
Minutes of the meeting of the **Academic Policy Committee** held on Thursday 21st October 2010, from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m., Room 310, James Building

Present: A.C. Masi (Chair), J. Abaki, J. Angeles, C. Buddle, A. Deguisse, I. Henderson, M. Kaartinen, M. Kreiswirth, P. Li, M.J. Mendelson, P. Perez-Aleman, M. Szyf, C. Urbain, M. Wanderley, C. Weston, H.M.C. Richard (Secretary to the Committee)

Regrets: G. Brown, A. Doyle, B. Low, S. McDougall, J. Potter, R. Rozen, W. Thomson, S. Williams

Guests: W. Folkerth (item 5)

Document circulated at the meeting: none.

04.01 Proposed agenda

The proposed agenda was adopted.

04.02 Minutes of previous meeting held on 7th October 2010

The minutes were approved with one addition. On page 3, item 03.08 “Proposal for the creation of a McGill Writing Centre within the Centre for Continuing Education”, the list of points that were made in the discussion should include the following: “Ways should be found to make the proposed McGill Writing Centre accessible to Macdonald Campus students.” The proposal, as revised for submission to Senate, reflected this concern.

Secretary’s note: *the revised text of the proposal includes the following, under Space” on page 6: “To serve the Macdonald campus student body, a physical location there is highly desirable; this possibility will be pursued with the Dean of the Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.”*

04.03 Business arising

There was no business arising from the minutes.

04-04 Report on Senate approvals (20th October 2010)

The proposal for the creation of the McGill Writing Centre under the auspices of the Centre for Continuing Education was approved by Senate for further submission to the Board of Governors for final approval. It will be considered at the meeting of the Board on 30th November 2010.

04.05 Draft University Student Assessment Policy submitted by ESAAC Workgroup on Examination Regulations (10-APC-10-21)

Professor Wes Folkerth, Department of English, Faculty of Arts, member of the Workgroup of the Enrolment and Student Affairs Advisory Committee (ESAAC), presented the proposed University Student Assessment Policy. The Workgroup’s mandate was to coordinate various documents into a coherent policy. Application of the Policy is flexible in some respects, as indicated in 1.1, allowing certain jurisdictions (GPS, Medicine and Law, for example) to opt out of certain articles in the Policy.

In the discussion, the following points were raised:

- Invigilation (5.6) is not defined. Regarding 5.6.1 “All written examinations other than take-home examinations shall be invigilated”: would this apply to mid-terms and would this not cause an issue? Invigilation, of what and by whom, should be clarified. It was noted that “invigilator” is to be understood as a generic term, not in labour-code terminology. It does not necessarily mean a person other than the main instructor or a T.A. would have to invigilate.
- Item 5.7.2 requires a correction: “Where the use of items referred to in sections 5.7.1 and 5.7.2 is permitted in the course of an examination, students shall comply with all restrictions imposed on such use.”
- The appointment of an Associate Examiner for each Course with a final examination ...in accordance with the procedures established by the Faculty” (3.8.1) and the substitution of the Associate Examiners for the examiner/Instructor “should the latter be unavailable when the examination is written” (3.8.2) were intended for formal examinations. It was noted that it may be difficult and futile to appoint an Associate Examiner for a course who may not be available.

-
- 3.4.4 and 3.4.5 under Reasonable Accommodation of Students should be referred back to the Working Group for elaboration of the wording. While some courses allow a student to pass the course without taking the final examination, 3.4.4 indicates that students have to take the final examination.
 - In 7.1.2, (i) should end with “or”, not “and”.
 - Should there be indication of a time by which students should see their results?

APC agreed to the following:

- the document should be referred back to the Working Group for revision;
- the Working Group should circulate the revised document to the Deans, so that any additional feedback from the faculties can be considered before the document is presented to Senate and in order to make sure that Deans, Associate Deans, Chairs and Directors and members of relevant faculty committees are prepared to support the document without raising major concerns in Senate;
- the revised document will also be circulated to the APC Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning (STL);
- the document will be returned to APC for subsequent submission to Senate for discussion, before it is formally submitted for approval, and speaking rights will be requested for the Chair of the ESAAC Working Group, Associate Dean Emine Sarigöllü, and possibly one or two other members of the Working Group;
- under “Prior consultations and approvals”, the document should list all the committees and student bodies that have been consulted, in chronological sequence and with dates, if possible.

Secretary's note: the tentative following schedule was drawn up:

- Deans electronically to obtain their faculty's input, with copy to ESAAC
- STL: 26th October
- ESAAC : 9th November
- APC for approval: either 11th or 25th November
- Senate Steering: 1st December
- Senate for discussion: 8th December 2010.

04.06 Certificates and diplomas

- Definitions approved by Senate on 19th May 1993, as presented in Appendix B of APC's 348th Report to Senate, March 31, 1993 (10-APC-10-22)

The 1993 definitions of *Certificate*, *Diploma*, *Graduate Certificate*, and *Graduate Diploma* were presented to APC because they need to be updated.

The definitions were intended to focus on the programs, on their level and admission pre-requisites, and on whether they are governed by the teaching Faculty (in the case of Certificates and Diplomas) or by GPS (Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas), not on the attribution of the degree title/attestation to students according to whether or not a student had an undergraduate degree prior to undertaking the program. A distinction therefore has to be made between programs that build on a prior degree (in terms of admission criteria and content) and programs that do not. The task at hand is to verify that diploma programs are offering the added value that was intended.

Jurisdiction was also said to be an issue: it was pointed out that Graduate Certificates and Graduate Diplomas are offered, some under the auspices of Continuing Education, some under the auspices of GPS.

APC agreed:

- that the language of the 1993 definitions should be revised: for example the use of "first cycle", "second-Cycle", "Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research".
- that the 1993 definitions should be referred to the Council of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, in consultation with Continuing Education, so that the definitions can be reviewed and concerns stated in the minutes can be addressed.

04.07 Council of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (CGPS)
- 2010 Annual Report to APC (10-APC-10-23)

Associate Provost and Dean Martin Kreiswirth presented the annual report from CGPS. In response to his concern that the University has no policy or procedure for monitoring newly approved teaching programs (for example student enrolment) after they have been approved, it was stated that this would be good administrative practice, but not APC's responsibility.

04.08 Other business

The issue of mental health and academic bullying as a security threat was brought forward. In response, it was stated that this was not an issue that fits APC's mandate and that McGill has administrative procedures (within Students Services and Human Resources) for dealing with cases where individuals may constitute a security threat to themselves and to others.

Insufficient or delayed communication flow pertaining to program requirements and availability of courses offered in a given year was raised as a problem: there have been instances when students start in a program requiring that they take certain mandatory courses outside the Faculty and are told that the courses are not offered. In response, it was stated that, as the University moves to an E-calendar, such problems will be solved. Part of the problem resides with a lack of automatic notification in the Banner system. **The Deputy Provost will bring this important issue to Enrolment Services.**

Program delivery was mentioned as an issue that will be scrutinized and may generate considerable business in terms of program revisions.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Helen M.C. Richard - HMCR/APPCdocs/minutes/2010-10-21