

Modern Languages & Cultural Studies (MLCS)

October 28, 2022

Remonia Stoddart-Morrison, Graduate Ombudsperson
Eric Awuah, Graduate Ombuds Intern
Office of the Student Ombuds
University of Alberta

Like a Tidal Pool:

Building a Rich, Diverse & Sustainable Ombuds Office

A Conversation with: Hector Escalante,
Bruce MacAllister, & Natalie Sharpe
CCCUO Asilomar 49th Conference
November 6-9, 2022
Pacific Grove, California

OFFICE OF THE STUDENT OMBUDS



Location: 2-702 Student Union Building
By Appointment Only - ombuds@ualberta.ca
Phone: 780-492-4689; www.uab.ca/Ombuds

Photos of OSO Staff and Activities 2022-2023

Fairness Day




Orange Shirt Day





OSO Staff in Self-Care and Teambuilding Activities



Staff Potluck 2023

Staff Meeting



Board of Governors Open Session Agenda for March 22, 2024

Kate Peters <peters3@ualberta.ca>
Cc: Carley Roth <caroth@ualberta.ca>

Mon, Mar 18, 2024 at 9:19 AM

Dear members of General Faculties Council,
At the request of the Chair, I am distributing the [Board of Governors' Open Session Agenda](#) for March 22, 2024.
If you are interested in observing the open session, you may do so in person (Council Chamber (2-100 University Hall) - please email erin.plume@ualberta.ca to let her know) or via the livestream (sign up through this [Google Form](#)).
Thank you,
Kate

Kate Peters | *Pronouns: She/Her/Elle*
Secretary to General Faculties Council (GFC) and Manager, GFC Services

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
University Governance
3-04 South Academic Building (SAB)
Edmonton, AB Canada T6G 2G7
T 780.492.4733 E kate.peters@ualberta.ca



**L'Université de l'Alberta reconnaît respectueusement
que nous sommes situés sur le territoire des traités 6, 7 et 8,
terres traditionnelles des Premières Nations et des Métis.**

University Governance | www.governance.ualberta.ca

This email message, including any attachments, is intended only for the named recipient(s) and may contain information that is confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender by reply email and delete this email message, including any attachments. Any communication received in error, or subsequent reply, should be deleted or destroyed.

Message sent on behalf of the Chair of the Board of Governors

1 message

GFC Services (University of Alberta) <ugovgfc@ualberta.ca>
Cc: Carley Roth <caroth@ualberta.ca>

Fri, Apr 5, 2024 at 10:01 AM

Please see the message below sent on behalf of K Chisholm, Board Chair and Chair of the Presidential Review Committee.

Dear Members of General Faculties Council,

On behalf of the University of Alberta Presidential Review Committee, I am writing to invite your participation in consultation regarding the 2024 Presidential Review. Details on how to provide feedback can be found in the message below that was sent to the campus community earlier this week.

Thank you,

Kate Chisholm, KC
Chair, Presidential Review Committee

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
University Governance
3-04 South Academic Building (SAB)
Edmonton, AB Canada T6G 2G7
E prreview@ualberta.ca



The University of Alberta respectfully acknowledges that we are situated on Treaty 6 territory, traditional lands of First Nations and Métis people.

This email message, including any attachments, is intended only for the named recipient(s) and may contain information that is confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, or are not the named recipient(s), please immediately notify the sender by reply email and delete this email message, including any attachments. Any communication received in error, or subsequent reply, should be deleted or destroyed.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Presidential Review Committee** <prreview@ualberta.ca>
Date: Tue, 2 Apr 2024 at 17:24
Subject: Presidential review: invitation to provide feedback



Dear members of the University of Alberta community,

As you may recall from January, President Bill Flanagan has advised that he would like to serve a second term as President of the University of Alberta.

Upon receipt of this notice, the Board of Governors ("the Board") initiated the university's *Presidential Review Procedure*, and a review committee was established. The review committee is composed of the Chancellor, members of the board of governors, academic and non-academic staff, graduate and undergraduate students, a faculty dean, a department chair, and a member of the Alumni Association. Over the coming months, this committee will review President Flanagan's performance, before making a recommendation to the Board in the June time frame.

In order to conduct a fulsome review, we hereby invite members of the university community to provide feedback on President Flanagan's performance in any of the following areas:

1. institutional growth and the promotion of the university's strategic direction and objectives;
2. maintenance and enhancement of both internal and external stakeholder relationships;
3. fiduciary oversight of the institution's operational portfolios; and/or
4. strategic, operational, administrative or managerial capacities or initiatives.

In addition, the review committee is interested in any advice you might give President Flanagan regarding the enhancement of the university's position should he be reappointed.

Input can be provided to the review committee either by email or by Google form:

1. To provide feedback using a Google form, please [click here](#) (CCID login required)
2. Feedback provided by email should be submitted in confidence to prreview@ualberta.ca.

Submissions must be received by 5:00 pm on April 22, 2024. All responses will be anonymized and shared only with the review committee.

Thank you for your input into this important process.

Kate Chisholm
Chair, Board of Governors
Chair, Presidential Review Committee

This information is also available online on the Presidential Review 2024 website.

University of Alberta
www.ualberta.ca