



**SENATE TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE MEETING  
MINUTES**

13 January 2021  
2:00pm to 3:30pm  
Via Zoom

**Attendees**

**Senators**

Dr. Francis Andrew	Dr. Simon Bates	Dr. Julien Dierkes
Dr. Joanne Fox	Dr. Ingrid Price	Ms. Karen Smith
Dr. HsingChi von Bergmann	Max Holmes	Arezo Alemzadeh Mehrizi

**Ex Officio**

Dr. Moura Quayle	Dr. Christina Hendricks
------------------	-------------------------

**Regrets**

Dr. Alison Greig	Dr. Maura MacPhee	Christopher Hakim
Dr. Margaret Moss	Dr. Kate Ross	

**Guests**

Annie Yim

**Office of the Senate**

Jo-anna Cowen

**Call to Order**      The meeting of the Teaching and Learning Committee (the “Committee”) was called to order at 2:03 pm on 13 January 2021 by Joanne Fox, Chair

**Agenda**              By general consensus, the Committee adopted the Agenda as presented.

**Minutes**             ***That the** Committee approve the November 16 2020 meeting minutes as presented.*

H. von Bergmann  
S. Bates  
CARRIED

***That the** Committee approve the December 9 2020 meeting minutes as presented.*

J. Dierkes  
F. Andrew  
CARRIED

**Introductions**      Committee member introductions: Francis Andrew, Karen Smith and Annie Yim (Kate Ross’ delegate)



**Business Arising** Academic Integrity Working Group - terms of reference and membership – see below in Discussions

**Academic Integrity Working Group** Clarification of the working group's governance structure - this working group is being struck outside the Senate subcommittee process. Committee's role is to give this working group feedback regarding terms of reference and membership list; Committee is not voting to approve either. Distinguishing scholarly academic integrity and the student academic integrity in the ToR was done on purpose to attempt to bound or contain the scope of the work; scholarly integrity is related but may fall more under the remit of the Research and Scholarship Subcommittee.

### **Member Feedback**

Articulating those bounds may be helpful.

These ToR may be unduly focused on undergraduates. For graduate students both scholarly academic integrity and student academic integrity are highly relevant; for faculty as well.

In terms of governance structures, the academic freedom working group, academic concessions working group and fall reading break working group were all approved by Committee and reported to Committee.

This committee should have an equal number of faculty members to students or perhaps more students; this could help ensure this is a partnership of trust. One of the problems around academic integrity is we're not reaching the diverse student body.

The ToR read as if reactive to issues seen this year; if the ToR is designed to be reactive, it should address inequities (e.g. a higher proportion of international students being punished for academic misconduct) and membership could include Equity and Inclusion Office and the Ombudsperson for Students.

Could one of the T&L student senators one of the four working group student members? And at least one grad student and one international student.

ToR include a point about offering clarity about instructors' responsibilities; there is an absence of reviewing student responsibilities and how we communicate those to students.

It would be a good idea to have a student co-chair the group.

The working group report should regularly to the Committee.

All student representatives should be appointed before the group starts its' work.

### **General Discussion**

It was not the intention of the Provost's Office to try bypass the academic governance processes of this Committee or the full Senate. Although the working group wasn't initially conceived as a working group of or reporting to



this Committee, if that's something the Committee would like to revise, it could be changed. Committee would support this change.

The focus of this working group is on the educative approach, designing out academic integrity, not dealing with it when it's found; there's language in the calendar and the President's Advisory Committee on Student Discipline has a process for dealing with actual cases.

There was general agreement among Committee members that once all students are appointed and there are equal faculty and students, the group could start working and come back later for approval, once membership and TOR are finalized.

### **Extend Course Withdrawal Deadlines**

The committee discussed possible language for a motion for extending the term 2 withdrawal date.

The motion for term one came through the Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC) not T&L.

Chairs of T&L and AP have proposed that both committees will look at the motion, vote on it, and if approved, jointly put it forward to Senate.

Both Committees have remits for aspects of the teaching and learning environment. Withdrawal days themselves are set by policy V-125 which is the remit of the SAPC not T&L. It's important to keep SAPC involved in these conversations because the policy aspects, the regulatory aspects fall under its specific auspices.

The draft motions take the form of directing the faculties to exercise their discretion in certain ways, not actual amendments or exceptions to V-125. It is very difficult to change the university student information system, especially when it comes to things that are hard coded into it.

Withdrawing can have negative repercussions for students so while giving students agency it is important to ensure they're making an informed choice, talking to the advising offices so they know the consequences e.g. lose a scholarship; lose eligibility for a new major; delay their progress or graduation. Any conversation about permanently extending the W date ideally should happen across both campuses to keep the dates consistent and avoid confusion. It would be helpful to have complete data on withdrawals before a discussion of permanently extending.

The Committee discussed the April 14<sup>th</sup> deadline, whether it worked for all programs i.e. professional programs; cohort programs; those that started back on Jan 4<sup>th</sup> not Jan 11<sup>th</sup>.

This will be communicated by faculty advising offices so it's important to this get to February Senate so advising offices have sufficient notice.

*Revised motion: that Senate direct the Faculties to normally grant formal Withdrawal (W) standing upon the request of a student for a course or courses taken in Term 2 of the 2020 Winter Session, provided such a request is made on or before April 14, 2021.*

H. von Bergmann



C. Hendricks  
CARRIED  
1 abstention

#### Action Item

**Annie Yim to provide updated report on withdrawals when available.**

#### Remote Invigilation

At the last meeting, the committee discussed remote invigilation issues including concerns about equity and invasive monitoring and how to introduce reasonable limits to the use of remote invigilation tools. They also discussed the need for wide consultation because this could have a big impact on potentially large numbers of faculty members.

From a governance perspective, because this isn't necessarily a policy change, how does the consultation proceed?

For the Committee to consider:

- i) reconsider the order of actions: the current draft supports in principle a document and then asks for broad consultation on the document
- ii) What does feasibility mean and what assessments would a unit head have to make to determine feasibility?
- iii) Who should consultation encompass: unit heads? all faculty members? students? bookstore? CTL? University Counsel re privacy and data retention?

There is an urgency here because exams will come up quickly.

With respect to privacy, there has been student concerns FIPPA compliance is too low a bar, there are ethical considerations as well.

(Motion to extend time by 10 minutes

H. von Bergmann  
S. Bates  
CARRIED)

#### Action Item

**Chair will revise the current motion and email the draft to Committee members.**

Next step would be consultation with a shortened reply period.

For now, this will remain a stand-alone motion; if there is a continuation of online learning, the Committee can consider a policy.

#### Student Experience of Instruction /Student Evaluation of Teaching

Last fall, the timeline was set to introduce the change in questions in May of 2021.

Since then there have been some deeper plans to do focus groups and pilot surveys of the new questions, as well as input from faculty who are exhausted and maybe not equipped to prepare for the new questions by May, so the implementation group would like to shift the timeline of the new questions to the fall of 2021.



The steering committee, chaired by Simon Bates and Moura Quayle, has ok'd the shift.

This Committee had no objection to the shift.

**Matters Arising** Members of the Committee raised matters arising that may be of interest to the Committee but that were not included on the agenda.  
**none**

**Next Meeting** Next meeting is to be determined.

**Action Item**

**Jo-anna will be sending out a Doodle poll with possible alternate meeting times.**

**Adjournment** The meeting adjourned at 3:31 pm.