AMS Education Committee

Minutes of May 8th, 2013

Attendance

Present: Armin Rezaiean-Asel (Chair), Eugene Ma (Member-at-large), Celia Yang (SUS), Eric Toyota (SUS), Stephanie Goh (LFS), Phaidra Ruck (Education), Caroline Wong (AMS President), Umang Khandelwal (AVPAUA)

Guests: Cole Leonoff (Senate – non member)

Regrets: Mona Maleki (Senate), Kurtis Harms (Member-at-large), Joaquin (VPF), Kiran (VPAUA)

Recording Secretary: Cole Leonoff (Student-at-large)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:04 P.M.

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Phaidra  
Seconded: Stephanie

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Appointment of the Vice-Chair

With the Chair noting that he will be away for a portion of the committee’s summer meeting, he suggested that the role of the appointed Vice-Chair is of particular importance. Your responsibility would primarily be in terms of running meetings as an in-person presence and would not place squarely on your shoulders the responsibilities of planning for the committee’s work; the Chair would continue doing so remotely.

Caroline suggested that Cole take on the role of Vice-Chair, but he noted that he was ineligible given that he is not presently a committee member.
Phaidra expressed interest and nominated herself to the position; Eric also expressed interest but noted that he would be away for part of July.

Moved: Stephanie  
Seconded: Eric

That Phaidra be appointed Vice-Chair of Education Committee for the duration of the present committee’s term, until the committee’s membership be replaced at the September meeting of AMS Council.

The motion carries unanimously.

Strategic Planning

Armin noted that all committees are responsible for providing updates to Council, and that a report is required at the end of each month regarding the committee’s activities. As such, it was emphasized that it is important to set tangible goals now for the committee’s summer term.

Armin opened the floor to suggestions of areas of interest from committee members. He gave an overview of some of the committee’s discussions last year, including the examinations database, midterm evaluations of teaching, and the Bachelor of International Economics degree’s tuition.

Phaidra raised the issue of the present arrangement of courses in the Education program at UBC, and stated that the consultation and feedback component of revising the current process would benefit from the committee’s assistance and to some degree advocacy. Some classes have been significantly reduced in class hours, the new “enhanced” practicum entails activities that have been met with some concern by students, and a number of other factors.

Celia spoke about issues of perceived disconnect between students and professors in the Faculty of Science in that students have a difficult time engaging with their instructors.

Caroline raised the point of anonymous grading and its use at other schools; Cole and Caroline both spoke to the issue of inconsistency in any such implementation at UBC.

Phaidra brought up the lack of tracking of employment rates for many faculties following the graduation of their students, with the idea there should be measurements of career success and preparation for UBC’s students.
Caroline tied in the above point to a lack of surveying of student satisfaction regarding academic advising, stating that there should be some set standard for the provision of data for evaluating advising successes.

Celia felt that there is a lack of a full orientations experience to UBC and more specifically a longer-lasting mentor (something beyond the role of a MUG leader); Phaidra suggested that a more full-fledged mentorship program should be developed. Eric raised the point that a lot of the mentorship that exists with MUG leader is focused -- and is emphasized during their training -- on extracurricular rather than academic needs. Students require some degree of information from others when it comes to study plans and approaches and knowledge as to how courses go. Caroline suggested that with the new UBC Orientations team having been hired, Education Committee and Student Life and Communications Committee should collaborated to convey to the trainers involved in the program what, from a student’s perspective, should play a part in the student onboarding experience. Eric suggested that the undergraduate society’s committees responsible for “Frosh” and “First Week”-type events should be involved in this, perhaps more so than UBC Orientations.

Umang mentioned the allowing of several minutes prior to beginning writing an exam during which students are allowed to review and read through the exam, with Armin further clarifying that it allows students an opportunity to “calm” themselves prior to the beginning of an exam.

Caroline mentioned that Kiran is working heavily on the Flexible Learning Initiative, and that the committee should also follow what is happening with the new Vantage College program. The committee was provided with a brief discussion of what the College is and some members noted concern with the proposed rapid rate of increase in intake numbers for students into the program.

Caroline spoke to the issue of mental health and the fact that it has for a number of years been an issue in academic discussions but that Education Committee hasn’t necessarily taken a specific stance on the issue yet.

Armin provided a brief reading over the Senate Student Caucus’s goals for the upcoming year.

The committee agreed that the academic mentorship and orientation matter discussed earlier would be a main priority for the summer.

Armin brought back up an aforementioned “academic bill of rights” regarding students’ academic allowances.
The committee agreed that cooperation with the Student Senate Caucus would be important going forward.

A faculty specific student survey was discussed, though it was noted that this in a lot of ways resembles the current AMS Academic Experience Survey.

**Summary of goals**

1) Guidebook in collaboration with Orientations Team to provide incoming students with more academic support.

2) Work in collaboration with the Student Senate Caucus to help move their goals forward.

3) (Side goal, if time permits) – look into prospect of “Bill of Rights” – this still requires a great deal of background research before becoming a real possibility.

**Tasks Assigned**

Armin (by next meeting, approximately 2 weeks time)

- Meet with SSC Chair to determine specifics on how Education Committee can best work with the SSC throughout the summer.

- Talk to Student Life Committee Chair regarding UBC Orientations academic guide idea.

- Follow-up with Caroline on “Bill of Rights” model used abroad.

**Next Meeting**

To be determined.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 P.M.
AMS Education Committee

Minutes of June 11th, 2013

Attendance

Present: Phaidra, Iugene, Niloufar, Stephanie, Celia, Kurtis, Mona

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:20pm

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Kurtis    Seconded: Niloufar

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Niloufar    Seconded: Kurtis

That the minutes from May 29, 2013 meeting be approved.

The motion carries unanimously.

Update from Kiran’s Office

- flexible learning initiative meet into seminars
  - use online technology
  - create interactive lecture
  - team based learning
  - styles of learning

- MOOC, free online, course cera
  - not for credit
  - how do you organize proctor
  - lecture capture - popular to a limited extent in some faculties
AMS Academic Policy Discussion – Revisions & Updates

Summary (order of prioritization from greatest to least urgent):

1) **1998-11, 2002-01, 2004-03, 2007-06** – look into re-affirming an exam hardship policy with the possibility of changing the “3 or more in 24 hours” rule to “3 or more in 36 hours.”
   a. Is there any possibility of this happening at Senate level?
      Kurtis: this may be a chance for advocacy this year, even though it may be a stretch for Senate to adopt this
      Nil: The University may not want to because of the perception the exam period may have to be extended, and the existing policies work to give students extensions if they need it
      General agreement around the table
      i. contact student senators, push w.d date

   b. What would be the repercussions? Additional research required.
      i. how many students will be affected as a result of 36 hours
      ii. consult other university about their action plan to resolve exams in 36 hours or similar solutions, alternative plans to
      iii. what are existing policies about 36 hours, what were previous cases

2) **2007-16** – look into re-affirming with an additional clause that refers to and supports the midterm teaching evaluation processes, assuming that adds values to the VPA’s initiative in that area.
   a. action to add midterm evaluation / find existing policy to integrate
      i. try to make evaluations public?
         1. Goes against spirit of formative evaluation
         2. Question of how effective these are if they are optional
         3. What mechanisms for follow up – are these in the policy?
      ii. can course evaluation
      iii. action length less than 5 minutes
      iv. hard to get a response efficiently without time

3) **1997-07, 2010-01** – desire to look into updated federal policy on copyright that would affect this open access policy before re-affirming.
   a. new law, exception for fair use
   3) access, copyright was the old way
      a. reference to ‘open access’, hosted library? Some policy terminology vague, perhaps idealistic
b. is the wording of open access current?
c. Do we want an idealist policy or a pragmatic one? – merits in both

4) Need an update of the creation in house copyright policies
   a. Step 2 to reaffirm from ams council as an action

5) call on university to educate faculty on possible copyrighted materials
   a. issue of Profs not knowing the copyright policy, resistance to posting articles online for fear of breaching copyright, erring on side of safety/ ignorance
   b. issue: we do not know how much existing material/ occurrences where copyright is sidestepped to ignore whether it is legal or not

2000-09, 2004-05 – omnibus academic policies. Can they be split up into more specific, individual policies? Or is a general, omnibus version better?
   • action - why is this omnibus
   • May have been from a last-minute push in the term, through Senate? (May)

6) On research grants – don’t fit with a lot in this omnibus

7) information of instructors should be streamlined
   a. Was the idea ‘Rate my Prof UBC’?
   b. Needs an update to reflect current practices

8) academic concessions
   a. includes wellness (mental health, family problem)
   b. different between faculties?
   c. what are rights. day to day, midterms, vs final which are not controlled by faculty
   d. Do you get a concession for a midterm?
      i. discretion of faculty
         1. should this be streamlined?
         2. Risk of ruining nice Prof practices in exchange for rigid policy
   e. academic concession is vaguely discussed, needs specific language

9) flexible courses (affects xchange, interdisciplinary)

10) prioritize what has been consolidated

Order of Action Items for VP Academic
1) Restructure interval between final exams to be 36 hours - Exam hardship
   • Best chance at advocacy w/Senate

2) Midterm evaluation and report
   • Estimate not much time finding the existing policy from last year to integrate

3) Copyright education
   • Anticipate some difficulty in finding clarity, but Profs need to know what the policy is if it goes on every syllabus and affect courses

4) Omnibus dismantling
   • No issues especially pressing, time-consuming to break up the omnibus, pair with other policies of the same ‘family’?
Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:19pm
AMS Education Committee

Minutes of July 24th, 2013

Attendance

Present: Joaquin, Eugene, Umang, Kurtis, Cole, Niloufar, Stephanie, Phaidra, Celia

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:04pm

Approval of Agenda

Item addition suggestion: TEO transition reports [Phaidra]

Phaidra: The TEO asked for transition reports from the outgoing ESA executive as if to manage another election/orientation like last year, and I have some concerns that UBC is over-reaching into places which are the purview of the AMS...would I ask this committee for assistance or is another place more suitable?

Joaquin: Refer it to SAC, which supports constituency business

Phaidra: Roundtable check of who was able to read the 20pgs + briefing documents – no one at the table confirms reading the briefs

Phaidra: I don’t think we had enough time to read the briefing documents to be altogether informed

Umang: A discussion will help guide the research and we’ll come back to the topic again, so there will be more time to read the information.

Moved: Joaquin Seconded: Umang

That the agenda be adopted as presented.

The motion carries with 4 in favour, 1 against.
AMS Education Committee

Minutes of July 24th 2013

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Celia  Seconded: Stephanie

That the minutes from June 11, 2013 meeting be approved.

Update from Kiran’s Office

Umang: There is no update today, Kiran says to check the term report sent to Council for more details.
Curtis: How will members-at-large be able to access this report? Are they on the Council email list? What about for Proxies?
Nil: These should be published online, so technically accessibility is suppose to be covered

Open Access Policy Discussion

Umang: One question we had was how do students benefit?
Curtis: There is collaborations with other institutions, which fits into the place & promise part of the university strat plan
Phaidra: Looks like it might be beneficial for student research, but access doesn’t seem to be an issue for UBC students, as we have access to research collections with the CWL.
Curtis: This [policy appendix]is for U of O, what does this mean for Vancouver? Does it apply?
Umang: Even though this is for the UoO Senate, it should be applicable to Vancouver
Curtis: It says specifically it would be updated at a future meeting, did that happen?
Joaquin: Wasn’t there [Sentate] turnover at that time [Cole]?
Cole: possibly
Umang:[approval] might take place at the September meeting coming up
Nil: Q about copyright / access relationship
Nil: My understanding was that the new copyright was going to encourage open access
Umang: [quotes copyright law from notes to check]
Curtis: what about this CIRcle?
Nil: I think it’s dead

Cole: I think there is some publishing through it

Phaidra: Why did a university policy fail 3 years ago? We made a policy to support the establishment of a policy 3 years ago, and this hasn’t happened...does anyone know the causes as why not?

Joaquin: there could be a prestige issue [publishing]

Curtis: What about making it more collaborative among post-secondary?

Joaquin: I also think it fits with the international strat. Planning going on at UBC

Nil: Q of broadness of policy

Cole: It hasn’t been brought to Senate yet...or if it will be ready, there is a huge process...that’s a weakness for the question points here [stuck in process]

Joaquin: another weakness is out of date research for students for the databases we currently access, Open access allows students access to up to date research by their Profs

Phaidra: question of adoption, peer review

Curtis: We need to find out the Status of CIRcle [ACTION ITEM]

Joaquin: Also research other models at leading institutions [ACTION ITEM]

Phaidra: yes, including how faculties are encouraged currently to adopt, current, other policies [ACTION ITEM]

Joaquin: that usually means a split between a creation policy and an implementation policy...we can find out where [each] would be relevant and applicable

Phaidra: should we put in implementation in the policy re-newal statement to encourage action and make a stronger statement

Joaquin: Let’s add what this means to UBC specifically, rather than just the concept, other characteristics.
Evaluations of Teaching Policy Discussion

Umang: Looking for general perceptions from students, faculty to enhance forthcoming backgrounder

Curtis: concerns from the EUS include that data isn’t valid due to low turnout, and students do not know or see how it is used, also issue of consistency across faculties.

Joaquin: trying to streamline across UBC is not a bad idea, could we give guidelines?

Curtis: we could ask what dept. faculty policies exist.

Phaidra: could this be a working group?

Joaquin: Between faculties, what are the main problems, changes made, questions asked...we should find out more about this

Curtis: Students used to complain it was too long, so this year we offered shorter questions and only 1 text response. Participation went up.

Iugene: There is different between numbers also on whether it is mandatory or not, which can skew results. There is some that are mandatory before you register for business courses, they do not take long and it is a normalized process.

Joaquin: We should look into these other methods, alternative ways to make it more effective, especially to get at what you really want from the data: what were the desired outcomes, Quality of teaching, marks etc. Focus groups might be one way.

General discussion on the scope of the policy: confusion between faculty & course evaluations. This policy covers teaching rather than course evaluations.

Sauder discussion: mandated: redundant, no impact seen by students on courses from year to year

Joaquin: review between course evals, how often they are being changed

General discussion on whether course and teaching eval policy should be linked for renewal-consensus is to separate the two types of evaluations in policy statements.

Phaidra: What about if the university doesn’t address teaching eval feedback effectively by doing some kind of democratic interaction, like a rate my prof but only for ubc

Joaquin: Problem is it looks too aggressive to UBC to be considered a positive move by the AMS
Umang: Also the same problems exist with skewed results, the diversity of feedback is difficult to capture [on systems like RMP] (Polarizing responses)

P: What about recommending some kind of public follow up, response from Profs to teaching evals [public blog, online blurb, end-of-year wrap up]

Nil: Part of the problem is Profs do not have to act on this

**Options for shape of policy renewal**

Need more info for each option:

1. Recommend to consolidate how process is done among the faculties

2. Recommend to have the onus on each faculty for how students see changes

Action: Look at discrepancies, transparency

Curtis: We could try a friendly FOI on an eval and see what happens. If nothing, then maybe an actual FOI. Someone is bound to request one eventually, and it might be fruitful to research this process now.

Nil: This could be good to refer to the VP Academic Caucus as well

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20pm.
Attendance

Present: Armin Rezaiea-Asel (Chair), Cole Leonoff (Senate), Kiran Mahal (VPA), Umang (AVPA), Stephanie Goh (LFS), Pierre, Eric (SUS)

Guests:

Regrets: Everybody else

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:00pm

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Stephanie Seconded: Kiran

That the agenda be adopted.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Approval of Minutes

That the minutes from July 24th, 2013 meeting be approved.

Update from Kiran’s Office

- For flexible learning, there’s a list of ~40 courses that are going over a review. Slight issue is that some of these courses exist in minor programs that aren’t represented by one particular body, so we don’t know who will represent these students?

- Flexible learning initiative to be funded by VP Student office:
  - 1st term: focus groups of students in these courses (one stream is students being talked to in beginning/middle/end of term to assess course) (second stream is students that are just there to discuss what flexible learning courses should look
like) These focus groups will work together to come up with a better understand of what students view flexible learning should look like.

- There will be another letter of intent in the first term going out for more courses to get funding to go over a “flexible learning” change

- Services Review happened, and the area students were most dissatisfied with was the university’s undergraduate research. It’s a general all around fail with students. If there’s any feedback to give from respective faculties about this, please share.

**Academic Experience Survey Results**

- What would be useful data to get, that isn’t already on the survey?

- Armin: is there a way to present to students what large-scale academic changes are being made at the university?

- Kiran: We need to find a way to better engage at a departmental level. Not much is being done to relay large-scale changes to students. Most faculties don’t invite students to be represented on their committees, within the department. How can the AMS help you guys get more involved with your department on these issues?

- Armin: The EUS has a good relationship with being involved in our department. Can the AMS help facilitate some sort of gathering of undergraduate society reps where they share best practices? And if an undergraduate society doesn’t even want students involved, I there anything the AMS can even do?

- Cole: CUS not exactly inclined for students to be involved on any of their committees, so Nil (CUS VPA) went and talked to a rep in the VP Students office to get more openly invited onto the committee. Didn’t work.

- Kiran: Maybe we can get all the VP Academics from the different societies to get back to us to inform us on the level of departmental engagement and situation, so that we can help them get more engaged, get their foot in the door, and become more engaged there. We could also see if societies with department reps are openly engaged with their departments. At the end of the day, these changes happen at a departmental level, so it would be great to get more engagement happening at that level.

- **Undergraduate Society Reps to get back to Kiran about the level of departmental engagement (from students) that is present so that VPA office can gauge how to help societies get more departmental involvement.**
- Kiran: What can we change on the survey in terms of adding in questions for an area that wasn’t too well covered? Anything that should be kept and highlighted moving forward?

- Umang: Area on mental health and wellness is really important right now, and it’s definitely worth highlighting and focusing on moving forward.

- Cole: It would possibly be worth expanding on “grading consistency” on the survey, asking students how they feel? I know this is a touchy thing.

- Eric: Is there an area on the relationship/satisfaction with instructors and TAs on the Survey? (Kiran answered no). It would be worth getting some hard data on quality of professors as per student opinions.

- Nil: Would it be worth tracking, in the long run, how many of these survey students are participating in the midterm evaluations?

- Kiran: What would be the reaction to collecting student numbers on these surveys and tracking student experiences, how their responses change, and comparing/viewing it all on an aggregate. There’s a certain level of discomfort with adding student numbers, especially with students’ responses being affected if their number is getting taken, but it would be interesting to track individual, as well as aggregate, student experience.

- Cole/Nil/Armin basically all saying it would be of an issue in confidentiality.

- Pierre: Is there a way of randomly assigning a number to each student/email address and track that randomly generated number from year to year rather than student number? It would be difficult, but the issue of confidentiality wouldn’t be a huge issue anymore. Randomly generated number based on email would be a more difficult, but better option.

- Armin: Do you know what metrics you would use to track how student experiences are changing over time with this random number tracking?

- Kiran: There are certain questions that carry over that are “issue neutral” that would be used to track a students’ change in response over time.

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50pm
AMS Education Committee

Minutes of September 26th, 2013

Attendance

Present: Armin [Chair], Kurtis [Member-at-large], Jordan [Member-at-large], Eric [Member-at-large], Helen [Councilor], Celia [Councilor]

Guests: Umang [AVPA]

Regrets: Cole, Lauren, Tahara

Recording Secretary: Celia

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:07pm

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Celia Seconded: Jordan

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Brief Overview of Education Committee

- Armin: Hope to push for a more active role this year

Ideas for Upcoming Year

Transition program for high school students into first year Academically (Celia)

- Similar to JumpStart for ALL entering students not just international students
  Possible to model a program after JumpStart
- Problems: reaching out to students (ie. MUG leaders) keeping in touch with students, students don’t ask for help until they need it
• Vantage college implementing transition for international students who are not academically ready to be a first year student at UBC (directly admitted to second year after 12 months at the college)
• Alternatives: informal resources- videos, developing a course (requires a permanent professional who holds a position at UBC to ensure ongoing of course) Collaborations, funding-to ensure

Shopping week for courses (Armin)
• Add/drop date is similar to this
• SSC to post professor video of 1-2 minutes to give students a feel of the course
• Including syllabus on SSC

Financial Aid Resource Centralized (Kurtis)
• 20 scholarships available to date-argued not enough
• Centralize scholarships into one site (all faculties, outside sponsors/sources)

Removal of Year standing (Kurtis)
• Pre-reqs and year standings
• Argue standings are categorical, but in reality It’s a hassle due to course restrictions and having to override the year standing
• Reason for standing (Armin) order of course registration (ie. first years register before second year)
• Timing of restriction: first period of registration-have year standings limit the timing of registration, after a period of time-free for all registration (without limiting student by standing)

Campus Housing plans (Kurtis)
• Look into university’s current housing strategic plan
• This is more UNECORN (Armin)

Student Perceptions on online courses & MOOCs (Helen)
• End of term survey (Umang)
• Examples: Yale, MIT not offered for credits
• Offer to students outside of UBC
• Look into student perception of opening up online courses to students outside of UBC, and if they feel this would diminish current students’ value of a UBC degree
• Coursera
• Flip Classes
Exam Release Date (Eric)

- Scheduling process at UBC: Manual resolution of exam overlap
- Change 3 in 24 hours to 3 in 36 hours Senate response: need to extend exam period by one week
- Look at problem from different perspective: help increase rate of exam scheduling especially program used & manual portion

Posting of course material in a timely matter (Eric)

- Timing of lecture material being posted
- Survey for evaluating profs: “lecture notes were made available in advance/ before class” – problem: survey is under contract, can’t be changed, copyrights, personal teaching methods cannot be controlled
- Midterm Evaluation

Graduate students concern regarding relationship with supervisor (Helen)

- Improve the resources for grad students to better select a supervisor
- Potentially survey supervisors to help students make their choices (Jordan)
- Provide workshops (?) or resources for grad students (Helen)
- Note: contact Ombuds person who brought this up

Research focused professors (Celia)

- Training program for professors
- In place at the time: Outstanding, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory (developmental plan to work with Dean for next year)
- Problem: attendees of workshops are usually profs who are already passionate
- Suggestion: teaching ability to be considered into the hiring of professors at an (equal?) value as the professor’s research ability [bring motion to AMS Council]
- Possibly offer monetary rewards to prof’s research to drive their involvement in the improvement of quality of teaching

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45pm.
AMS Education Committee

Minutes of October 18th, 2013

Attendance

Present: Armin [Chair], Kurtis [Member-at-large], Jordan [Member-at-large], Cole [Councilor], Helen [Councilor], Mona [Councilor], Anne [VP Academic]

Guests: Umang [AVPA], Pierre

Regrets: Everybody else

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:03pm

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Mona Seconded: Jordan

That the agenda be adopted.

The motion carries unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Helen Seconded: Kurtis

That the minutes from September 26, 2013 be approved.

The motion carries with 5 yes, 1 abstain.

Housekeeping Matters

- New Doodle form being sent out soon
- New meeting times will be established
- Punctuality in email responses
Updates on Ideas for Upcoming Year from previous meeting

Transition program for high school students into first year Academically

- Only people that really handle this sort of transitional stuff are the Orientations team. What we could possibly do is creating a working group in our committee and look into what other universities do with regards to academic transitions, and we could create policy and recommendations to the Orientations team based on this.
- We could also look into working with Peer Programs.

Vantage College

- Although vantage college is a specialized program, they still enter 2nd year since they are taking the same courses but in a more flexible learning atmosphere.
- This only applies to Ba/Bsc, not other programs like engineering.

Removal of Year standing

- This is largely an administrative issue / faculty specific.

Campus Housing plans

- The committee chooses to disregard this earlier idea as it isn’t really in the scope of our committee’s mandate.

Exam Release Date

- This has been recurring for years – not going anywhere.
- Not exactly a feasible idea or good way to spend our time and effort.
- Choosing to disregard this one due to time constraints and feasibility issues.

Undergraduate Research

- Value for the committee to work on this – seems to be very important and hot topic for students, especially since dissolution of undergraduate research office.
- Collaborate with VPA office and SSC on this issue moving forward.

Academic Town Hall Project

- New project, never taken on by the committee before.
- Purpose would be provide a better platform to educate students on what is going on in the academic office and also get more perspective from students (2 birds 1 stone).
• Possibility to collaborate with External office since they want to do something similar with external issues? Share costs?
• VP Students office and AMS are doing focus groups together on issues that came up in the academic experience survey, so we could use focus group results to shape this type of event to get further feedback by luring students through “hot topic” discussions.
• Could be used to specifically address issues raised in academic experience survey.
• Online event, or physical?
• Could in general be used to both educate students on what has been going on as well as getting more feedback.

Academic Night Project

• Invite VP Academics + task them to get x more students from their faculties.
• Discuss some of the issues the AMS has been tackling from an academic side, to get more broad feedback.
• Similar to previous idea? Could combine the two?

Other Items

• Kurtis: Can we meet with VP Academic and Provost on giving them information on what we have been doing as a committee?
• Pierre: Could pursue something where VPAUA + Educom Chair meet with them and discuss what the office and committee have been doing. Once a term? Once a year?
• By next meeting, decide on whether we want to pursue the above new projects.

Adjourn

Moved: Kurtis Seconded: Helen

Motion passes anonymously to adjourn meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45pm.
AMS Education Committee

Minutes of October 29th, 2013

Attendance

Present: Armin [Chair], Kurtis [Member-at-large], Eric [Member-at-large], Cassandra [Councilor], Helen [Councilor], Lauren [Councilor], Anne [VP Academic], Joaquin [VP Finance]

Guests: Umang [AVPA]

Regrets: Everybody else

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:02pm

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Lauren Seconded: Kurtis

That the agenda be adopted.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Helen Seconded: Lauren

That the minutes from October 18, 2013 be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Updates from VP Academic Office

- Been having frequent meetings with UBC Administration about Campus Security issues. If you have any issues with the safety matters, please bring to VPAUA office.
- Been working on Open Access and Acadia Park Policy
- Been transitioning – a lot of work.
AMS Education Committee

Minutes of October 29, 2013

- Have been working on central exam database (priority for office)
- Working on midterm evaluation of teaching with constituencies.
- AMS made presentation on Open Access last week for campus-wide audience.
- Hiring stuff
- Acadia Park: hoping to pass policy in Council next week endorsing Kiran’s Acadia Park points from her final presentation.

Open Access Policy Discussion

- Grammar issues: missing a few “an” and “the” from certain areas – Anne is looking at fixing these.
- Anne: Current model for publishing journal articles is that you pay journal to have your article in that journal, and then the university pays that journal to have access to the article. Model is old.
  - Most people are moving to a model where more information is online and easier to access. There is more open access to information online, and that is essentially the scope of open access.
  - Senate is making a statement in November in support of Open Access.
  - With the AMS policy, 2 of the paragraphs are being changed because they weren’t factually correct. It said that open access was freely available without copyright or licensing commitments, but the latter part isn’t true.
  - Open Access across a campus is not unprecedented – many Ivey League schools and top schools around the world have some form of policy that says professors must post material in “open access.” (at the very least – journal articles)
- Eric: Do you foresee this every affecting the university’s decision-making process on where they get material (will they scale back on journal subscriptions)?
  - Anne: I highly doubt the university will restrict itself to just open access material right off the bat like that – it would be impeding their access to a lot of information.
  - Joaquin: The University would be impeding themselves on their access to information if they do this.
- Umang: Some of the clauses are quite broad, so we could be more specific in the wording of the policy.
- Joaquin: I think in general, some of the clauses newly added into the policy are convoluted. We should be clearer in our policy and statement as to why students want this and why open access is important to them.
- Do we as a society support the statement and do we want to continue to push for a full-on policy to be made at a university level?
- Anne: University wants it to become a policy. I’ve been in talks with people from the University that want to see this stuff happen.
- Armin: What do you want to see from us as a committee – what are you asking us for today aside from feedback on Open Access?
• Senate will be transitioning at the end of this year (including faculty reps) so is this the right time to be bringing this up if it will take years to get something like this to become university policy?
• Issues to look into with the policy briefing:
  o Eric: concerned with the use of “eliminating” in some areas that discussed eliminating closed access journals. Sometimes closed access hasn’t been a worse situation (open access has). Perhaps change wording to “significantly reducing” or “reducing”.
  o Joaquin: Would like to see more on a “how this impacts students” in the whereas clause of the policy.
  o Umang: our policy doesn’t address learning material in terms of open access, even though the university’s stance includes it. Should we look into adding this in?
  o Joaquin: Don’t think we should include learning material.

Motion to approve Open Access policy briefing in principle under the assumption that the recommended changes occur.

Mover: Lauren Seconder: Kurtis
Unanimous.

Academic Town Hall and Academic Night Project

• Possibility of collaboration with External: maybe not the best idea since external and academic are both complex and different in their own ways.
• Funding options: ask Anne about funding from her office and look into VP Students office to see about funding.
• Helen: Pick hot topic and use that as a theme.
• Idea of Town Hall is good because it’s a high level conversation that can address issues with general students that aren’t normally involved.
• Joaquin: determine clear-cut goals before moving forward wit this. Develop a strategy.
• Kurtis: What would we be adding as a committee if we did this?
• Anne: I don’t see the value in us having an event where we stand up at the front of the room and share with students what we do in the AMS for them academically.
• Anne: Armin or I could approach certain figures in the university and ask if they’d be willing to attend an Academic Night-type event.
• Kurtis: Do you see the primary objective of this that students feel their voices have been heard?
• Anne: Maybe we should figure out purpose and goals before moving forward – and decide the appropriate way of approaching this after we get goals.
• Eric: Maybe we could just use this as an opportunity to gain ideas.
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- Joaquin: Perhaps figure out a direction for the committee this year. Do some research on topics we want to target.
- Armin: Maybe we can scrap this idea, and how about we spend this year to just to just lay a really strong foundation for future years of Educom. It hasn’t really been done, and therefore the scope of this committee is a bit confusing and that could hurt us in the long run. I think perhaps we should spend our energy this year laying a foundation for the committee and ensuring moving forward, it has more clear scope and the committees have a better idea of their scope moving forward.
- Umang: Agreed with above points.
- Helen: Perhaps we can do working groups for the ideas we mentioned at the beginning of the year.

Action Items

- Look into working group ideas from previous meetings and talk to people that would be necessary to make some of what we mentioned possible. (Working group for Orientations – would Orientations be open to working with us)?
- Start process of creating clearer vision of this committee and developing the strong foundation for this committee’s future.

Adjourn

Moved: Lauren                              Seconded: Cassandra

The motion carries unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:26 pm.
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Attendance

Present: Armin [Chair], Kurtis [Member-at-large], Jordan [Member-at-large], Cassandra [Councilor], Helen [Councilor], Lauren [Councilor], Anne [VP Academic], Riley [Councilor], Joaquin [VP Finance]

Guests: Umang [AVPA]

Regrets: Everybody else

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:00pm

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Moved: Helen Seconded: Riley

That the agenda be adopted.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Approval of Minutes

Moved: Jordan Seconded: Helen

That the minutes from October 29, 2013 be approved.

*The motion carries unanimously.*

Updates from VP Academic and University Affairs Office

- Working on midterm evaluations of teaching project (with CTLT)
- Working on Exam Database project (with CTLT)
- Working on Open Access Statement
- Made statement to Senate Open Access
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- Hired new International Commissioner

Policy 73

- How can we better incorporate academic support into this policy?
- Currently at early stages of revision – not yet gone to public consultation for this policy revision. We can look at this as a committee to give earlier input on this matter (before drafting is done by University Counsel).
- Riley: Were there any specific concerns by students with disabilities on the policy 73?
  - Anne: scope is an issue. Also, processes you have to go through to get approval as a student with disabilities is also a problem.
- Jordan: do you have to be able to explicitly be able to prove that you have a certain disability and “self-identify” that you have a disability? Wouldn’t that be a problem (self identifying) in the mental health realm.
  - Not sure if people with mental health issues would be able to self-identify in the first place.
- Joaquin: Part of the problem is the self-identifying process. Also, does this process have a broader mandate? This seems to be part of a larger conversation in terms of access points and how to get the type of support that this policy gives you the rights to?
  - Anne: Technically yes, but the problem is that this is often very diagnosis based. In terms of self-identification, the mental health aspect can be problematic.
- Umang: The Policy states that you need appropriate documentation. Does it then define what that entails?
  - Yes the policy makes it clear.
- Kurtis: Is it in the scope of policy to make it the responsibility of certain people on campus (like profs and employees) that they have an obligation to direct students to things like access and diversity when they approach the profs about issues like health and whatnot.
  - Literally impossible to do this. Can’t mandate profs to do anything...
- In 3.1.1 of policy 73, I’d be interested in knowing how the university goes about making this clear and fair in applications?
  - Misunderstanding of what this meant. Some of the committee thought it meant admission to MHN, but it means admission to university.
- Joaquin: perhaps it’s more productive to get this conversation going when we have more concrete points to evaluate and look into?
- Kurtis: 4.1.2.2 and 4.1.2.3 make it sound like if you have a disability but aren’t aware, you will not be able to get into an accommodating process / will not get renewed... this sounds quite restricting?
  - Anne: It just makes it clear that you have to check in at the beginning of the term to keep up to date with people you’re working with.
What about students who don’t feel comfortably about these things at first and want to bring it up later?
- It’s a good process for keeping people in the loop of when you have troubles that you’re dealing with.

- Cassandra: it would be useful next time to know maybe where people with disabilities have felt that there were holes in the process of have had negative experience that we can look at as a committee next time?
  - There is no representation of students with disabilities on campus, unfortunately, so it would be hard to get this data/information.
  - Do we have representation on any committee that pertains to this as AMS Councilors?
    - Yes, we think our Equity Officer is on this.

### Student Evaluations of Teaching

- Should we split this evaluation into 2 things: professor evaluation and course quality evaluation (2 different evaluation processes)?
- Right now, evaluation process sort of couples both the course evaluation and teacher evaluation in one form, so it might not be the best process at the moment.
- It might be easier to advocate for a completely separate evaluation process than to change the current one.
- It seems the implementation would be rather limited?
  - Adding things and changing the current one would be tougher, but perhaps advocating for a completely new one would be easier.
- Would professors like to have an evaluation that solely focuses on them as teachers? Doesn’t seem they would support something like that?
- Some of the interaction had with profs regarding the Midterm Evaluations of Teaching is that some profs view it as meddling on the part of the AMS.
- Issues with having 2 different ones: survey exhaustion, we might confuse students as to which one to fill out... they might think both are same and just ignore one, and in general, we shouldn’t be adding on another initiative in this area... not practical or beneficial.
- Perhaps we should look at making it clearer that the current survey process can ask students for both types of feedback?
- Or, we can look into a more faculty-level review process rather than making this a campus-wide thing.
- Anne: I definitely see the concerns with regards to Midterm Evaluations of Teaching, but 3 years down the line when the MEOt issue has died down... we need top-down data on the issues of profs and courses, which is where this comes in.
- Joaquin: I think you’re on the right track to want to do things at a higher level, but we need to give ability to students that sit on curriculum related committees (via Senate) to help us in these
regards. I also think we have so many issues going on as the AMS right now and we don’t necessarily have the capacity to deal with something new like this at the moment.

- Perhaps we should look into common aspects of all faculties on campus before discussing this further in the future? Bottom-up approach works better for engineering because our departments are so different, but faculties like Sauder and Arts are a lot more homogeneous so top-down works better there.

**Mental Health Network Relationship**

- Discussion point: how can the AMS and the MHN have a relationship with UBC.
- We’ve been having discussions with MHN, people from UBC, people from student health regarding how a relationship can be made. What do we have to have in this relationship? What do we not want to have in this relationship? Formal relationship? Informal?
- Extra info: MHN is not run by AMS or UBC. It’s run by a network of multiple groups on campus… we give them some money through AMS, UBC gives them some money, but it’s made up of multiple groups and such… mostly on the student side.
- Question for committee: how can we create a structure where UBC, AMS, MHN can all work together in a stable way that gives students the best support on campus to students?
- Right now, MHN doesn’t provide services to students on campus. So right now, MHN has 25 members approx. representing constituencies on campus (EUS, GSS, Sauder, Arts, etc…). These people give feedback on where they want to see the society (MHN) going, and where they want to see policies going, so it’s very much group run as a society.
- It’s a place to come together and do advocacy for students, largely.
- The MHN is trying to change so that it becomes more of a “network” like global lounge network, and less of individual units and such. They want to have their own initiatives as the MHN in the future, and not just piggy back on initiatives the subsidiaries are working on.
- All 3 bodies are trying to create a space for collaboration on issues and be more centralized in our approach tackling MHN issues.
- They should look into advocacy, as that is an area that perhaps is not well thought out at the moment.
- What does the AMS Mental Health Coordinator think about this?
  - Anne is taking charge on this one – the MHC isn’t doing much in this regard. She’s focusing on policy and research, not this liaison act.
- Why can’t MHN incorporate as an independent society?
  - Money issue. But perhaps they can become AMS club?
- If we already help represent MHN in terms of the advocacy aspect, why can’t they just be an AMS club?
- To clarify discussion: since AMS sort of represents the MHN in a lot of ways, we’re looking into the relationship between the AMS and UBC on this matter.
• Why are we discussing relationship between AMS and UBC on this issue since the relationship between these 2 bodies is always the same: we collaborate with them and work with them on these issues.
  o Anne: in this case, we have potential to draft up an official agreement / MOU with university on how we can work together on this issue.
• Also, with regards to more consistent funding for MHN, we can look into an MOU (like Sustainability Fund model) on how the university can finance x amount per year for MHN.
• Would it be appropriate to base the MOU we make with the university on Mental Health with the model we have on MOUs with regarding to sustainability issues?
  o Kurtis: We could add points in the MOU with regards to membership of MHN board (students, ubc reps, etc....)
  o Riley: It would be tough to add financial aspect to MOU.
  o Joaquin: I would assumed UBC would give some support for MHN, but we can get further/additional funding through AMS/clubs/etc..
• Is there potential downside to approaching things this way?
  o No.
• Biggest challenge will be convincing MHN members that this is something they should buy into. They currently like the sense of knowing they’re independent.
  o Trade-off: If they want more structure and stability, they will need to be in support of this.

Additional Stuff

• Anne: I’ve been thinking of Student Academic Experience Survey. Start thinking so that we can bring it up next time. (in January)

Adjourn

Moved: Kurtis Seconded: Lauren

The motion carries unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:23pm.