The following Motions and Documents were considered by the General Faculties Council at its Monday, February 22, 2021 meeting:

Agenda Title: **New Members of GFC**

**CARRIED MOTION:**
**TO APPOINT:**

The following undergraduate student representatives to serve on GFC for a term commencing February 22, 2021 and ending April 30, 2021:

Megan Ciocchetto      Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences (ALES)
Liam Pearce               Faculty of ALES

---

Agenda Title: **Synchronous and Online Proctoring in Winter 2021**

**CARRIED MOTION:**
THAT General Faculties Council recommend that the Provost Task force on Remote Teaching & Learning make appropriate provision for alternative delivery of lectures accessible to students in courses who cannot attend synchronous components, not including exams, until in-person delivery resumes.

**CARRIED MOTION:**
THAT General Faculties Council recommend an appropriate alternative way of completing the course for students facing synchronous learning accessibility challenges, such as, and not limited to, students who parent, students studying in a different time zone or having a poor internet connection, from the participation grade/weightage that is based on attendance or activities requiring students to participate synchronously, until in-person delivery resumes.

**CARRIED MOTION:**
THAT General Faculties Council recommend that the Provost Task force on Remote Teaching & Learning explore alternatives and resolve the concerns/issues related to synchronous online learning, until in-person delivery resumes.

---

Agenda Title: **Proposed Rescission of GFC Policy 37 and Consideration of the GFC Programs Committee Terms of Reference**

**CARRIED MOTION:**
THAT the General Faculties Council rescind GFC Policy Manual Section 37.

---
Agenda Title: **Motion from the Floor**

**CARRIED MOTION:**
THAT General Faculties Council refer Item 10: Development of a GFC Position on Metrics Associated with Academic Restructuring to the Academic Planning Committee and that it be brought back to GFC for further discussion.
New Members of GFC

MOTION TO APPOINT:

The following undergraduate student representatives to serve on GFC for a term commencing February 22, 2021 and ending April 30, 2021:

Megan Ciocchetto   Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences (ALES)
Liam Pearce        Faculty of ALES
**Governance Executive Summary**

**Action Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Title</th>
<th>Synchronous and Online Proctoring in Winter 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Motion 1**

THAT General Faculties Council recommend that the Provost Task force on Remote Teaching & Learning make appropriate provision for alternative delivery of lectures accessible to students in courses who cannot attend synchronous components, not including exams, until in-person delivery resumes.

**Motion 2**

THAT General Faculties Council recommend an appropriate alternative way of completing the course for students facing synchronous learning accessibility challenges, such as, and not limited to, students who parent, students studying in a different time zone or having a poor internet connection, from the participation grade/weightage that is based on attendance or activities requiring students to participate synchronously, until in-person delivery resumes.

**Motion 3**

THAT GFC recommend that the Provost Task force on Remote Teaching & Learning explore alternatives and resolve the concerns/issues related to synchronous online learning, until in-person delivery resumes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Requested</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed by**

Chanpreet Singh, President of the International Students’ Association (ISA)

**Presenter(s)**

Chanpreet Singh, President of the International Students’ Association (ISA)

**Details**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Administrative Responsibility</th>
<th>Provost and Vice-President (Academic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Purpose of the Proposal is:

The proposal is before the committee because the General Faculties Council (GFC) needs to explore alternatives and resolve issues related to synchronous online learning. Students are severely suffering, mentally and academically, due to synchronous online learning practice including lectures not being accessible to students in some time zones, participation grading based on attendance or activities requiring students to participate synchronously, and banning the use of the proctoring tools violating student privacy.

GFC is asked to make appropriate provision for alternative delivery of lectures accessible to students in courses who cannot attend synchronous components, not including exams, until in-person delivery resumes.

GFC is also asked to consider appropriate alternative ways of completing coursework for students facing synchronous learning accessibility challenges. These may include, but are not limited to, students who parent, who study in a different time zone, who have a poor internet connection. These students should be provided with alternatives to participation grades/weightage that are based on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.6</th>
<th>attendance or activities requiring students to participate synchronously. These measures should be offered until in-person delivery resumes. Finally, it is recommended that GFC explore alternatives and resolve the concerns/issues related to synchronous online learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Executive Summary | Due to Covid-19, the University of Alberta switched to the remote delivery of the lectures. This created an additional problem for the international or out-of-province students studying remotely in varied time zones. Some courses have weighting of term work based on the attendance of the students or participation in a synchronous activity. This is leading to some students having to wake up in the middle of the night or at odd times to attend lectures scheduled on Mountain Standard Time (MST).

Students who parent are also severely suffering due to their inability to actively participate in synchronously delivered lectures. Students from rural communities, or developing countries are also suffering due to poor internet connections, further limiting their ability to participate in a synchronously delivered lecture.

Recording of synchronously delivered lectures or other alternatives to make course content accessible to students until in-person delivery resumes is the minimum that the University of Alberta can do to help students. Decisions to use proctoring tools, should consider the students in developing countries with hours of power cuts and poor internet connectivity.

The GFC should acknowledge these concerns and take actions as described in the motions. While we understand that some courses might require active class participation, at the same time it is unacceptable to force a student to compromise their mental health or physical wellbeing. Concerns have been raised about pedagogy, academic integrity, Academic Freedom, and balancing the needs of a diverse group of students, but it’s important to understand that they are only applicable for the short term. GFC members should recognize that Academic equity and student mental health are as important as Academic Freedom. Students are suffering mentally and the University may, in some circumstances have a duty to accommodate these students in accordance with the University’s Duty to Accommodate procedure. This is why General Faculties Council (GFC) is asked to explore alternatives and resolve the concerns/issues related to synchronous online learning. |
| Supplementary Notes and context | The GFC Executive Committee discussed the motions recommended by COSA at their February 10th meeting. Using their authority to prepare the agenda for GFC as set out under 4.2 in their Terms of Reference, the Executive Committee chose to provide the following comments to GFC on this agenda item:

1) The intent of Motions 1 and 2 should guide the work of the Provost’s Task Force on Remote Teaching and Learning (the Taskforce), taking also careful consideration of the quality of education so that the high quality of education delivered will be preserved. |
2) The taskforce shall interpret motion 2 as encouraging that the full extent of reasonable accommodations (currently only mentioned as "but not limited to...") in the motion) be considered when providing alternatives to participation grading, and that the taskforce support with advice and strategies to meet the needs of students now and in the future.

3) GFC should note the scope of the University’s duty to accommodate and the definition of protected grounds in the Duty to Accommodate Procedure (see legislative compliance section).

### Engagement and Routing (Include meeting dates)

**Consultation and Stakeholder Participation** (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)

<For information on the protocol see the Governance Resources section Student Participation Protocol>

**Those who are actively participating:**
- David Draper, Vice President Academic (University of Alberta Students’ Union)
- Sachiketha Reddy, Vice President Academic (University of Alberta Graduate Students’ Association)

**Those who have been consulted:**
- 30+ GFC Graduate/Undergraduate Student Members.
- Council of International Students

**Those who have been informed:**
- University of Alberta International (UAI)
- Office of the Dean of Students
- Registrar and Associate registrars - University Registrar
- Vice Provost Learning Initiatives • Vice Provost Programs
- Public Health Response Team Academic Impacts Group
- Public Health Response Team
- GFC Committee on the Learning Environment
- GFC Programs Committee
- GFC Executive
- Festival of Teaching and Learning Steering Committee
- GFC Academic Standards Committee

### Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)

- Council on Student Affairs (COSA) January 14, 2021 (Recommendation)
- GFC Executive Committee, February 10, 2021 (Recommendation on the GFC Agenda, see comments provided under Supplementary notes and context)
- General Faculties Council, February 22, 2021 (Approval)

### Strategic Alignment

**Alignment with For the Public Good**

Please note the Institutional Strategic Plan objective(s)/strategies the proposal supports.

**Alignment with Core Risk Area**

Please note below the specific institutional risk(s) this proposal is addressing.

- ☐ Enrolment Management
- ☑ Faculty and Staff
- ☑ Funding and Resource Management
- ☑ IT Services, Software and Hardware
- ☑ Leadership and Change
- ☐ Physical Infrastructure
- ☐ Relationship with Stakeholders
- ☑ Reputation
- ☑ Research Enterprise
- ☑ Safety
- ☑ Student Success
### Legislative Compliance and Jurisdiction

1) **Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA):**
   - a. Section 32(1) of the PSLA states that “A general faculties council may establish a council on student affairs to exercise immediate jurisdiction over student affairs with respect to any matters and in any manner the general faculties council determines and to exercise or perform any other powers, duties and functions the general faculties council determines.”
   - b. Section 26(1) of the PSLA states that “Subject to the authority of the board, a general faculties council is responsible for the academic affairs of the university and, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, has the authority to(...):
   - c. (o) make recommendations to the board with respect to (...) any other matters considered by the general faculties council to be of interest to the university” - Section 19(3) of the PSLA further states that “[a] board must consider the recommendations of the general faculties council, if any, on matters of academic import prior to providing for.”

2) **Discrimination, Harassment and Duty to Accommodate Policy**
3) **Duty to Accommodate Procedure**
   - The Duty to Accommodate Procedure notes the University’s legal obligation and the shared responsibility between the University and the member of the University community requiring accommodation. Once a request for accommodation based on a protected ground has been made, or where the University should reasonably have known that an individual requires accommodation, the primary responsibility for considering and effecting an accommodation, up to the point of undue hardship, rests with the appropriate university representative.

4) **Council on Student Affairs Terms of Reference**
5) **Assessment and Grading Policy**
6) **Evaluation Procedures and Grading System – University Calendar**
7) **Alberta Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPP): Purpose of collection of information**
   (33) No personal information may be collected by or for a public body unless (...)
   - c. that information relates directly to and is necessary for an operating program or activity of the public body.

8) **Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Policy**
9) **Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Procedure**
10) **Collective Agreement between the Board and the AASUA 2018-2020**
Attachments:

1. Attachment 1 (page(s) 1 - 5) Open letter to the University Administration
2. Attachment 2 (page(s) 1 - 2) Letter to the Council on Student Affair (COSA)

Prepared by: Chanpreet Singh, ISA President, isa.president@ualberta.ca
Open Letter to the University Administration

This letter is addressed to the University President, Provost and Academic Administration of the University of Alberta by the University of Alberta International Students’ Association (UAISA, hereby ISA), to call upon the University to address the concerns related to recording of live lectures not being mandatory, participation grades and the use of remote proctoring softwares. The ISA raised these concerns earlier this year in the Council on Student Affairs (COSA), but unfortunately, the administration so far has failed to adequately address these concerns.

One particular concern raised by the ISA is the lack of live recorded lectures that could be used as resources by students, with some professors and sessional lecturers not offering any live recorded lectures at all. Adhering to the live classes schedule designed based on the MST time zone results in students living across the world compromising their sleep and well-being to attend classes. Therefore, some international students are missing live lectures or lacking enough attention and concentration while taking online courses as it is late at night in their country. These factors are negatively affecting their capabilities to effectively learn their course material, and ultimately their well-being.

We have also raised concerns regarding courses having participation weightage, to insist students to attend live lectures, again forcing international students to wake up in the middle of night for these participation credits.

Many professors are using multiple proctoring systems (i.e, SEM and ExamLock) to conduct remote proctoring for quizzes, seminars and exams. These softwares require a stable internet connection and have lighting requirements, which are not available to every international student studying around the globe. While we understand that final exams may require some sort of proctoring, making every weekly quiz or seminar proctored might be unfair to students sitting around the world, especially in developing nations. We as ISA stand by the UASU advocacy effort in banning the use of remote proctoring softwares.

International students are not in a different timezone by choice, they are in their home country due to very restricted availability of Canadian visa services, global travel restrictions and living expenses in Canada. As one of the leading internationalized universities, it is the duty of the University of Alberta to support international students in such times and address their concerns.
Our concerns have been frequently ignored by the administration, but as an advocate of international students, it is our duty and responsibility towards our community to write this open letter to the administration to make ourselves heard. The University of Alberta has 9,000+ international students, who chose University of Alberta amongst all other great institutions not only in Canada but globally, and this is how we are addressing concerns/issues that are impacting them the most by sidelining them under the name of Academic Freedom. It is unfair for the university to claim that it is not possible for it to simply make live-recorded lectures available whereas, on the other hand, it is relatively easier for the university to ask an international student to wake up at 2 am for four months.

The ISA strongly urges the University of Alberta Administration to address these concerns and make considerate decisions for the international students. The UAlberta international students’ community is suffering across the globe and it is yet to see what our very own institution does to help them in such hard times. Today, the entire international students’ community stands united and expresses these concerns through international student leaders who have joined this open letter initiative and their thoughts are attached to this letter.

The UAISA and entire international students’ community calls upon the University of Alberta to make recording of live lectures mandatory and ban participation grades.

Regards,

Chanpreet Singh
President of ISA
Support from the entire International Students’ Community

“A lot of students need to get up at mid-night to attend courses, seminars and labs, with eight-hour time differences. We feel that studying in such a way is harmful to our physical and mental well-being, and makes it more difficult for us to obtain achievements in those courses we are attending. So we hope that the university can make arrangements regarding this issue to ease our struggles, and make the opportunity for every student in U of A to obtain knowledge and make progress as fair as possible."

- Kevin Tang,
  President of the Chinese Students and Scholars Association

“The University of Alberta’s Black Students’ Association stands behind the International Students’ Association in their open letter to the University of Alberta. We at the UABSA are committed to helping the international black identifying students at the University of Alberta, this includes advocating for students to have equal access to their classes. We understand that this time has been stressful and challenging for all however, that does not take away the fact that each and every student should have equal access to attending lectures and seminars even if they are in a different time zone. For this reason, the UABSA stands behind the recommendation to make it a priority for professors to record their lectures for international students.”

-Celine Caruso Dixon
  President of the Black Students’ Association

"As the president of the Indian Students’ Association, It is extremely sad to see students who are currently abroad, go through so much, than the rest of us during these tough times especially on factors that are accommodable. Research has shown that sleep loss leads to learning and memory impairment, as well as decreased attention and vigilance, which can eventually lead to low grades and potentially lead them into a negative feedback loop. Considering the long-term consequences of our actions right now, I would like to appeal for providing the students with flexibility, in the terms of recorded lectures and to forgo participation grades to ease their burden. I sincerely hope that the university will reconsider its decision and make this a norm to support its students."

-Priyanka Maripuri
  President of the Indian Students’ Association
“International students are at a disadvantage in this new online environment with mandatory live lectures, having to wake up at irregular hours to receive marks for their classes. As the university strives to create an environment with EDI at the forefront, it is crucial that recorded lectures are available to students across the globe. To create equity in our learning, it is essential that these recordings are provided to students.”

-Nicole de Grano & Rupert Gomez
Co-Presidents of the Philippine Students’ Association

“The university experience makes a great difference in nourishing one’s personality, in the times we are living in I believe the International Student Community is already at a great disadvantage and going through enough stress, so not providing the International students with proper resources such as recorded lectures is just setting them up for failure. I cannot stress this enough, I do strongly support the ISA for taking the initiative and bringing this matter to the responsible personnel, and would like to see the University take proper actions to address this issue.”

-Maimoona Kanwal
President of the Pakistani Students’ Association

“Vietnam is 14 hours ahead of the MST time zone, forcing many of our international Vietnamese students to attend classes anywhere from 10PM to 5AM. A lot of homes in Vietnam are small, and oftentimes study and bedroom spaces are shared with other family members. It is incredibly hard for students to wake up to attend live lectures in the middle of the night while also trying to be considerate to their family.”

-Noella Chu
President of the Vietnamese Student’s Association

“Through these dynamic times, it is important to understand how decisions made can affect students, both locally and internationally. Adapting to the intersect between recent changes in education and the current global circumstance can already be a task of its own, however introducing new obstacles to those who live in different time zones can be overbearing. It is essential to recognize the needs of students and offer a fair system in which education prosperity can be achieved. Not only can these changes prove to be beneficial to the academic success of students, but also to their mental health.”

-Elfas Johannes
President of the Eritrean & Ethiopian Students’ Association
“Some professors refuse to record lectures on the basis of “encouraging students to attend live lectures to not miss anything behind.” I believe that this is unreasonable and discriminatory against international students who are not currently residing in Canada due to time difference. This is a trying time for all of us, educators and students, but we do hope that in order for students to study and for educators to instruct optimally, recorded lectures, more diverse availability times for office hours and banning participation grades will be the most beneficial solution to both students and educators.”

- Salsabila Natasha Andhika Putri
  President of the Indonesian Students’ Association

"The Nigerian Students' Association at the University of Alberta is committed to ensuring that Nigerian students enjoy a rich and fulfilling learning experience. The presentation of lectures and exams in a synchronous manner places a vast disadvantage to students residing outside of Canada. While we recognize the need to ensure academic integrity, it is also crucial to ensure academic fairness. Requiring students to attend lectures or write examinations at really late hours is far from equality, in our opinion. It is vital to have all classes recorded and available to be watched at the students’ earliest convenience. We strongly urge the University of Alberta’s Administration to consider this request in preparation for Winter 2020 and upcoming semesters hosted virtually.

- James Aina
  President of the Nigerian Students' Association
Date: November 2, 2020

Office of the Vice President Academic

**Impact of Online Learning on International Students**

Covid-19 has made this academic year a challenging one for the entire UofA Community. The international student community overseas is currently facing increasingly hard challenges when trying to navigate through the technical aspects of remote learning. This document shall summarize a few of the challenges faced by international students.

### Issue with Lectures not being recorded:

One particular concern raised by our community is the lack of live recorded lectures that students could use as resources, and which some professors and seasonal lectures are not offering at all. ISA is committed to raise awareness and foster changes regarding this issue. For international students overseas, time zone differences are affecting their ability to productively engage in online classes, mainly because of the odd times some lectures are being delivered in their home countries (e.g. very early mornings). It is also important to understand that our university has students from over 156+ countries, some of these students are in countries where there are no adequate internet connections, and hence are highly affected by the delivery of online live classes. Therefore, some international students are missing live lectures or lacking enough attention and concentration while taking online courses. These factors are negatively affecting their capabilities to effectively learn their course material, and ultimately their well-being.

Adhering to the live classes schedule designed based on the MST time zone results in students living across the world compromising their sleep and well-being to attend classes. Making the recordings available is crucial for the well-being and success of international students (currently residing around the world in different time zones) as they would be able to watch the lectures at a more appropriate schedule instead of joining classes in the middle of the night in some countries, as mentioned earlier. Recording lectures made available for later review could also potentially assist students in general to do better in the course as they would be to study the material multiple times and with better attentiveness.
Issue with Participation grade:

Few courses have participation weightage, to insist students to attend live lectures. While we understand that the motivation behind participation marks is to increase students participation and attendance, at the same time forcing international students to wake up in the middle of night for these participation credits is not valid. While, mandating attendance for a single lecture over the term for in-class activity is an exception, expecting students to attend every lecture in the middle of night is a concern. This would eventually lead to unfair performance evaluation of students from a different time zone.

Issue with Proctoring Systems - Smart Monitoring System (SEM) or ExamLock

Many professors are using multiple proctoring systems (i.e, SEM and ExamLock) to conduct remote proctoring for quizzes, seminars and exams. Such systems block the users computer and monitor students movements using webcams and audio/screen recorders. We understand that it is essential to proctor exams for academic integrity purposes, but it is also important to understand that our university has students from over 156+ countries, with not all of them having access to adequate internet connection. Students have also informed ISA about hardship in meeting the lightning requirements when using the proctoring systems. In addition, many countries do not have adequate electricity supply, thus leading to unpredictable power outages while writing exams on SEM or ExamLock. While we understand that final exams might need some sort of proctoring but making every weekly quiz or seminar proctored might be unfair to students sitting around the world, especially in developing nations.

Conclusion:

As an international student advocating body at the University of Alberta, we bring forward aforementioned concerns to the university administration and seek cooperation in resolving the concerns as we believe no student should have to wake up at odd times (for example, 3 am in the morning) for a whole term to attend classes. We understand that these are difficult times for both students and professors. The professors and students are both currently undergoing a learning process in which different means of technology/technique have to be experimented with, to understand what works best for online education. Most of the concerns outlined in this document are solvable by providing specific instructions to the professors such as making it mandatory for every lecture to be recorded, banning participation grades forcing students to attend more than one lecture, and restricting proctoring tools to only final exams or very essential components of a course. ISA looks forward to hearing more from the administration on the issues outlined in this document and we are committed to work together in resolving the aforementioned issues.
### Agenda Title
Proposed Rescission of GFC Policy 37 and Consideration of the GFC Programs Committee Terms of Reference

### Motion
THAT the General Faculties Council rescind GFC Policy Manual Section 37

### Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>☒ Approval</th>
<th>☐ Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by</td>
<td>University Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
<td>Brad Hamdon, General Counsel and University Secretary, Kate Peters, General Faculties Council Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Administrative Responsibility</th>
<th>General Faculties Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Purpose of the Proposal is *(please be specific)*

The proposal to rescind GFC Policy 37 is the final step in the reorganization of program approval processes. Before considering the proposed rescission, GFC shall consider whether it wishes to revise the Programs Committee Terms of Reference.

Executive Summary *(outline the specific item – and remember your audience)*

The *ad hoc* Committee on Program Approval Processes was established by GFC Exec on January 14, 2019 with the purpose:

To review current approval processes and propose revised pathways that will be transparent, straightforward and will incorporate the recommendations of the report of the *ad hoc* committee on Academic Governance including Delegated Authority, and other issues that have arisen since the report was endorsed by GFC.

The final proposal approved by GFC May 25, 2020 created a single standing committee, the GFC Programs Committee, responsible for a cohesive, transparent, and streamlined approach to the program approval process. The GFC Policy Manual Section 37 must be rescinded to complete the changes.

Section 37 of the GFC Policy Manual lays out the previous process for course and minor program changes that is now superseded by the delegated authority from GFC to the GFC Programs Committee as laid out in their approved Terms of Reference. The proposed rescission will eliminate the conflict between GFC Policy 37 and the approved committee terms of reference.

At the October 19th meeting of GFC, the proposed rescission of Policy 37 was deferred to allow for discussion of Academic Restructuring. The *approved motion* to table the rescission for consideration at a later meeting also requires them to consider whether GFC wishes to revise the Programs Committee Terms of Reference. Specifically, a motion was submitted by a GFC member to revise the Terms of Reference of the GFC Programs Committee that would require rescission of the
delegated authority to Programs Committee to approve new programs, modifications of existing programs, and program terminations. The proposed changes would have the Programs Committee recommend to General Faculties Council on:

- introduction and modification of academic programs
- termination of academic programs and report to GFC and APC for information.
- introduction, modification, and termination of programs from the Centre collegial de l’Alberta

### Supplementary Notes and context

**Rescission of the GFC Policy Manual:**
- **GFC Executive Committee recommended that General Faculties Council approve the Rescission of the GFC Policy Manual on September 14, 2020**

**Delegated Authority to the GFC Programs Committee**
- **The General Faculties Council has delegated authority to approve the introduction and modification of programs to the GFC Programs Committee. This authority was previously delegated to the Academic Standards Committee and the Academic Planning Committee.**
- **The work of the Programs Committee with delegated authority from GFC resulted in 30 motions being approved up to their January meeting. These decisions are usually time sensitive related to admissions and program cycles. Bringing this work to GFC will present difficulties in terms of agenda planning for Executive Committee, and for General Faculties Council in terms of meeting efficiency.**
- **Suspension of programs begins at the Department and Faculty level and are approved by GFC and the Board before consideration by the Ministry who has the authority to approve.**
- **Termination of programs typically follows a five-year teach out period and does not require Board approval before submission to the Ministry. The authority has been delegated to the Programs Committee and was previously delegated to the Academic Standards Committee.**
- **The GFC Principles of Delegation of Authority state:**
  - (7) “Withdrawal of delegated authority should be considered judiciously based on the best interest of the institution and cannot be done retroactively.”
  - (8) “An officer or body is not compelled to exercise delegations. The fact that a delegation is held does not oblige the officer or body to exercise the delegation if, in the opinion of the delegate, some special or unusual circumstances are involved which make it sensible that the issue should receive consideration at a more senior level.”

### Engagement and Routing (Include meeting dates)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation and Stakeholder Participation (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)</th>
<th>Those who have been consulted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFC Academic Standards Committee, Sept 19 and Oct 17, 2019, Jan 16 and Apr 16, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee of Associate Deans Undergraduate, Sept 26, 2019, Jan 23, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item No. 7

<For information on the protocol see the Governance Resources section Student Participation Protocol>

- GFC Academic Planning Committee, Sept 25, 2019, Nov 27, 2019, Jan 15 and Apr 15, 2020
- GFC Executive Committee, Oct 7, 2019, Jan 13 and Apr 6, 2020
- General Faculties Council, Oct 21, 2019, Jan 27, 2020
- GFC Executive’s Transition Committee, Jan 8, 2020
- GFC Nominating Committee, Feb 12, 2020
- Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research Council, Jan 22, 2020
- FGSR Policy Review Committee, Oct 2, 2019
- GFC Executive Committee, May 11 2020
- General Faculties Council, May 25, 2020
- Program Support Team, August 27, 2020

| Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates) | GFC Executive Committee, September 14, 2020 (for recommendation) General Faculties Council, September 28, 2020 (deferred) GFC Executive Committee, October 5, 2020 GFC, October 19, 2020 (deferred with motion to consider the Programs Committee Terms of Reference) GFC Programs Committee, November 19, 2020 (for discussion on Terms of Reference and mandate) GFC Executive Committee, January 11, 2021 (for discussion on Program Committee mandate and Terms of Reference) GFC Executive Committee, February 10, 2021 (for approval of the GFC agenda) General Faculties Council, February 22, 2021 (for approval) |

**Strategic Alignment**

**Alignment with For the Public Good**

- **Objective 21**
  - Encourage continuous improvement in administrative, governance, planning, and stewardship systems, procedures, and policies that enable students, faculty, staff, and the institution as a whole to achieve shared strategic goals.

**Alignment with Core Risk Area**

Please note below the specific institutional risk(s) this proposal is addressing.

- ☐ Enrolment Management
- ☐ Faculty and Staff
- ☐ Funding and Resource Management
- ☐ IT Services, Software and Hardware
- ☒ Leadership and Change
- ☐ Physical Infrastructure
- ☒ Relationship with Stakeholders
- ☒ Reputation
- ☐ Research Enterprise
- ☐ Safety
- ☒ Student Success

**Legislative Compliance and jurisdiction**

- **Post-Secondary Learning Act**
- GFC Programs Committee Terms of Reference
- GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference
- General Faculties Council
- General Faculties Council Principles of Delegation of Authority

**Attachments**

1. GFC Programs Committee Terms of Reference
2. GFC Policy Manual Section 37: Two Column Comparison

**Prepared by:** University Governance
37. Courses and Programs: General Regulations and Course and Program Changes

Note from the University Secretariat: The Post-Secondary Learning Act gives General Faculties Council (GFC) responsibility, subject to the authority of the Board of Governors, over "programs of study" for any "degree or diploma" (section 26(1)(b) and (c)) and also over the "granting and conferring of degrees other than honorary degrees" (section 26(1)(f)). GFC has thus enacted policies concerning Course and Program Changes, as set out below.

The complete wording of the section(s) of the Post-Secondary Learning Act, as referred to above, and any other related sections, should be checked in any instance where formal jurisdiction or delegation needs to be determined.

37.1 Approval of New Courses; Challenging Procedures; Changes to Existing Programs; Discontinuance of Service Courses

A. Submission of Course Change Proposals and Circulation by Secretary to GFC
All course changes, including the provision or discontinuance of service courses offered by one Faculty to another, shall be submitted in the first instance to the Faculty Councils for approval.

Course changes shall be forwarded to the Secretary to GFC from the Faculty Councils.

All program changes, and any course changes which affect the nature or course-sequencing of a student's program, will normally take effect in the academic year following their approval (i.e., the year the information is published in the Calendar). Exceptions may be made jointly by the Offices of the Vice-President (Academic) and the Registrar.

The Secretary shall keep a circulation list of Deans, Department Chairs and other interested parties to whom the course changes will automatically be sent. In accordance with the circulation list, the Secretary to GFC shall circulate once per month, during the first week of each month, all course changes received and they will be subject to challenge.

Note from the University Secretariat: On an annual basis, The Office of the Registrar and Student Awards will circulate internally (i.e., to the Registrar's Office), for information, a listing of courses for which approval has been granted by either the Provost or the Board of Governors to assess additional instructional support (miscellaneous), cost recovery, or alternative delivery fees.

The text that will be added to the course

### Indicate in Guidelines and Calendar Guide:

“Changes to service courses offered by one Faculty to another, including proposals to discontinue them, will require Faculty-to-Faculty consultation and review by the Program Support Team before PC approval.”

### REMOVE (Administrative)

To be added to the **Changes in Regulation Section in the University Calendar**

### REMOVE (no longer relevant)

Interested parties may request to be added to the FYI list for the GFC Programs Committee meeting materials. Those with questions or concerns can reach out to the committee coordinator.

### REMOVE (no longer accurate)

The text that will be added to the course
descriptions that require payment of additional instructional support fees is as follows:

?Course requires payment of additional instructional support fees (see Student Instructional Support Fees Policy in UAPPOL).?

The text that will be added to the course descriptions for alternate delivery or cost recovery courses is as follows:

?May contain {alternative delivery/cost recovery} sections; refer to the Fees Payment Guide in the University Regulations and Information for Students section of the Calendar.?

### B. Challenges of Course Proposals

General Faculties Council policy regarding course change procedures is so interpreted that the following shall be circulated and subject to challenge:

a. offering of new courses

b. dropping of existing courses

c. changes to the content of existing courses which alter the nature of the course

d. changes in prerequisites, options and weights.

Challenges which can not be resolved between the Faculties concerned shall be reported to the Secretary to GFC within two weeks of circulation. Challenges may emanate from any person.

Upon receiving notice of challenge, the Secretary to GFC, having ascertained that

REMOVE (Approval of new courses and changes to existing courses included in Programs Committee Terms of Reference)
attempts to resolve the difficulty have been made both at Departmental and Faculty level, shall notify immediately the Dean and/or Department Chair concerned and have the challenge placed before the Executive Committee of General Faculties Council for final resolution.

In those cases where the Executive Committee is of the opinion that a policy issue is involved, it will place the issue before General Faculties Council. Course challenges can only be made with respect to individual courses and must be accompanied by reasons relating to the specific course in question.

The Executive Committee shall decide whether a challenge is frivolous and an appeal from such a decision shall lie to General Faculties Council.

C. Automatic Approval Date for Course Proposals

Faculties may assume that their course changes have been finally approved if no notice of challenge is received from the Secretary to GFC by the expiry of the third week after circulation.

D. Deletion of a Service Course

The Secretary to General Faculties Council shall be informed of all withdrawals of service courses* in order that a record may be kept.

If agreement is reached between a servicing and a serviced Faculty on a proposed withdrawal of a service course, then approval need not be sought from General Faculties Council nor from the Executive Committee.

If agreement cannot be reached between the servicing and serviced Faculty on a proposed

REMOVE (No longer accurate)

REMOVE. To be added to administrative guidelines: Services courses were defined by GFC as basic courses applicable to other disciplines that should be taught by the Department charged with responsibility for the basic discipline. (GFC 26 MAY 1975) New service courses or modification of existing services courses, where more than one faculty is impacted, will require Faculty-to-Faculty consultation and review by the Program Support Team before PC approval.
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withdrawal of a service course, the matter should be referred to the GFC Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee is unable to resolve the problem, the matter should be referred to General Faculties Council.

For information on the GFC ad hoc Committee on Service Courses, see 37.3.1.

* NOTE FROM THE UNIVERSITY SECRETARIAT: Faculties are asked to denote on their submissions those courses which are considered to be service courses.

### E. Changes to Existing Undergraduate Programs

1. Faculty Councils shall approve program changes and submit them to the Secretary to GFC.

2. The Secretary to GFC shall then:

   a. Circulate the changes in accordance with procedures governing course changes. Challenges should be lodged with the Secretary to GFC, who shall notify the Registrar and the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) of any challenge. Changes to existing programs may not be implemented until a challenge is resolved,

   and,

   b. Forward program changes to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), who will discuss them with Deans of affected or interested Faculties and the Chair of the GFC Academic Standards Committee, where the Provost and Vice-President perceives this to be necessary or useful. (GFC 29 SEP 2003)

3. Any challenge to a program change arising

| REMOVE (Covered in the GFC Programs Committee Terms of Reference) |
| REMOVE (To be added to the “Guidelines” : All changes impacting more than one Faculty, will require Faculty-to-Faculty consultation and review by the Program Support Team before PC approval.; ‘Guidelines’ document will contain instructions on consultation |
| REMOVE (no longer relevant) |
| REMOVE (Consultation advice will be included in the ‘Guidelines’ doc) |
from step 2(a) shall be coordinated by the Secretary to GFC, in consultation with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), who together will ensure that Faculties are subject to only one negotiation procedure and approval route. (GFC 29 SEP 2003)

4. Any concerns of another Dean or Deans or of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), arising from step 2(b), shall be discussed with the Dean of the originating Faculty, who may, if the Dean sees fit, recommend to his/her Faculty Council a revision of the changes.

a. If the proposed changes are not accepted by the Deans and the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) the changes, together with supporting and opposing statements, will be considered by APC and submitted to the Executive Committee of GFC, which shall hear representations from the Deans and/or the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and shall then approve or reject the proposed changes.

b. Any Dean may appeal the decision of GFC Executive to GFC itself.

F. Faculty of Extension Courses and Programs: Approval Route (See also Section 12, 1, 3, 14)

1. GFC delegated to the Academic Standards Committee the authority to approve new non-credit programs and program expansions in the Faculty of Extension. Where additional funding and/or space is required, ASC would provide a recommendation on the proposed program to the GFC Academic Planning Committee (APC); APC, in turn, would have the GFC-delegated authority to give final approval for the overall program. (GFC 29 SEP 2003)
2. GFC delegated to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) the authority (a) to approve new non-credit courses or major changes in the content or delivery of existing non-credit courses in the Faculty of Extension and (b) to receive and resolve challenges concerning these courses.

3. GFC delegated to the Academic Standards Committee the authority to make a decision on any challenge made to an Extension non-credit course which the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) has been unable to resolve. (GFC 30 MAR 1981) (GFC 29 SEP 2003)

4. Credit programs and courses in the Faculty of Extension will follow the normal route as outlined in Section 3 and Section 37.1.

G. Changes to Existing Graduate Programs

1. All proposed changes to existing graduate programs shall be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research (FGSR);

2. The Dean of FGSR shall assess the proposed changes and identify those deemed to be editorial or administrative and internal to the academic program of the unit submitting the change. These, if approved by the Dean, will be submitted directly to the GFC Secretary to be circulated to interested staff for information;

3. Changes which are deemed to be of a major nature, or minor changes which have potential impact on other units, shall be submitted to the Council of FGSR for ratification;

4. Minor Changes which are approved by the Council of FGSR shall be submitted to the Secretary of GFC for information. The GFC
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Secretary will circulate the changes to interested staff for information.

5. Major Changes which are approved by the Council of FGSR shall be forwarded to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). The Provost and Vice-President (Academic) will assess the nature of the change and may approve proposals which have a clear and current precedent or analogue, involve no request for additional funds or space, and appear (after appropriate consultation) not to raise jurisdictional questions or larger issues of University-wide support.

Proposals which do not meet these criteria will be routed through the University's committee system by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic).

6. Minor Changes are those which do not change the basic nature and/or intent of the program. Major Changes are those which change the basic nature and/or intent of the program, or which result in a change or addition to the degree designations of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research.

(See also Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, Section 63.)

H. Courses Recommended for Admission

The GFC Academic Standards Committee does not consider courses recommended for admission (as opposed to courses required for admission); these proposals instead will be submitted to the Secretary to GFC to be circulated for information only. (GFC 29 SEP 2003)

37.2 Course Numbering and Naming System

REMOVE (No longer accurate)
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Course numbers which are deleted shall not be reused for a minimum of five years (ten years is preferred). This period of retirement is necessary to prevent confusion of the academic record by students, advisors, and those who refer to transcripts. (GFC 17 JUN 1996)

Faculties are discouraged from presenting proposals to renumber courses at the same number level (eg, from one 200-level number to another 200-level number) because of the confusion that this can create for students, academic records, advisors, departments, Faculties, administrative systems and transfer institutions. Strong academic reasons must be provided for such proposals. (GFC 17 JUN 1996)

Recommendations to renumber courses at the same level shall be proposed by the appropriate Faculty Council, circulated according to the procedures described in Section 37.1, and, in the absence of unresolved challenges, submitted to GFC Executive for ratification. Course renumbering to a different number level will normally be accomplished by deleting the current course and introducing a new course at the new level. (GFC 17 JUN 1996)

Course subject names shall designate broad areas of study (often an entire department) and shall not be used to designate numerous specializations. Faculty Councils shall endeavour to keep the number of subject names in the Faculty to an acceptable minimum. Subject names shall not be added or changed except for strong academic reasons. Changes made to subject names can create problems for students, other departments, other Faculties, administrative systems, and other institutions which are involved in transfer agreements with the
New course subject names and their abbreviations shall be proposed by the appropriate Faculty Council, circulated according to the procedure described in Section 37.1, and, in the absence of unresolved challenges, submitted to GFC Executive for ratification. (GFC 17 JUN 1996)

The single designation of INT D shall be adopted for all interdisciplinary courses.

The following course number system shall be used for all new courses proposed after June 17, 1996:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000-099</td>
<td>Pre-University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td>Basic Undergraduate. Normally requires no university-level prerequisites. Designed typically for students in the First Year of a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299</td>
<td>Undergraduate. Prerequisites, if any, would normally be at the 100-level. Designed typically for students in the Second Year of a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399</td>
<td>Undergraduate. Prerequisites, if any, would normally be at the 200-level. Designed typically for students in the Third Year of a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-499</td>
<td>Advanced Undergraduate. Prerequisites, if any, would normally be at the 300-level. Designated typically for students in the Fourth Year of a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-599</td>
<td>Graduate. Designated for graduate students and certain advanced or honors undergraduate students in their final Year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-799</td>
<td>Graduate Courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
800-899 Special Registrations

900-999 Graduate Thesis and Project Numbers

For the purposes of program descriptions and prerequisite designation, courses numbered 100-199 will be designated as Junior Courses and courses numbered 200-499 will be designated as Senior Courses. (GFC 17 JUN 1996)

Note: Some exceptions to the course number system described above have been granted to the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry. (GFC 17 JUN 1996)

Course titles should be as brief and general as possible. Care should be exercised to not recommend changes to existing titles which would suggest to a reader of the academic record that the course material has been substantially modified. In the case of a substantial modification of course content, a new course should be proposed. (GFC 17 JUN 1996)

37.3 Service Courses Policy

General Faculties Council reaffirms its present policy that basic courses applicable to other disciplines should be taught by the Department charged with responsibility for the basic discipline. (GFC 26 MAY 1975)

37.3.1

Since expertise and facilities in our university are organized according to departmental subdivisions, and since the duplication of staff and facilities is inefficient and impractical, General Faculties Council believes that Faculties can rightfully expect that properly qualified instructors from relevant
Departments will teach service courses on request. (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

37.3.2

Individual Faculties have the right to determine the programs of their students, subject only to General Faculties Council's approval. This right, to be meaningful, must be taken to mean that Faculties can, if they wish, define the objectives of service courses (although it is assumed that, rather than specify specialized variants, Faculties will use existing standard courses wherever possible). (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

37.3.3

Although Faculties have the right to determine course objectives, the means by which course objectives are to be attained must finally be the responsibility of the servicing Department, where subject matter expertise resides. (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

37.3.4

Students at the University of Alberta must have access to all courses that form part of their program (as detailed in the University Calendar), and should not be discriminated against on the basis of their Faculty of registration. (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

37.3.5

Historically, funding for Faculties has recognized the service teaching role. It is therefore incumbent on Faculties to see this role as part of their obligations. (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

37.3.6

Given points (4) and (5) above, any attempt
to limit enrollment on a discriminatory basis in courses that form part of the program of students outside the Faculty will not be permitted. (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

37.3.7

At the same time, program changes in Faculties that have an impact on service burdens for other Faculties require discussion and agreement between Faculties. (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

Faculties seeking changes to existing programs must consider and seek the agreement to any impact of the proposed program changes on the library system and on course enrollments in other academic units. (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

Any new program proposal going forward for approval will require a service impact statement. Where the affected Faculties and/or Library are in agreement this statement will note that fact and details of the arrangement. (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

Where there is disagreement, the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) will assist in mediation. (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

37.3.8

In order to ensure fairness in allocation of funds, the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) will recognize not only enrollment targets as mandated under Section 50 of this Policy Manual but also undergraduate course registrations and graduate enrollment. (EXEC 09 SEP 2002)

37.4 Repeating of Courses

1. Students may not repeat any university
course passed or courses for which they have received transfer credit except for reasons deemed sufficient, and verified in writing, by the Dean of the Faculty in which they are enrolled.

2. Only one re-registration for credit or audit will be permitted in any failed university course, except for reasons deemed sufficient by the Dean (or delegate) of the Faculty in which a student is enrolled.

3. 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 for reasons deemed sufficient by the Dean (or delegate) of the Faculty in which a student is enrolled.

4. In cases where a student contravenes regulations 1., 2. or 3. above, the Dean (or delegate) may withhold credit or indicate the course as extra to the degree, on the course registration that contravenes the regulation.

5. Students may repeat a first-term course in the second term, if it is offered, as long as the student complies with regulations 1., 2. and 3. above.

6. An undergraduate student who, because of unsatisfactory academic performance is either required to withdraw, and/or required to repeat a year, and/or put on probation, will retain credit for courses in which grades of D or higher have been attained during the period for which the student's performance was evaluated as unsatisfactory. Notwithstanding this credit, Faculties may require substitution of other courses in programs in which full course loads are required. (EXEC 17 JUN 2002)

7. The Faculties of Law, Medicine, and Dentistry were granted exemption from the
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revision to Section 37.5.6 above, retroactive to April 11, 1983.

8. The Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences was granted exemption from item 6 above. (EXEC 13 NOV 1990)

9. The Faculty of Engineering was granted exemption from item 6 above, effective 2002-2003. (CAAST 16 MAY 2002)

NOTES:


2. Withdrawals recorded on a student's record prior to September 1, 1988 would not be included in that re-registration count.

3. Students are responsible for monitoring the number of times they have repeated a course.

4. Withdrawals (W's) in a course will be considered together with failures (WF's or F's) when a Faculty is restricting the number of multiple registrations in a course.

Questions about this policy should be directed to the Registrar.

37.5 Course Flexibility

ADC Report on Greater Flexibility of Course Offerings at Undergraduate Level

In the course of discussions within the Academic Development Committee concerning the development of interdisciplinary studies at the University the question of flexibility of course offerings at the undergraduate level arose. It was suggested
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that there was a need felt among some students to have a greater selection of courses to make up their degree programs. These students did not want degrees made up of completely unrelated courses since in most cases a pattern or a direction would emerge from the courses they chose.

The Committee felt that the possibility should be looked at of finding new combinations of courses that would make meaningful patterns of study for students who wished to have a wider range of courses from which to choose.

In order to determine the existing degree of flexibility amongst Faculties and Departments in the offering of courses at the undergraduate level, the Academic Development Committee asked the Office of Institutional Research and Planning to carry out a study of this matter. The preliminary Report Describing Course Flexibility and Interdisciplinary Studies at the Undergraduate Level, dated November 1971 is available in the Office of the Secretary. The general conclusion of the Preliminary Report is that students’ freedom to take options outside the Faculty in which they are registered varies widely depending on the Faculty with which the students are affiliated and the degree program in which students are enrolled, as follows:

1. in some professional Faculties the programs are structured to educate students for relatively specific occupations. Their programs, therefore, tend to have a high proportion of required courses and in some of these Faculties there are few options;

2. in the Faculties of Arts and Science the student has greater freedom in designing a program, but must normally restrict choices to the offerings in these two Faculties. Honors programs which are designed to provide depth in a non-applied area, indirectly limit
the number of options by requiring many courses in the area of specialization;

3. faculties in which the educational goals combine applied and basic education allow the greatest flexibility, since students have considerable freedom to choose options of both types.

Having considered the Preliminary Report, the Academic Development Committee has concluded:

| 1. | that flexibility of course programming is the first step to interdisciplinary studies; |
| 2. | that restrictive regulations should be relaxed where possible in order to enable students to choose more freely from the course offerings of various Faculties. |

The Academic Development Committee therefore recommends:

| 1. | that Departments be asked to re-examine the number of required courses their students must have in their major field of study before the Department would approve the program as, for example, a degree in Physics or a degree in History; |
| 2. | that Departments be asked to re-examine their total programs, with particular emphasis on prerequisites and other restrictions to enrolment, whether or not they are actually legislated; |
| 3. | that the Faculties of Arts and Science be asked to re-examine the reasons for the restrictions in allowing credit for courses taken in other Faculties, with a view to easing the restrictions; |
| 4. | that in order to make more options available in practice, provision be made in |
university scheduling to make this possible;

5. that Faculties be encouraged to provide adequate counselling to assist students in the selection of courses or programs best designed to meet their interests;

6. that Faculties be prepared to inform the Academic Development Committee as to their progress in implementing the recommendations of the Committee.

37.6 Withdrawal from Courses
(effective 1999-2000)

Students may not officially withdraw from a course after the Withdrawal Deadline. All students registered in a course after the Withdrawal Deadline will be assigned a final grade by the instructor, based on course work completed.

Faculties shall have discretionary authority to waive withdrawal deadlines for their own students in exceptional circumstances such as illness or domestic affliction.

37.7 Prerequisite and and Corequisite Course Requirements

For admission to a course with a prerequisite requirement, the minimum grade which must be obtained in the prerequisite course shall be a D. (GFC 28 JUN 1976) (EXEC 05 OCT 1976) (EXEC 16 OCT 1981) (EXEC 17 JUN 2002)

The new policy with respect to a grade of D in a prerequisite course shall take effect in the 1977-78 Academic Year and shall affect students entering the senior course.

37.7.1 Prerequisite Course Requirements
Students registering in courses for which a prerequisite is listed must meet the prerequisite requirements. A grade of D is the minimum grade acceptable in a course which is to be used as a prerequisite. Departments may cancel the registrations of students in courses offered by the Departments who do not meet the prerequisite requirements as stated in the course descriptions in this calendar.

Degree credit may be withheld for courses with prerequisite requirements if the prerequisite requirements have not been met or have not been waived in writing.

Where a prerequisite is stated, it is understood that equivalent courses may be used to satisfy the requirement. In addition, the prerequisite requirements may be waived with the written approval of the Department that offers the course.

Students who are unsure that they meet the prerequisite requirements in a course, or who wish to obtain permission to have a prerequisite waived, should consult the Department offering the course. (EXEC 03 OCT 1988)

37.7.2 Corequisite Course Requirements

Students registering in courses for which a corequisite is listed must also register in the corequisite course or have previously passed the corequisite course with a minimum grade of D. Departments may cancel the registrations of students in courses offered by the departments who do not meet the corequisite requirements as stated in the course description of this calendar. Degree credit may be withheld for courses with corequisite requirements if the corequisite requirements have not been met or have not
been waived in writing.

Where a corequisite is stated, it is understood that equivalent courses may be used to satisfy the requirements. In addition, the corequisite requirements may be waived with the written approval of the Department that offers the course.

Students who are unsure that they meet the corequisite requirements in a course, or who wish to obtain permission to have a corequisite waived, should consult the department offering the course.

Courses with corequisite requirements may only be used for degree credit if the corequisite requirements have been met or waived in writing. A grade of D is the minimum grade acceptable in a course used as a corequisite.

37.8 Quotas on Courses

See Enrolment Management, see Section 50.

See Course Weight - see Section 61.

37.9 Course Weighting

Note: Course description symbols and figures are given in the Calendar in the Course Listings section.

37.9.1 General

In the normal case, courses will be weighted in terms of their hours of instructional delivery. A course which consists of three hours per week of lectures or stand-alone seminars for one term of Winter Session (eg, 3-0-0 or 0-3s-0) shall be weighted as three units of course weight (i3). Except for courses offered by the Faculty of Engineering...
additional laboratory hours will not increase this weight (eg, 3-0-3 is also i3).

In the general case, then, one unit of course weight is assigned for each weekly hour of lecture or stand-alone seminar instruction for the entire term.

Full-Session courses are weighted as the sum of the weights for each term. Hence 3-0-0 for a full Winter Session received six units of course weight (i6).

A normal laboratory course with no separate lectures or seminars will receive one-half unit of course weight for each hour of instruction per week for the entire term (eg, 0-0-6 for one term would receive 3 units of course weight, or i3),

Other courses have a variety of types and hours of instructional delivery. In proposing such courses, Faculties shall seek advice from the Registrar who shall maintain a protocol of course weight calculation based upon total hours of instruction.

Some courses are offered for credit only and may carry a weight of i0.

The weight for a given course shall always been the same regardless of the Faculty, program or year in which it is taken.

A number representing this weight shall be included in the Calendar.

37.9.2 Faculty of Science

A full session course (or full course equivalent) means a single course with a course weight of 6 or two or more courses whose combined weights are 6. A half session course means a single course with a course weight of 3 or two or more courses
whose combined weights are 3. Please note -
There are certain courses with weights of 1, 2
and 4; these courses are considered as
one-sixth, one-third and two-thirds of a full
session course respectively. For courses
taken in Engineering, the course weight is
designated by the i symbol. (See Section
192.8 of the Calendar.)

Following the title of the course is the symbol
"i" standing for "course weight", and a number
indicating the weight of the course as used in
computing grade point averages and for
meeting degree requirements. A full session
course is weighted 6; a half session course is
weighted 3. There are certain courses,
offered over the full session or in a half
session, with weights of 1, 2 and 4. These
courses are considered as one-sixth,
one-third and two-thirds of a full session
course respectively. Some honors and
graduate courses involving research may
vary in weight according to the length and
difficulty of the project. Some courses are
offered for credit only, and carry a weight of
0. (See Section 194.1 of the Calendar.)

37.10 Course Syllabus and Calendar:
Publication of Incidental Fees

The University of Alberta's policies and
procedures governing incidental fees are on
line in the University of Alberta Policies and
Procedures On line (UAPPOL). (BD OF GOV
23 JUN 2006)
1. **Mandate and Role of the Committee**
   The GFC Programs Committee is a standing committee of General Faculties Council (GFC) charged with oversight on matters related to programs of study and courses.

2. **Areas of Responsibility**
   a. Introduction, Modification and Termination of Programs and Courses
   b. Admission, Transfer and Academic Standing Regulations
   c. Physical Testing and Immunization of Students
   d. Non-Credit Programs and Courses

   *All proposals for consideration of the Committee are first submitted to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and/or the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research who will assist with consultation including consideration by the undergraduate or graduate Program Support Team (PST). PST is an administrative committee with a mandate to review proposals and advise the Programs Committee. The Programs Committee will not consider proposals until they have been reviewed by PST and strongly recommends that proposals are considered by the undergraduate or graduate PST before Faculty Council approval.*

3. **Composition**
   **Voting Members (18)**
   - Ex-officio (5)
     - Provost and Vice-President (Academic), Chair
     - Vice-Provost and University Registrar
     - Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
     - Vice-President (Academic), Graduate Students’ Association
     - Vice-President (Academic), Students’ Union
   - Elected by GFC (9)
     - 5 academic staff elected by GFC (A1.1, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7), at least three of which are members of GFC, at least one of which 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 staff members at-large (A1.0, A2.0 and/or S1.0, S2.0)
     - 1 graduate student, preferably from GFC
     - 1 undergraduate student, preferably from GFC
   - Appointed (4)
     - Vice-Provost Indigenous Programming and Research, appointed by the Chair
     - Academic staff (A1.1, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7) from Faculté Saint-Jean, appointed by the Dean
     - Academic staff (A1.1, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7) from Augustana Faculty, appointed by the Dean
     - Academic staff (A1.1, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7) from Faculty of Native Studies, appointed by the Dean
   - Non-voting Members
     - GFC Secretary
     - University Secretary
- Associate Dean of Students
- Director Student Ombuds
- Director of Continuing and Professional Education Unit, Faculty of Extension

4. **Delegated Authority from General Faculties Council**  
   *Should be reviewed at least every three years and reported to GFC.*

4.1 **Introduction, modification and termination of programs and courses**  
a. Approve the introduction and modification of academic programs  
b. Approve the termination of academic programs and report to GFC and APC for information.  
c. Approve the introduction, modification, and termination of programs from the Centre collegial de l'Alberta (including all admission/transfer, academic standing/graduation, and related matters)  
d. Approve the introduction, modification and termination of embedded certificates  
e. Approve the introduction, modification and deletion of courses  
f. Approve new course designators

4.2 **Admission, Transfer and Academic Standing Regulations**  
a. Approve routine changes to admission/transfer and academic standing regulations  
b. Approve changes to International Baccalaureate (IB) and Advanced Placement (AP) regulations  
c. Approve (for inclusion in the Alberta Transfer Guide) and deny courses for transfer credit to the University of Alberta which are offered by Alberta Council on Admissions and Transfer (ACAT) member institutions and institutions within the Alberta Postsecondary Six-Sector Model with specific exceptions outlined in the Transfer Credit Articulation Procedure.  
d. Approve routine changes to Physical Testing and Immunization of Students

4.3 **Non-Credit Programs and Courses**  
a. Approve the establishment of non-credit programs and associated courses  
b. Decide on any challenge made to non-credit courses which the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) has been unable to resolve.

5. **Responsibilities Additional to Delegated Authority**

5.1 **Introduction, modification or termination of programs and courses**  
a. Review and recommend program suspensions to APC

5.2 **Admissions, Transfer, and Academic Standing Regulations**  
a. Recommend to GFC on policies regarding admission, registration, academic standing  
b. Recommend to GFC on changes to admissions, transfer and/or academic standing regulations with institutional scope  
c. Receive and discuss the Report of the Senate Committee of Lay Observers of the Admissions Process in Quota Programs
6. **Sub-delegations from the GFC Programs Committee**  
*Should be reviewed at least every three years and reported to GFC.*

6.1 **Introduction, modification or termination of programs and courses**  
a. **Academic Programs – Graduate Degree Specializations** - All proposals for establishment, suspension and termination of graduate degree second level specializations shall be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research. The Dean, after consultation, may approve proposals which do not involve base operating or capital funds; the Dean will report these on an annual basis to the Programs Committee.

6.2 **Non-Credit Programs and Courses**  
a. Approval of modification, suspension, or termination of non-credit programs and courses is sub-delegated to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) who will report these on an annual basis to the Programs Committee.

7. **Limitations to Authority**  
The following further refines or places limitations on authorities held by or delegated to the Programs Committee:

7.1 **Academic Programs**  
a. In cases where a new program represents a new credential for the university, final approval resides with GFC and the Board of Governors
b. Proposals which involve new space or resources or affect long-range planning shall be referred to the GFC Academic Planning Committee

7.2 **Admission, Transfer and Academic Standing Regulations**  
a. Substantial changes and those with institutional scope are recommended to GFC

8. **Reporting**

8.1 The Committee should regularly report to GFC with respect to its activities and decisions.

9. **Definitions**

*Program* - refers to all credit programs that result in a government approved credential including: degrees, diplomas and certificates

*Non-Credit Program* – refers to stand-alone programs for professional development and continuing education.

*Embedded Certificate* – refers to a credit program with a specific area of focus that is completed during the course of an undergraduate or graduate degree program

*Routine* - refers to proposals which do not involve or affect other Faculties or units and do not form part of a proposal for a new program. Routine changes include any and all changes to the wording of faculty or program specific admissions or academic standing regulations.

*Substantial* - refers to proposals which involve or affect more than one Faculty or unit; are part of a proposal for a new program; are likely to have a financial impact; represent a definite departure from current policy; involve a quota; articulate a new academic concept.
Dispute - 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.

Academic staff – as defined by the Recruitment Policy (Appendix A) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff, Administrators and Colleagues

10. Links
   Admissions Policy
   Transfer Credit Articulation Procedure
   Undergraduate Admissions Procedure

   Academic Standing Policy
   Academic Standing Regulations Procedure
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