



ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE (APC)
Minutes of Meeting

Date: Thursday, September 24, 2015

Time: 9:30am-11:00am

Room: 209 Assumption Hall

Committee Members: Dr. Lorna deWitt, Dr. Erika Kustra, Dr. Scott Martyn, Dr. Katherine Quinsey, Dr. Karen Roland, Dr. Antonio Rossini, Dr. Bruce Tucker.

Absent: Ms. Shaista Akbar, Mr. Emmanuel Igodan, Mr. Sanam Mehta Dr. Mitra Mirhassani, Mr. Hassan Shahzad, Dr. Chris Weisener, Ms. Shuzhen Zhao.

In Attendance: Mr. Tim Brunet, Ms. Jenny Atkins, Ms. Renée Wintermute and Alison Zilli (University Secretariat).

Formal Business

1 Approval of Agenda

Although the items were not discussed in sequential order, the minutes do reflect the agenda order of business.

MOTION: That the agenda be approved.

Dr. A. Rossini/Dr. K. Roland

CARRIED

2 Approval of Minutes

MOTION: That the minutes of the meeting of May 7, 2015 be approved.

Dr. S. Martyn/Dr. E. Kustra

CARRIED

3 Business arising from the minutes

Nothing to report.

Items for Information

4 Outstanding business

4.1 Multiple Final and Term Evaluations Over a 24-hour Period (Subcommittee Report)

(See document APC150924-4.1 for more details.)

MOTION: That the proposed revisions to Bylaw 51 be approved, including incorporating the Policy on Multiple Final Exams in One Calendar Day, and be forwarded to the Bylaw Review Committee for consideration.

Dr. E. Kustra/Dr. K. Roland

NOTED:

- During the last academic year, Senate requested that APC revisit the policy on Multiple Final Examinations in One Calendar Day with a view to extending the policy to three consecutive final exam slots *within 24 hours*, and extending this to midterms, in order to reduce the stress on students who have three consecutive final or midterm exam slots within 24 hours and to better reflect the knowledge attained.

- Since midterms are defined differently across Faculties this was addressed by referring to them as “term evaluations” and setting a minimum value of 20%.
- A student scheduled to write three final examinations in consecutive time slots over a 24-hour period may apply, to have one of their examinations rescheduled on a supplemental examination day.
- A student who has three or more term evaluation procedures, each worth 20% or more of the final grade of each course and scheduled within a 24-hour period, may apply to have the due date extended for one of the term evaluation procedures.
- If approved, the Policy on Multiple Examinations will be deleted and the proposed policy will be incorporated into Senate Bylaw 51.
- A midterm exam or term evaluation could be an essay, term paper, or a take-home examination.
- Strong concern was raised regarding the issue that the creation of this policy will create additional paperwork in the Associate Deans offices, particularly in larger Faculties such as FAHSS.
- In the Faculty of Education, students have many group assignments and projects that would be difficult to change due to scheduling of courses and timing of practicums, *etc.*
- In smaller Faculties, instructors are able to meet and plan when they will be scheduling major assignments. This helps decrease the incidences of students having too many assignments due during the same timeframe.
- In some instances, students are not able to start their term assignments until the week before they are due as they may not have sufficient in-course information to complete the project.

AGREED:

- Although APC was in support of accommodating students with multiple term assignments due in a 24-hour period, the general consensus is that the proposed policy is too broad in its definition of term evaluations and too prescriptive and will create a cumbersome process for Faculties to administer.
- If the policy is to be retained, the following amendments were suggested: 1) that the term “evaluative procedures” be more narrowly defined to include written test, oral examinations/presentations, and take-home tests, *etc.*, and, 2) that language be added to the policy to encourage departmental coordination.
- The Subcommittee membership be comprised of Mr. Sanam Nehta and Dr. Katherine Quinsey (new members), along with Dr. Lorna deWitt, Dr. Erika Kustra, and Ms. Shaista Akbar (current members).

WITHDRAWN

4.2 Removal of Gender Question from the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Form (Subcommittee Report)
(See document APC150924-4.2 for more details.)

This item was deferred to the next agenda.

5 Reports/New Business

5.1 Academic Policy Committee Mandate

(See document APC150924-5.1 for more details.)

NOTED:

- An overview was provided on the mandate of Academic Policy Committee.
- Academic Policy Committee (APC) is charged with receiving and reviewing annual status reports from a number of academic areas and academic service areas on campus, and reviewing and recommending policy changes, as appropriate.
- Reports forwarded to Senate by APC serve to keep the University community informed on the issues and activities of numerous areas on campus.
- The document was received for information.

5.1.1 Establishing Leader Readers for Annual Reports

(See document APC150924-5.1.1 for more details.)

NOTED:

- Each year one, Committee member will be identified as the lead reader for each of the annual reports that are presented to APC.
- The lead reader will review the report thoroughly in advance of the APC meeting in order to (1) either determine that the report is complete or identify the required additional material, (2) ensure that the report addresses the University's strategic plan priorities, and (3) ensure that the report is in the required format.
- The document was received for information.

5.2 Report on Student Awards Established during the 2014-2015 Academic Year

(See document APC150924-5.2 for more details.)

NOTED:

- An overview was provided on the student awards that were established during the last academic year.
- The Student Awards and Financial Aid Office is charged with administering the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) as well as scholarships, bursaries and awards for undergraduate students which are based on both academic merit and financial need.
- The list provided includes active and non-active categories of awards because awards are invested for a full fiscal year cycle prior to them being released to students.
- In response to a question raised, it was noted that graduate scholarship are administered through Graduate Studies.

5.2.1 Board of Governors In Course Medals Review and Recommendations

(See document APC150924-5.2.1 for more details.)

NOTED:

- Board of Governors In-Course Medals are awarded annually, in the Fall semester, to the undergraduate student in each Faculty who has the highest cumulative average of all non-graduating students at the end of the preceding regular semester.
- Students need a minimum cumulative average of 78.5%, must have completed at least ten courses at and must be registered full-time in an honours degree program.
- Given that the Student Awards Office is questioned annually about the selection of recipients, which causes issues, recommendations are being proposed for consideration by APC.

AGREED:

- A Subcommittee comprised of Dr. Lorna deWitt, Dr. Karen Roland, Ms. Marion Doll, TBA UG student was established to review the recommendations.

Items for Approval

5.3 Policy on Conditional Admissions to Academically Qualified Applicants Who Must Still Meet English Language Proficiency Requirements

(See document APC1509-5.3 for more details.)

NOTED:

- The policy proposes that the University will offer conditional admission to academically qualified applicants who may need to meet English proficiency requirements
- Such candidates will be automatically enrolled in the English Language Improvement Program as a pathway option to both undergraduate and graduate studies.
- The proposed policy will make it clear that all prospective students are treated equally in terms of admissions.

- Each ELIP level takes 12 weeks to complete and successful completion of the final level (ELIP 3) with a minimum final grade of 75% meets University of Windsor English proficiency requirements.
- Students who do not meet the English language proficiency requirements are required to repeat the program or submit another proficiency test if they are in the 70-75% range. They are also able to upgrade over the course of 3 weeks and then re-test.

5.4 Changes to Residency Requirements for FAHSS

(See document APC1509-5.4 for more details.)

NOTED:

- The proposed change would require that students obtaining an undergraduate degree in the Faculty of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences complete a minimum of 50% of their courses at the University of Windsor (45 semester hours for a three-year general degree and 60 credit hours for a four-year honours or general degree).
- Currently, students are required to complete successfully, at the University of Windsor, a minimum of ten courses (thirty semester hours) numbered 200 or higher to qualify for an honours degree from the University of Windsor.
- FAHSS believes that the change will raise the profile of the University of Windsor by protecting the brand and the integrity of the degree and argues that there is a growing trend of universities moving towards raising the residency requirements from 25% to 50%.
- In response to a question raised as to whether this will hinder student mobility for other institutions, it was noted that the aim is to get strong students in FAHSS who will stay a year longer at the University Windsor, rather than transferring here and completing a degree in one year.
- Strong concern was raised about the proposal to increase the residency requirement for FAHSS programs to 50% as the proposal seems opposite to, and inconsistent with the Ontario Ministry of Colleges and University's push toward greater student mobility and opening up pathways.

AGREED

- Additional information and stronger rationale is needed for Academic Policy Committee to make an informed decision about approving an increase in the residency requirement for only FAHSS programs.
- The argument about protecting the brand left the Committee confused in light of: (a) the Ontario government's push to increase pathways and mobility for students, (b) the brand question has not been an issue before and the policy has been in place for decades, and (c) approximately half of Ontario Universities have set their program residency requirements at 25%. The Committee focused on Ontario universities (rather than a broader national scope of universities) given the need to be responsive to the Ontario government's higher education focus and directives.
- If there is an impact of a 50% residency requirement on enrolment, committee members suggested that it would likely be a decrease in enrolment numbers. Committee members questioned this because the policy change is being proposed at a time when FAHSS is struggling with significant decreases in enrolment.
- Over the past 5 years, only 29 honours students and 17 general students have graduated with fewer than 50% of their courses from the University of Windsor, approximately nine per year. The proposal therefore appears to attempt to address a perceived issue that does not exist. Further, the majority of those students were in the BSW for University Graduates. A change to 50% residency requirement may significantly impact that program. What other articulation agreements or degree completion programs would need to be reviewed?
- While Engineering as a professional program requires 50% residency, all other Faculties require 25% residency. Having significantly different residency requirements for FAHSS will create a barrier to student mobility within the University, and could be viewed by students as unfair. Should it be desirable to move to 50% residency requirements, the change would need to be applied to all University Faculties.
- Overall, the committee is looking for greater clarity on the motivation behind this proposal, beyond the argument of protecting the brand.
- This item was referred back to the proposer for clarification.

5.5 Nursing - Admission Requirements Deferral of Math Requirement

(See document APC1509-5.5 for more details.)

NOTED:

- The Nursing proposal is to defer the math admission requirement for the Collaborative BScN for one year as follows: As of Fall 2017: ENG4U, SBI4U, SCH4U, and one Grade 12 mathematics required.

AGREED:

- The proposal will be circulated for e-Vote.

5.6 Revised Policy on Plagiarism Detection Software (Formerly Turnitin.com)

(See document APC1509-5.6 for more details.)

This item was deferred to the next agenda.

5.7 Instructors Teaching Own Family Members - Policy

(See document APC1509-5.7 for more details.)

MOTION: That the following paragraph be added to the Conflict of Interest Policy:

Instructors shall not teach their own children or other close relatives. An exception may be possible in those very rare instances where there is no other option, such as when the course is a degree requirement taught only by that particular instructor and for which a course substitution cannot be found. In such cases, the instructor will notify the Dean (or designate) immediately who will confirm whether there is another option and, if not, establish checks and balances to minimize the potential conflict prior to the start of the course offering. Under no circumstances should the instructor be assessing and grading the relative's course work. The student's evaluative procedures must be assessed and graded by a third party, possibly from another university if there is no other instructor with the same or comparable expertise at UWindsor.

Dr. B. Tucker/Dr. A. Rossini

NOTED:

- The proposed clause is being proposed as there currently is no clearly written policy in place and there have been many instances when instructors are not sure what the proper protocol should be when they have students in their class that are close relatives or family.
- Generally, instructors who are aware of the conflict will ensure that the Dean is aware of the situation so that someone else can mark the course evaluations.
- In response to a question raised about how the term "close relative" is defined, it was noted that it would encompass immediate family such as children, mother, father, partner, brother, sister, cousins, nieces, nephews, etc. However, "close relative" is deliberately not defined because of the various types of relationships, and traditional and non-traditional family dynamics.
- As is normally the case, where there is a question about whether a student is a "close relative", the Dean would adjudicate the matter.
- In response to a question about close family friends, it was noted that this judgment would need to be made by the instructor in consultation with the Dean (or designate).
- To avoid even the appearance of a conflict, it is best to always err on the side of caution and pursue a fairly strict application of the policy.

CARRIED

6 Question Period/Other Business/Open Discussion

Nothing to report.

7 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.