

08 AMS Advocacy Committee Meeting Agenda

Monday, February 3rd, 2020. 6-7 pm. NEST 3511

Attendance

Invited: Julia, Brandon, Nevena, Nicholas, Will (AMS AVPX), Anne, Rashika

Present:

Regrets: Cristina

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 pm

Land Acknowledgement

Portfolio Updates

1. AMS VP External [Cristina Initchi]
2. AMS VP AUA [Julia Burnham]

[Julia]

- Worked 70 hours to finish policy submissions (AMS and SASC submissions)
- We had an eventful week: meetings with VP Students, AMS/GSS/BoG Reps re: BoG Agenda.

[Nick]

- What's the next step?

[Julia]

- SC7 - Sexual Misconduct. Committee reconvenes with all this feedback next week.
- Can't speak to other policies as AMS is not included, it must be a similar timeline.

Discussion

Student Evaluations of Teaching

[Julia]

- Feb 12 @ 3:30
- The AMS and Center for Learning and Teaching are hosting a town hall event in regards to student evaluations of teaching.
- These are used to improve instruction and tenure/promotion assessment.
- There's been controversy on the validity of these surveys (ie: racial biases, students' ability to respond to questions in a useful manner).
 - Still important to keep students involved in their academic experience.

- A Senate committee is looking at how these evaluations, has 14 recommendations
 - Have an event to give feedback in safe space
 - Walk through of these recommendations

[Nick]

- What is an example of these recommendations?

[Julia]

- Don't know them off the top of my head.
- Mainly around how questions are framed.
 - To limit the bias of students.

[Nick]

How important are these to the tenure process? What about once they are tenured?

[Julia]

- Very very important.
- Looking at how we can change from *evaluation* to an open conversation on increasing quality of in-class learning
- Also reaching out to TA Union.
- No impact once the professor is tenured.

[Rashika]

- We need a change in how these are conducted. Don't know how genuinely students complete these surveys. We should have a student body running this. This might change the response rate.

[Julia]

- Not sure if this would change feedback. AMS is not really not involved in the decision making.

Academic Experience Survey Policy ([link](#))

[Julia]

- I brought the AES questions to the Executive Policy, Chris Hakim brought up the fact that we are in conflict of AMS Code
- I put forth a motion to suspend this policy to AMS Council.
- 1a) does not reflect reality
 - In practice, there is a consultation with Academic Caucus
 - We spoke about potential changes to the AES
 - Moved away [in 2017] from faculty-specific questions (to save costs and get better responses)

- We should continue to avoid the faculty-specific question
- 4) we need to talk to the finance committee
 - This is budgeted within my office
 - Did an RFP and environment scan
 - Asking Fin Comm is inefficient when I have staff who can do it
 - However, we send in these recommendations to Fin Comm
- Appendix:
 - So important to maintain consistency year-to-year to get long-term data
 - Trying to transfer over AMS specific question to the NEST Experience Survey
 - 2019 did not have discrimination survey
 - "Knowledge of fees levied by AMS" question not to be reviewed (counter-intuitive)
 - "Why did you chose UBC"
 - Should be asked by UBC, not AMS
 -

[Nick]

How do AES and Nest Experience Surveys differ?

[Julia]

- AES is really the advocacy survey
 - UBC Experience survey data is not made public
 - So it is important that the AMS has it's own data
 - Very important for VPAUA and VPX's effort (ie.: lobbying, submissions to BoG)
- NEST Experience Survey
 - Used to be quite operational
 - Now includes experience survey questions

[Nick]

- So are we trying to bring forward changes to this policy?

[Julia]

- Ideally, yes.
- Bring changes to the policy itself, as well as updating the appendix.

[Nick]

- Can you bring back policy change suggestions on February 24th?

[Julia]

- Yes, of course.

Adjournment

The next meeting will be held Monday, February 24th, at 6:00 pm.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:39 pm.