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 Ilnitchi]
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 choose 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 its 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.