



Brock University Senate

MINUTES OF MEETING #4 (2009-10)

**SENATE TEACHING AND LEARNING POLICY COMMITTEE**

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2010, 11:00 AM

13<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR BOARD ROOM, SCHMON TOWER

PRESENT: Professor Paul Zelisko (Chair), Professor Frances Owen (Vice-Chair), Professor James Allard, Dean John Corlett, Ms. Margaret Grove, Professor Barry Joe, Professor Julian Kitchen, Professor Diane Mack, Professor Roberto Nickel, Ms. Ellen Robb, Dean Marilyn Rose, Professor John Sivell, Dr. Philip Wright

Mr. Patrick Beard, Ms. Jill Grose, Ms. Margaret Thompson, Administrative Support

REGRETS: Dr. Greg Finn, Professor Nancy Francis, Dr. Murray Knuttila, Ms. Carly White

Professor Zelisko welcomed members and called the meeting to order.

**1. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of Meeting #3 (2009-10) held on January 12, 2010 had been distributed with the meeting materials.

**MOVED** (Owen/Mack)

**THAT the minutes of Meeting #3 (2009-10) held on January 12, 2010 be approved.**

**CARRIED**

**2. Business Arising from the Minutes – None**

**3. Report of the Chair**

Professor Zelisko, on behalf of the Senate Budget Advisory Committee of which he is a member, requested that members contemplate and then forward to him their views on the most important academic priorities to be considered during the 2010-11 budget process and beyond. The ideas submitted would then be compiled and forwarded to the Budget Advisory Committee. It was suggested that commentary regarding the significance of library resources and information technology resources be included. It was further noted that it is difficult to establish academic priorities in the absence of a university-wide academic strategic plan.

#### 4. Academic Accommodations for Student Absence

Dean Corlett and Dean Rose reported that as requested by the Teaching and Learning Policy Committee, the Committee on Academic Deans had been asked if there were issues within their Faculties regarding academic accommodations for student absence when the student is representing Brock University. CAD expressed that the accommodations are normally handled without incident and that there was no need to develop a policy. The potential to develop a best practices document to ensure that both students and faculty members are aware of the preferred process may be of benefit. Professor Zelisko agreed to develop the succinct key points and would bring the draft document forward to the Committee for review at the next meeting prior to submitting the best practices document to Senate. It was further suggested that it may be beneficial for instructors to include information regarding their preferred preferences on the course syllabus, Department/Faculty website or Sakai.

#### 5. Development of Brock's Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations

[The Updated Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents (OCAV) Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations had been distributed with the meeting materials.]

Professor Zelisko referred members to the updated OCAV Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations. He noted that, in follow-up to the previous meeting, he had contacted the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee regarding the potential overlap of the modification of the UDLEs and GDLEs.

The Chair opened the floor for suggestions on how to modify OCAV's UDLEs to reflect Brock's mission and values. It was suggested it may be beneficial to include information regarding seminars, small group learning and context credit courses and to articulate how the degree level expectations are achieved during the student's course of study.

During further discussion, it was suggested that given the diversity across disciplines within the University and the broad-based categories proposed by OCAV which are intended to develop consensus regarding Ontario universities' system of credentialing, that the UDLEs not be altered and that a preamble be developed. The preamble could include what is considered the hallmark of a Brock education and common to all units, for example, to encourage students to develop their potential and to be all they can be, and could reference general implementation strategies. It would be the responsibility of the individual Faculties/Departments/Programs to tailor the UDLEs to their specifications and explain how the expectations are achieved.

**MOVED** (Sivell/Kitchen)

**THAT Senate adopt the Ontario Council of Academic Vice Presidents Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations as proposed.**

**CARRIED**

Professor Zelisko and Professor Allard agreed to draft the preamble which would be reviewed by the Committee at the next meeting. The recommendation would then be forwarded to Senate following the Committee's approval of the preamble. It was further suggested that the

preamble be shared with the Graduate Studies Committee for consideration during its examination of the Graduate Degree Level Expectations, and that both Committees bring their recommendations forward to Senate at the same time.

## **6. Standing Reports**

### **6.1 Centre for Teaching, Learning and Educational Technologies**

Ms. Grose provided a brief oral update regarding activities within the CTLET. Detailed information regarding workshops, awards, etc. is available on the website at <http://www.brocku.ca/ctlet>.

### **6.2 Library**

[A Library Report to the Committee dated February 3, 2010 had been distributed with the meeting materials.]

Ms. Grove referred members to the written Report. She encouraged members to view the Scholars Portal new E-Book platform at <http://books1.scholarsportal.info/home.html>. During discussion, Ms. Grove responded to questions regarding the E-Book platform.

Noting that the time allotted for the meeting had ended, the Chair questioned if the Committee would like to extend the meeting.

**MOVED** (Corlett/Nickel)

**That the meeting be extended for five minutes.**

**CARRIED**

### **6.3 Information Technology Services**

Dr. Wright noted that a new schedule 8 had been distributed and information regarding proposed information technology projects on campus was being collected to review and prioritize the projects. It was stressed that decisions made at the Senate level which have implications for information technology would also need to utilize the schedule 8. Amendments to Faculty Handbook III: 16 Academic Computing and Communications Policies may be required. It was suggested that the matter be referred to the Information Technology and Infrastructure Committee which is responsible for that section of the FHB.

## **7. Other Business - None**

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:07 p.m.