University of Calgary
Congress What We Heard Report

April 2021

y

Introduction – The University of Calgary Congress

As part of the ongoing development and delivery of the University of Calgary's Growth Through Focus strategic institutional plan, the UCalgary community was invited to participate in the University of Calgary Congress – a process designed to solicit critical feedback and constructive discussions based on the proposals from the University of Calgary's three *big ideas* detailed in October 2020:

- Transdisciplinary Scholarship and Areas of Focus
- Deeper Community Partnerships
- Future Focused Program Delivery

Those proposals were developed to provide a next level of detail around the future implementation of the University of Calgary's new institutional strategic direction, reacting to both the ongoing development of UCalgary's academic and institutional ambitions, as well as the current external context directly impacting institution.

The University of Calgary Congress was envisioned as an opportunity for the community to review the proposals surrounding the *big ideas* and provide substantive and direct advice to the working groups and senior administration on how to move them forward. Hearing reaction to the proposals directly from the UCalgary community allows a view into the practical perspective of those that would be contributing to the success of these ideas in their day-to-day scholarship, research, teaching and learning. The ultimate intended outcome of the Congress was to collect and consider the input arising from a collective community discussion to strengthen Growth Through Focus as it moves forward toward a governance review and approval process.

Reflecting What We Heard at Congress

The Congress itself was designed as many different opportunities for open public and group discussions, individual submissions to discussion questions, and both named and anonymous submissions. The main goal of the process design was to facilitate feedback of all types in whatever manner participants felt comfortable providing their submissions.

Those various input were collected, coded and synthesized into this What We Heard report. It is intended to describe the engagement process of Congress and report on the repeated, recurring and common reactions, recommendations and advice put forward by the Congress as a whole. While not every individual reflection that was shared throughout the Congress is included in this report, it does represent the general inventory of ideas shared within the Congress process.

Referenced Documentation

Throughout the course of the Congress, reference material was collected and made available on the [University of Calgary Congress website.](#) This includes all statements from President Ed McCauley, the working group proposals, videos of most presentations during Congress (due to

technical difficulties, two presentations were lost), and requests for transcripts of each open registration Zoom session.

Methodology

The engagement, through to the authoring of this report, was carried out by the engagement team at Y Station Communications & Research, working alongside the Office of the President and UCalgary Communications.

Engagement Principles
Entering into this process as the University of Calgary's engagement consultant, the engagement team committed to a number of principles throughout the Congress process. First and most importantly were the University of Calgary's table stakes: the commitment to ii'taa'poh'to'p and to equity, diversity and inclusion, as well as to the principle of charity. While no process or facilitation is ever perfect, the team worked to ensure that all voices could be heard on these important topics, and that the discussions were also grounded in desire to build up this institution.

The next was to be as iterative as possible. The engagement team attempted to adjust the programming of the Zoom sessions, the questions asked and the timeline as much as possible to respond to the feedback of participants.

Third, the engagement team wanted to give participants time to sit with the proposals and the consultation questions to ensure they had an opportunity to give thorough, well-considered feedback. This commitment was reflected in the extended timelines for the main survey and for the post-session feedback surveys.

Fourth, the engagement team wanted to provide as many input mechanisms for participants as reasonably possible. Given the limitations of in-person gatherings, it was clear from the beginning that the process would need to go above and beyond to offer opportunities for feedback and participation. With accounts participants could email, multiple surveys, an online discussion forum and through the Zoom Congress sessions themselves, the team sought to give participants as many entry points into the process as possible.

Communication and Outreach Activities
The University of Calgary adopted a multi-pronged approach to inform the University community of the proposals and the opportunity to participate in the Congress. This outreach included:

- Email notification of the release of the three working group reports (February 5)
- Email notification of the opportunities to participate (February 8)
- Advertisements through the Congress website
- Advertisements in UToday on:
  - February 10-15, 19, 22-26

- March 1-5
  - Email from President McCauley circulating the online survey (February 19)
  - Email notification of the online survey (March 3 and 5)
  - Event invitations to attendees of past Growth Through Focus events

Additionally, the opportunity to participate in the online discussion forum, email the President's office, and take part in the surveys was mentioned to each group at the beginning and end of each Congress Zoom session. Time was also built into each Congress breakout room to allow participants to work on their post-session reflection surveys.

As part of the Congress, but external to the Zoom sessions, specific student-focused sessions and follow-up feedback forms for the Students' Union and the Graduate Students' Association were held, including:

- Presentation with question-and-answer sessions with UCSU Student Legislative Council on March 23
- Presentation with question-and-answer period open to all graduate students, hosted by the Graduate Students' Association on April 7

The summary report from the February 25th, 2021 University of Calgary Alumni Association focus group was also reviewed and considered, but this process was operated by the UCAA and not a planned part of the engagement design.

Input Mechanisms

The following input mechanisms were openly available to Congress participants to provide their feedback as part of the process:

- Six Zoom sessions featuring presentations from the working groups and facilitated breakout discussions – with each working group proposal being discussed twice
- Six post-session participant surveys
- A final reflections survey following a closing statement from President McCauley
- An open online survey reflecting on each working group proposal
- Open submissions call to the President's office
- Anonymous submissions to the President's office
- Online forum hosted on Discourse

These opportunities were shared with the community through the advertisements and email notifications outlined in the previous section.

Data Analysis

All data collected in this process was qualitative, and coding and evaluation was done through qualitative content analysis. Coders from Y Station created categories based on the themes contained in the responses to each question, and coded responses to those themes where applicable.

All themes that emerged in the responses were coded and sorted into tables for each survey question, and subsequently grouped within each overall working group section. The transcripts for the Zoom sessions, and any direct submissions received were also coded under these tables. The themes explored in the findings represent the most frequently appearing themes within each of the three working group categories, across all questions from the surveys and the discussion within the Congress sessions.

As with any research methodology, there are inherent weaknesses to qualitative content analysis as a strategy – it can be reductive and relies heavily on the interpretation of the coder to evaluate the response themes contained within a content. However, content analysis is the most appropriate approach in this case, both by virtue of the type of data collected, and the complex themes contained within these conversations.

Engagement Metrics
Engagement metrics for each of the engagement tools are as follows:
- Attendance at the Congress Zoom sessions (916 attendances across all sessions, with 410 unique participants overall):
  - Future Focused Program Delivery Part 1, February 10: 136 participants
  - Transdisciplinary Scholarship Part 1, February 11: 120 participants
  - Deeper Community Partnerships Part 1, February 12: 126 participants
  - Transdisciplinary Scholarship Part 2, February 16: 136 participants
  - Future Focused Program Delivery Part 2, February 17: 151 participants
  - Deeper Community Partnerships Part 2, February 18: 132 participants
  - Congress Closing session, March 5: 115 participants attended
- Responses to the post-session participant surveys:
  - Future Focused Program Delivery Part 1, February 10: 55 responses
  - Transdisciplinary Scholarship Part 1, February 11: 43 responses
  - Deeper Community Partnerships Part 1, February 12: 29 responses
  - Transdisciplinary Scholarship Part 2, February 16: 26 responses
  - Future Focused Program Delivery Part 2, February 17: 30 responses
  - Deeper Community Partnerships Part 2, February 18: 19 responses
- Stand-alone survey responses:
  - Transdisciplinary Scholarship: 55 responses
  - Future Focused Program Delivery: 66 responses
  - Deeper Community Partnerships: 53 responses
  - Final Reflections: 30 responses
  - UCSU Students' Legislative Council: 4 responses
  - Graduate Students' Association: 2 responses
- 35 direct emails received by the Office of the President, from 32 individuals
- 54 anonymous emails received by the Office of the President
- 12 responses received in the Discourse online forum

Note: Y Station staff received two written submissions through non-Congress input mechanisms, which were included in the coding and synthesis.

What We Heard – Findings, Recommendations & Advice

This 'What We Heard' report is designed to provide a concise review of the general outcomes of the dialogue and debate that occurred during Congress. It is not intended to be purposefully critical or supportive of the working group presentations or proposals – it only acts as a mirror to the input of participants.

As such, the findings of this report are positioned as advice to senior administration on how the working group proposals can be evolved or improved in the context of the proposed direction of Growth Through Focus as it moves forward. Congress itself was not set up as a validation exercise for Growth Through Focus, but rather a community dialogue around how to ensure it best served the University of Calgary's immediate and long-term future.

Growth Through Focus Overall
Ahead of the breakdown of recommendations and advice based on each working group, there were a number of reflections from participants that represented overall advice for Growth Through Focus, rather than applied to just one or two proposals:

- EDI practices and ii'tah'poh'to'p do not feel reflected in the working group processes or proposals commensurate to their emphasis as Growth Through Focus table stakes. This is a narrow path to walk. Attempting to retroactively correct that involvement deficit at this point in the process is not a perfect outcome as it suggests that these components are afterthoughts rather than table stakes, however this approach is preferable to not including these perspectives going forward at all. There will need to be a recognition and exploration of the representative communities who are most significantly impacted by these changes. Any organization has blind spots – to address these, subsequent processes will need to be more intentional about including representative voices from across the institution, including EDI groups, Indigenous scholars and staff, students from both undergraduate and graduate streams, non-academic staff, and faculty from across the institution, to name a few.

- With each proposal, there was a sense from participants that STEM and digital programs were being emphasized at the expense of others, particularly at the program level in the Humanities and Fine arts. Even with assurances, there is a sense of inevitability that the Humanities and Fine Arts would be overlooked as each phase of the Growth Through Focus process moves forward.

- There is a deep concern from many participants that the shifts these proposals describe will require additional time and effort from an already resource-constrained staff and faculty. Further to this, there is concern that delegating resources to this work may compromise the ability of faculty members and staff to carry out other parts of their

work and deliver a high-quality student experience. Clarifying and understanding the supports that will be available and the expectations for community members to contribute will be important to the success of each of the proposals.

- Beyond process and development issues, many community members worry about issues that may arise with the changes to priorities and processes required to carry out Growth Through Focus – principally, this advice was about the character of the institution and whether it would be able to hold onto academic traditions and institutional practices that have defined the experience of many students and staff. These are trust issues, justifiably felt, and the University of Calgary will need to keep that concern in the forefront as it moves forward.

- There needs to be more clarity around the potential immediate and expected long term impacts of these changes on staff, faculties and programs. This is a broad category of concern, containing grants and funding, staffing, new resources, physical space and assets, attention from leadership, and of course the impact to the student experience overall.

Acknowledging Outright Objections and Endorsements

For the purposes of a What We Heard report it is important to acknowledge and consider, but properly place, outright endorsements and objections in the input. Because either position represents a very strong view, they are important to listen to and review to determine if either viewpoint reaches the point of a substantial critical mass. In both cases, these two positions made up a relatively small portion of overall Congress participants, falling an appreciable distance from what would be considered a critical mass compelling a substantially different process coming out of Congress. As a result, these two positions are detailed here, but the remainder of the recommendations and theme synthesis in this report focuses on input that falls between these two positions.

Outright Objections

During Congress, there were members of the University of Calgary community calling for a wholesale reset of Growth Through Focus, or at least of the proposals of the working groups. In the spirit of a Congress that invited a healthy debate considering all ideas and perspectives, it is important to detail the variety of reasons that motivated these objections. The strongest among these objections was that the institution had not appropriately applied EDI principles or the Indigenous strategy in the development of the *big ideas* or in the working group proposals and that the process should begin again with those strategic imperatives in mind. Other objections included a lack of academic rigour or evidence-based decision making; a need for different institutional community representation on the working groups themselves (particularly the addition of students and different faculty compositions); the perceived erosion of academic tenure; or some simply believed this was the wrong direction for the institution considering the external pressures on the University of Calgary. It should further be noted that many of these objections did not come anonymously – they were often made in public forums or with direct feedback mechanisms with names attached and with full accountability for their statements.

Outright Endorsements

Conversely, there was a small cohort of input from Congress participants that expressed very clear, in some cases unreserved, support for the direction forward. Those comments, while validating for the Growth Through Focus process to some extent, provide very little constructive and actionable input that the Congress intended to capture.

Transdisciplinary Scholarship and Areas of Focus

- Create incentives to engage in transdisciplinary studies by integrating transdisciplinary scholarship into performance reviews, promotions and hiring. Recognizing a person's contribution to the institution's efforts to be a leader in transdisciplinary studies will allow them to focus on this work without concern that a lack of 'in-discipline' research will result in negative reviews or career outcomes.

- Recognize that the nature of integrating and realizing transdisciplinary studies is going to take time, space and resources for the institution to move forward.

- Advocate to the Tri-Council to recognize the value of transdisciplinary work when awarding grants.

- The University of Calgary must be deliberate in creating an institutional culture around transdisciplinary scholarship – it must be viewed as a collaborative rather than transactional undertaking. Several participants who had engaged in transdisciplinary work in the past spoke to the experience of having one partner 'take over' a project or neglect to acknowledge the work of the partnership in presenting findings or results. How the TAC could or should intervene where necessary to help ensure partnerships remain equitable and respectful should be considered.

- The institution needs to make a commitment to removing red tape as transdisciplinary studies evolve and start impacting the institution. This will require administration to develop and reorient processes to foster connection and collaboration at the senior administration, faculty leadership and researcher level.

- Leadership of the Areas of Focus and TAC should belong to multiple faculties rather than resting with one to allow for a diverse set of opportunities for development and exploration.

- Create physical and virtual spaces where scholars can collaborate, post ideas and information.

- The supports needed for professors are going to need to reflect the nature of transdisciplinary scholarship. Provisions like course release and project-based administrative support for professors undertaking large-scale transdisciplinary research will be important to see a real impact.

- Conduct an environmental scan of the transdisciplinary work that is ongoing at the institution and elevate that work during early implementation stages. Right now, transdisciplinary scholarship is somewhat abstract, especially since it is in a strategic framework – seeing what's already happening in the field at the University of Calgary will provide a much-needed reference point.

- Connecting to the worry that the Areas of Focus (and Growth Through Focus generally) do not incorporate more general faculties like Arts or Science, consideration should be given to expanding the grand challenges to make them inclusive of more types of work and study.

- Think carefully at how the University of Calgary will incorporate students in a meaningful way. Involve students in the process of creating the TAC and defining the grand challenge; create a program stream option that allows students to build degree pathways across departments; or even make it a mandatory part of their UCalgary degree program. Allow graduate students to be supervised in multiple departments or outside of their home department was a common suggestion within this category of feedback.

Deeper Community Partnerships

- Make adjustments to the language to make it more accessible to the institution as a whole – the term "mega partnerships" gets in the way of engaging with the idea; "wicked problems" sounds reactive and "high value" feels exclusionary and lacks a definition. Shifting the language of these concepts and better defining what each mean will help create space for the community to identify with the concept. Regardless of the label, each concept will need a clear definition, including contextually relevant examples, and an acknowledgement that the concept is not entirely new to the institution. Explicitly recognizing that some of this work is already going on at UCalgary will help to illustrate the value the UCalgary leadership places on the on-going work of faculty, students and staff.

- The University of Calgary needs to be clearer in communicating the impact that a shift in focus to mega partnerships will have on existing partnerships and how they would support the new and existing partnerships that scholars and students need that do not fall under mega partnerships. Drawing on existing examples of mega partnerships from within the institution will help to make this case and committing to developing a clearer understanding of the current landscape of partnerships within the institution would also be a good step to illustrate interest in the ongoing work in the university community and develop a stronger sense of the approaches that have been successful for members of the institution in the past.

- It will be important to affirm support for and the value of existing partnerships. One way to do this is to recognize and incorporate in the proposal the strong community and network connections current academic staff have that can contribute to advancing many of the goals laid out in this proposal.

- An additional focus on smaller partnerships should be formalized and encouraged. This will, collectively, yield impact on the community and benefits for the institution. This is a low-cost move, as these partnerships would likely go forward regardless of the mega partners initiative and may carry great impact themselves or blossom into larger partnerships down the line.

- Ensure that mega partnerships are not solely synonymous with economic partnerships – as an institution, community and social impact will yield reputational capital, impactful outcomes, and open the institution up to a broader range of potential mega partnerships.

- Networks within the institution are the lifeblood of creating, growing and sustaining successful partnerships – work in the Deeper Community Partnerships area needs to support and foster those networks and connections as a key component of institutional culture, in both formal and informal ways.

- There must be a culture of inclusion within the pursuit and operation of new partnerships. That includes additional education on how to ensure all communities are included within the development and decision-making around what partnerships to pursue; that new processes, including folding in existing EDI practices and ii'tah'poh'to'p, involve these communities from the beginning of the partnerships process. Evaluation metrics should include expectations around EDI and ii'tah'poh'to'p best practices, and students and staff from all backgrounds and representations should be able to feel the benefits of these partnerships and engage in them if they so choose.

- Many respondents felt it was vital that the partnership model feed back into improving student experience. This could look like ensuring that students are meaningfully and measurably incorporated into partnerships and that all partnerships are geared to provide teaching and learning opportunities.

- In order to succeed with partnerships, the University of Calgary needs to create a clearer value proposition for why organizations or individuals should engage in partnerships with them. It must demonstrate the kind of institution that UCalgary is and be clear about the institution's expectations and values, while also providing examples of past partnership success.

- Partnerships of any kind must completely respect academic freedom at the institution – this was raised in particular when it came to industry partnerships.

Future Focused Program Delivery

- Preparing staff adequately for these modality shifts is vitally important for the University of Calgary to build a competitive advantage in this space. Under-resourcing those professional capabilities, both in terms of IT infrastructure, funding and support staffing, may result in the Future Focused Program Delivery not getting off the ground. This could include more resources and support for teaching staff who are currently teaching online to help them create better student experiences.

- Microcredentials, work experience and any other new learning modalities need to be paired with efforts and programs to ensure this shift is still accessible to all students and does not place additional financial or resource burdens on them. This is particularly but not exclusively true during the pandemic, when access to online resources can be a barrier for students studying remotely.

- Microcredentials and certificates need to have full faith and credit at comparable institutions and systems. UCalgary will need to pursue an advocacy and outreach strategy to ensure these microcredentials and certificates are transferable to other institutions and are recognized as valuable by industry.

- Students need to be foundational part of creating these new programs – the institution should seek to understand how these programs can respond to students' areas of practice and prepare them for the future that students wish to see in their programs.

- Collect additional evidence from appropriate comparator institutions around best practices and applications for microcredentials and stackable certificates ahead of wide-scale development and implementation. Appropriate comparator institutions should be of a similar size to the University of Calgary, should be public institutions rather than private, and should include some examples from within the Canadian context.

- The University of Calgary already has work similar to Future Focused Program Delivery happening within the institution, from interdisciplinary programs, to effective pandemic classroom practices. The institution needs to understand what is already working in the University of Calgary context and test if it can be applied and evolved into best practice in an institution striving toward implementing Growth Through Focus. An environmental scan would be a good first step in achieving this goal.

- Creation of these new programs and credentials need to continue to develop degree programs built around exploration, knowledge creation and practical application – even with more specialization and choice, the University of Calgary needs to continue offering a U15 status education. There is significant concern that these types of microcredentials or stackable certificates will lead the University of Calgary down the path of a technical college rather than that of a research-based university.

- Despite the ubiquity of online learning, in-person, community-connected learning must be a part of a typical University of Calgary experience. Students will want to ability to contribute to and benefit from a rich institutional culture.

Student Session Input Summaries

As part of the University of Calgary community, students were invited to and participated in the Congress as individuals. However, as part of an effort to ensure students were engaged in their own forums, sessions were held with the UCalgary Students' Union Student Leadership Council, as well as an open session hosted by the Graduate Students' Association. The findings of this What We Heard report are inclusive of all feedback, including from students at these sessions, but due to the specific nature of this constituencies, a brief outline of each session is included to highlight direct student feedback.

UCSU Student Legislative Council

The Student Legislative Council (SLC), the legislative body of the UCSU, made space available in their March 23 Session for presentations from the chairs of each working group, as well as a question period with the chairs and President Ed McCauley. SLC members were also able to respond to a specific survey to reflect on strengths or needed improvements for the ideas arising from the working group presentations.

Continued Consultation – For a number of SLC members, there was a clear expectation that as Growth Through Focus proceeds, students will continue to be consulted. Perhaps more importantly, SLC provided a reminder that where students would be able to make a clear impact was in ongoing consultation as programs are actually developed and implemented.

Ensuring Student Experience Access – Some participants at SLC saw potential in the Future Focused Program Development proposal as an opportunity for students to see value in a customized program but cautioned that these programs would need to be paired with support so that students are not excluded due to the cost of – for example – study abroad programs.

SLC members also cautioned that in order for more students to participate in PURE, NSERC and MITACS research programs – which Growth Through Focus generally envisions – the existing stipends for students would need to be higher to reflect a cost closer to a living wage. There were calls for joint advocacy between UCalgary senior leadership and undergraduate representatives on that potential initiative.

Some participants also saw the shift in thinking required by Growth Through Focus to be an ideal opening to apply creative approaches to other aspects of the student experience, such as lowering the cost of learning materials through Open Educational Resources, which may be ideal for personalized learning programs.

Campus Community Building – While SLC participants recognized the opportunity in more learning opportunities outside of traditional classroom settings as a potential strength of these proposals (particularly when looking at the success of current programs), there was additional advice that a brick and mortar campus community experience is still vital for students in their learning and in the institution's ability to create strong ambassadors for UCalgary, and promotes a diversity of thought that only a physical experience can reliably provide.

Microcredential Quality – As with graduate students (as you will see below) and Congress participants in general, students saw the concept of microcredentials is only as valuable as the full faith and credit they held at comparable institutions in the U15 and beyond.

Incorporating EDI Concerns – Several members of SLC saw the shift in thinking and opportunities for input in Growth Through Focus as a smart opportunity to address some EDI issues affecting students. In particular, a focus on building trust with equity-seeking students that they would be able to report acts of racism and discrimination without consequence to scholarships or academic advancement.

Graduate Students' Association Hosted Session

On April 7, the GSA hosted graduate students to see presentations from the working group chairs and ask questions, again with President McCauley available. As with the SLC session, a short survey was available.

Participating in Development and Details – Graduate students present at the session generally acknowledged that the working group proposals, at a high level, represent new and potentially interesting opportunities for graduate students. Participants signaled that much of their experience and ability to advance their graduate studies would depend on additional detail in the creation and administration of these initiatives, including:

- What kind of service structure something like the Transdisciplinary Activity Centre might have (is it a physical office? Online service centre? etc.).
- That the integration of international students into these new programs will need to be considered given the additional financial, working and scholarship constraints they face.
- That students coming from different university systems have sufficient support to help them navigate unique microcredential, certificate and program opportunities.

The students reminded the session that these are all solvable problems if students are at the table helping provide input into the new programs and supports that come with them. The students at the session – many of whom were GSA executive members – signaled that they were up for the challenge.

The Role of Social Sciences and Humanities – As with the general Congress participant population, graduate students were concerned about the impact Growth Through Focus would have on the importance of Fine Arts and Humanities at the University of Calgary moving forward. Some attendees saw the Social Sciences and Humanities as having important interdisciplinary strengths. There was a desire from these attendees to see the Social Sciences, Fine Arts and Humanities to be continually engaged and incorporated as Growth Through Focus comes online.

Supporting Graduate Students **–** Participants reminded the session that graduate students have a lot of different responsibilities, including graduate teaching and their research, which is typically their main source of income. With changes to program choices or changes to the

programs they are providing support for, there is a clear need to ensure that graduate students are not inadvertently burdened with additional work that keeps them from progressing in their research or their ability to meet important external responsibilities such as family and children.

EDI Issues – While participants accepted that the University of Calgary was developing a larger proposal on equity, diversity and inclusion issues, some participants saw Growth Through Focus as being a good opportunity to make some strides in that category. Beyond the general commitments to EDI and ii'taa'poh'to'p, there is room to create new opportunities and a welcoming environment for new cohorts of equity-seeking students. This was also reflected in the various discussions around how graduate students are supported so that they can participate – if UCalgary can attract diverse students with new and valuable academic programs, there needs to be a scaffolding in place to support them as they navigate the institution.

Microcredential Quality – Echoing the undergraduate students and the general population, the graduate students also provided the advice that the quality of microcredential programs is vital to their success and that they must be transferable between institutions. The quality of the microcredentials (and certificate programs, for that matter) overall at the University of Calgary can be further ensured by continuing to engage graduate students in the development of all Growth Through Focus initiatives.

Conclusion

A congress is a forum intended to provide an authentic and robust discussion about matters of importance and consequence. The participants in a congress must listen carefully, present their arguments in good faith, and truly inform decision-making as a means of making constructive progress. While the University of Calgary Congress process was not perfect – no engagement process ever is – these principles were generally adhered to in the course of this process, yielding a significant amount of input from which to garner substantive and constructive feedback from the UCalgary community to move Growth Through Focus forward.

The recommendations and advice contained within this report will be reviewed and responded to by University of Calgary senior administration and will materially inform the next steps as Growth Through Focus moves toward submission to the governance process.