

APPENDIX A
PORTION OF THE MINUTES OF SENATE 518, JUNE 8, 2004

b) Sub-Committee on Instructional Development (Agd. 518-2)

Professor Owen presented the Committee's Report. She noted that the Report had been postponed from the previous meeting of Senate as the proposed motions within the Report had implications for Deans, and several Deans had not been present at that meeting. Professor Owen further explained that following that meeting, further consultations had been held with the Committee of Academic Deans and the motions had been modified.

Professor Lye commented that while the rationale was not binding, it might be taken as a guideline as to best practices.

MOVED (Owen/Bradish)

- i) **THAT Senate endorse the expectation that “The Departmental Committee, after consulting with its Dean, shall establish common evaluation forms and a procedure for student evaluations of all departmental courses with enrolments of five (5) or more students” (Collective Agreement, 2003-2006, Article 16.03, f) as outlined in Agd. 518-2.**
- ii) **THAT Senate endorse that by November 15, 2004 all academic departments, after consultation with the Dean, shall submit to the Senate Teaching and Research Policy Committee copies of their course evaluation *process*. Any standard course evaluation form(s) used should also be submitted at this time. These materials shall also be posted on the departmental web sites. (As outlined in Agd. 518-2)**

Professor Owen reviewed the rationale for the proposed motions.

A lengthy debate ensued regarding the level of autonomy of Departments. It was questioned whether the Departmental Committee should be able to establish a common evaluation form and a procedure following a “consultation” with the Dean, as opposed to gaining “approval” from the Dean. Discussion included the following concerns/comments/suggestions:

- With respect to motion i), it was essential that Deans “approve” common evaluation forms and procedures as Deans were responsible for the academic quality and delivery of programs.
- Motion i), which indicated a “consultation” with the Dean, was a direct quote from the Collective Agreement. It was not under the purview of the IDC or Senate to alter the wording within the Agreement.
- Motion i) was redundant as this requirement was set out in the Collective Agreement. Motion i) should be withdrawn and motion ii) should include a statement that the Deans' approval was required.

- Motion i) endorsed the expectation that the procedures required by the Collective Agreement would, indeed, be followed; the motion was intended to ensure adherence, currently not the case.
- It was essential that students be involved with the departmental committees in developing the teaching evaluation process, that the process be transparent for students, and that the students in some way be involved in reviewing evaluations prior to selecting their courses.
- The Dean should not be able to prohibit a decision made by the Department to utilize a specific evaluation form.
- As approval of the motions would have implications with respect to the mandate and work of the new 2004-05 Senate Teaching and Research Policy Committee, the matter should be referred to this Committee.

MOVED (Sternin/Sivell)

That the motions be referred to the Senate Teaching and Research Policy Committee for further consideration.

CARRIED
(8 opposed, 3 abstentions)

Professor Lye requested that the 2004-05 Senate Teaching and Research Policy Committee address the motions contained in the Report from the Sub-Committee on Instructional Development as an initial undertaking. He thanked Professor Owen for bringing these long-outstanding issues forward and commended her for her courage in tackling this contentious issue. Professor Owen, in turn, commended the full Committee.