

**Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning
of the Academic Policy Committee
28th meeting held on Tuesday, 9 March 2010**

**10:00 to 12:00
Arts Building, room 160**

Present: J. Clark, R. Dooley, J. Ellis, J. Everett, D. Harris, A. Jaeger, M. Kilgour, S. Komarova, F. Labeau, M. Mendelson (Chair), Y. Steinert, N. St-Pierre (Secretary), C. Urbain, H. Weiler, C. Weston

Regrets: A. Costopoulos, A. De Motta, I. Henderson, A. Lebedev, D. Levasseur, J. Luker

1. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted as circulated.

2. Approval of the minutes from 2 February 2010

The minutes were approved as circulated.

3. Business arising from the previous minutes

There was no business arising.

4. Expectations of McGill Undergraduates upon graduation

C. Weston informed the subcommittee that a small working group met over the summer of 2009 to draft the proposal as circulated. The ensuing discussion centered on the following questions:

- Why are we doing this? For recruiting or public relations?
- What is understood by using the word *expectations*? Several members noted that *attributes* was more passive, whereas *expectations* seemed to put the onus on the students.
- How would the expectations be measured and how do we ensure that all the students achieve these expectations?
- How would they be used to guide program development?
- Would the expectation change course content and delivery?

The Subcommittee discussed the expectations proposed with some concerns being raised; in particular members want to ensure that course and program content would not necessarily be driven by the expectations.

Copies of the attributes adopted by the CEAB (Canadian Engineering Accreditation board) and the ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) were distributed for review.

Secretary's note: Electronic copies were distributed on 10 March 2010.

Consensus was reached to develop McGill-specific expectations using the CMEC document as a foundation. The expectations should be broad-based, but flexible, so they can be adapted by academic

units. The primary hurdles will be in the conceptualization of expectations and in possibly translating expectations into curriculum development. The expectations should be developed further and returned to STL for review before being presented to Deans and APC.

Action item: TLS to provide information on how expectations have been implemented and measured in other universities.

5. Report on Implementation of Course Evaluation Policy

Laura Winer and Pierre-Andre Vungoc of Teaching and Learning Services joined the meeting.

As per the policy adopted by Senate in January of 2008, the Course Evaluation Policy must undergo a review during the 2010-2011 academic year. L. Winer presented a highlight of some issues that need consideration to the Subcommittee, and members were encouraged to forward their comments to her.

It was suggested that the system be programmed so that, at minimum, students are required to respond to the four core questions that are mandatory for all units.

Action item: The revised Course Evaluation Policy will be returned to STL for feedback.

L. Winer added that TLS is developing a pilot project that would extend the course evaluation period with the aim of increasing the response rate.

Action item: The proposal for the pilot project will be returned to STL for further consideration.

6. Other business

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.