General Faculties Council
Committee on the Learning Environment
Approved Open Session Minutes

Wednesday, February 07, 2018
Room 2-31 South Academic Building (SAB)
2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

ATTENDEES:

Sarah Forgie, Chair	Andrews Tawiah	Regrets:
Kathleen DeLong	Jennifer Tupper	Yuuki Ito
Firouz Khodayari	Mani Vaidyanathan	Janice Miller-Young
Jeff Rawlings	Stanley Varnhagen	
Norma Rodenburg	Samer Adeeb	Staff:
Shane Scott	Janice Causgrove Dunn	Meg Brolley, Committee
Robert Desjardins	Janet Wesselius	Coordinator
Eva Lemaire		

OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Rawlings/Causgrove Dunn

THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment approve the Agenda.

CARRIED

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of December 6, 2017

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Causgrove Dunn/Scott

THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment approve the Minutes of December 6, 2017.

CARRIED

3. Comments from the Chair (no documents)

The Chair noted that The Quad had featured Graeme Pate, an educational developer with CTL, in the January issue. Committee members then provided the following news from across the institution:
- Engineering has hired two individuals on one year terms to create videos on youtube to enhance the lab experience for undergraduates
- there has been good response from across campus for the first round of OER awards
- the continuing work in Education to collectively engage in teaching and learning toward truth and reconciliation
- an engaged discussion on experiential learning at GFC
- the development of OER copyright modules with funding from a TLEF grant
- student group talking to applicants in the search for a new Dean of Rehabilitation Medicine
- as part of professional development activities, GSA is developing ways to connect graduate students with alumni and government who are working and using their graduate degrees
- SU advocacy with the university and government on OER

- ways to broaden access across campus when Faculties bring in visiting speakers
- good response to new TLEF smaller innovation seed grants
- Indigenization of curriculum

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4.   Copyright and LMS Course Materials

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Adrian Sheppard, Director, Copyright Office; Kathleen DeLong, Vice-Provost and Chief Librarian

Purpose: The Copyright Office is in the early stages of developing a process for reviewing the course materials on eClass from a sample of courses and is seeking some input early in the process to identify the issues and concerns related to such a review to better address those issues and concerns in design of the process. Feedback is requested from the committee that identifies points of concern and how those might be properly addressed in this copyright LMS course materials sampling and review process currently being developed.

Dr DeLong confirmed a commitment to consult early and often on copyright processes. Mr Sheppard provided an overview of the document and highlighted the focus on improving current practices and guidelines.

Discussion:
Members provided feedback on the importance of communication and buy-in from the community. They discussed how to reach instructors and provided the following suggestions: discussions at faculty councils with a focus on support and education; providing examples, with possible solutions, that instructors would find relevant to their work; ensuring the rules and message are simple and the information easy to find; and helping instructors understand where the lines are and how to be compliant. The committee discussed how to have the conversation about non-compliance, and using an education rather than an enforcement focus. They also asked questions about the cost of non compliance and retroactive licensing fee.

5.   Classroom Evergreening Plan - Update

There were no documents.

Presenter(s): Adam Giraldeau, Solutions and Standards, Information Services and Technology; Jeff Rawlings, Director/Relationship Management, Office of the Associate Vice-President (Information Services & Technology)

Mr Giraldeau gave the following presentation on IST Classroom Technology Direction to the committee.
(Secretary's note: The presentation was obtained after the meeting and will be contained in the official meeting file.)

Current State
- ~325 centrally booked classrooms with technology
- Currently provide a standard set of technology for (most) classrooms
- Year-round technology renewals

History
- Major expansion to number of rooms
- ~150 -> 325 rooms
  o   ~80 new rooms from construction
  o   ~80 rooms from adding technology to existing classrooms
- Major technology shift - Analog to digital
- Multiple years of budget cuts - 31%
  o $1.6M to $1.1M / year

Current Challenges
- Aging equipment and technology change
- Financial challenges
- No clear direction and fragmentation of governance
- Diverse requests for new functionality
  - Wireless projection
  - Lecture capture
  - Upgraded wireless
  - Higher definition projection
  - Changes to room and furniture layout

Financial Challenges
- Our current capital budget is
  - ~$1M/year (before recently announced cuts)
- Capital cost required to evergreen at current standard
  - ~$1.5M / year
- No additional funding

What we have already done
- Reduce cost for rooms - cost < 50% of 5 years ago
- Adopting new technology, vendor management and year round renewals
- More value from current hardware
  - Reuse existing where possible
  - Extend lifespan

- Feedback from Governance Committees on approach (it was noted that this did not refer to University Governance Committees)
  - ITSC-TL
  - LTAC
- Getting approval for plan still to come

Moving Forward
- Goals:
  - No room older than 10 years
  - Achieve this within 3 years
- Multiple Tiers of Technology
  - Level 0 - No digital technology
  - Level 1 - Foundational Technology
  - Level 2 - Larger spaces and custom configurations

Impact
- Transition ~200 smaller rooms to the new standard
- New standard achieves 90% of the functionality
  - Reduced ability to add or adjust
- Remove technology from 30 rooms

Approach
- Gradual Changes
  - Remove 30 rooms (completed across 3 years)
  - Changes during renewals (~35-50 rooms per year)

Operational Constraints
- Must be within budget
- Must be maintainable and reliable
- Similar user experience across campus
- Must address accessibility requirements
- Accessible through the booking process
- Geographic Distribution
- Rooms are available for work
- No additional rooms without available funding

Principles
- Room Size and Configuration
- Room and Technology Use
- Equitable Geography Balance
- Registrar's Office and Facilities Input
- Changing Faculty and Departmental Requirements
- Relative Cost of Maintaining the Room

Future Work
- Ongoing Technology Standards Review
- Transition to spaces for personal devices
- Possible new tiers or unique spaces
- Improved shared governance and design

Discussion:
The committee asked for clarification on classrooms which were described as spaces that were centrally booked/managed and those that were department/faculty managed. The committee discussed the removal of technology from classrooms, whether attempts at standardization were realistic based on the speed of technological change, how the basic standard for technology in the classroom is determined, how reduced budget and increased classroom numbers can be handled, a possible tiered model of classrooms with high end technology located centrally, and best practices.

6.   Summary of Learning Outcomes Retreat and update

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Sarah Forgie, Chair, CLE and Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives)

The Chair provided a summary of the Learning Outcomes Retreat and noted the ongoing work on learning outcomes including: CTL workshops centrally and in Faculties, an online Guide to Learning Outcomes to assist in writing effective learning outcomes, presentations by leaders in the field such as Harvey Weingarten, President and CEO of HEQCO in November 2017, and the upcoming March 16 presentation by Brenda Brouwer from Queens University on graduate student learning outcomes.

Discussion:
Members discussed: the buy-in of professors for learning outcomes, benefits to students, availability of resources in French, how learning outcomes relate to quality, the extensive use of learning outcomes in the in K-12 sector, link to mental health and wellness and the decreased level of anxiety for students, assessments linked to learning outcomes, how learning outcomes are used and perceived by students, difficulty in assessing

higher level thinking, that outcomes are sometimes unpredictable and organic, and the impact on awards which are based on GPA calculations.

7.   Experiential Learning - Update

There were no documents.

Presenter(s): Sarah Forgie, Chair, CLE and Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives)

The Chair reported that experiential learning was discussed at GFC as an item for early consultation and that there were useful comments and a good level of engagement of members in the discussion. She further noted that the Council on Experiential Learning had met twice and was engaged in developing principles.

8.   Updates (no documents)

A. Information Technology – Mr Rawlings reported that he is working with two professors in Education on secure testing an application for students to use their own devices in the classroom for testing purposes. He noted that it is in the beta testing stage now, with a pilot scheduled for the spring semester. Mr Rawlings indicated that with a 30% increase in computer based examinations, this may prove to be a way around limited space.

B. Learning Services – Dr DeLong reported on *Don't Judge a Book by its Cover Week* designed to encourage reading of underrepresented literature; this year is LGBTQ2S+. She also noted February 20 - 24 as Fair Dealing week across Canada and will include three days of panels and workshops on what fair dealing means in the post-secondary environment. She also reported on the images of research competition in partnership with the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research; graduate students are invited to present the essence of their research in one image. She indicated that there would be workshops on how to do this and that the images would be captured in an institutional depository and displayed in Cameron Library.

C. General Faculties Council (GFC) – Dr Lemaire reported on a good discussion at GFC on experiential learning which included questions about how to define it, the importance of reflection on the experience as a way of learning, and technical or academic experience. She also reported on the joint Summit of GFC / Board of Governors / Summit on freedom of speech noting the complexity of the issue and how support units would intervene at specific points.

D. Student Success Centre – Dr Desjardins reported that there have been significant organizational changes to the Student Success Centre, which has moved to the first floor of SUB and now includes the former Student Accessibility Services. (For those unfamiliar with the SSC, it is important to note that the centre's services are not just remedial; they support students at all levels of study.) This weekend, Graduate Writing Resources, a program within the SSC, hosted its third thesis writers' retreat in cooperation with the GSA. The retreat brought together more than 30 thesis writers.

9.   Question Period

A member asked about the status of the USRIs. The Chair responded that the policy development work was currently underway. She noted that she had spoken with other universities, most of which will not share what their questions. She also noted that examples of such policies are normally short with a more comprehensive guideline document. Dr Forgie indicated that St Joseph's new academic dean had offered that unit to test out questions and the multifaceted piece of evaluation.

INFORMATION REPORTS

10. <u>Items Approved by the Committee by E-Mail Ballots (non-debatable)</u>

There were no items.

11. <u>Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings</u>

There were no items.

CLOSING SESSION

12. <u>Adjournment</u>

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.