



Academic Advocacy Committee Meeting #1

Meeting called to order at 7:05

Ryan welcomes everyone to the committee. He says that he's glad lots of people ran and he's looking forward to working with everyone this year. Ryan sets the agenda to interviews and the anti-calendar initiative. He also notes that there have been 9 applications for UCC and only 2 for AAB.

Ernesto asks for clarification on which committees will have people appointed in the fall. Ryan affirms the other committees will be filled in the fall when there's more people and more engagement.

Discussion turns to the lack of AAB applicants, and its role amongst the other standing committees is clarified. Ernesto mentions that the UCC meetings are always at inconvenient times. Marissa says that there should be more than 2 reps for UCC so that EngSoc isn't deprived of a voice on the committee. Praneet disagrees and says that it can be confusing for where people stand when meetings occur and more than 2 people show up. Marissa sees what Praneet means, but still feels that more people means EngSoc is never short on seats. Praneet counters and says that it can make organization confusing and muddle our voice on the UCC.

Praneet and Ernesto both mention that the UTM issue was unsuccessfully pushed in the UCC and that it will come up again. Ryan asserts that EngSoc should stand against having a UTM Engineering program as it needlessly divides Engineering and also doesn't make practical sense. Praneet mentions that he'd wouldn't like a strict 'course load' at just UTSG, but says the program (if implemented) should be here. Marissa mentions that shifting resources to UTM is bad for Engineering, and also says that specific profs would be needed. Praneet agrees and simply states that more 'generic' courses could be conducted on UTM or UTSC. Ernesto brings up the idea of having some online courses, but the other committee members disagree.

Marissa brings discussion back to interviews. Ryan distributes the list of candidates. The committee notes having knowledge of nearly all the candidates and asserts that they are all qualified. Praneet mentions that questions that should be asked should be determined. Ryan asks the committee what structure people would like for the interviews, such as who would sit on each one. Marissa mentions 2 people on each interview would be a good idea. Ernesto agrees and states that different combinations of interviewers would be preferable. Praneet brings up the option having all of the interviews on one day.

Ryan summarizes the discussion and states that there will be 2 interviewers, and interviews will be next week. Ryan and Marissa claim Tuesdays and Wednesdays. Praneet mentions Tuesdays work. Ernesto says any day in the week after 5pm works. The committee decides that schedules will remain flexible and Mondays and Thursdays will be offered as well, with 30 minute time slots for each candidate.



University of Toronto Engineering Society
June 2014 Academic Advocacy Committee Meeting

June 3, 2014
7:00pm
EngComm

Discussion turns to the anti-calendar initiative. Praneet talks about how in Chem, there was a UUC of its own for academic reform. This club created a booklet for incoming engineers that included an anti-calendar and pieces of advice for all courses. Praneet mentions he has all of the books for Chem, and they shouldn't have problems helping out and distributing. He says that EngSoc would like to standardize this across the board and make this for 2nd, 3rd and 4th years as well for all disciplines.

Marissa asks if this will only be for core courses, and Praneet says yes. Ernesto talks about how Civ Club did a similar thing with his help, and that he created a survey to distribute. Although the surveys didn't go very well, he thinks it was useful. He asks if we could get all the academic reps together and talk about what would be a good format. Ryan says he tried to contact the chairs but got no response. He mentions that he wanted to collect the anti-calendars from different clubs and standardize off of that, and get feedback off of the standardized versions from the clubs. Praneet mentions that 1st year reviews of courses should be a priority. Ernesto agrees and talks about getting it really well done over the summer for 1st years, and then move to discussing upper year courses with discipline clubs over the year. Marissa agrees. Praneet says he has all of the Chem stuff, and he says it would be a good format to base this standardized one on.

Praneet shows an example and explains its structure to the committee. Marissa says she likes it, but it should be restructured so that it isn't a wall of text (for example, bullet points). Ryan mentions that harder metrics might be good too. Marissa asks Praneet how this was given out to first years. Praneet mentions these were printed and handed out. Ernesto asks about the survey that was used to get feedback for this anti-calendar. Praneet says the surveys were done on paper through the semester.

Marissa asks about potentially coordinating with the Frosh Handbook. Ryan advises against this, and says the handbook committee's focus is the handbook and their course descriptions are unvetted. Praneet and Marissa mention possibly having the final product in the frosh kits, which would be a good way to get kids starting on the right foot. Marissa also mentions putting it up on skule.ca. Everyone agrees on putting these in the Frosh kits and posting them to the website afterwards.

Marissa mentions the importance nailing down a timeline. Ernesto also asks if we'll do outreach online. Marissa agrees, and says that we should reach out to this past year's class reps. Praneet also mentions getting those class reps involved in writing things out would be good. Ryan agrees and asks what sort of timeline people are comfortable with. Marissa gets her agenda to organize a timeline.

Ernesto asks if reaching out to the first year office would be good. Ryan disagrees and talks about how collaboration with the faculty takes a lot of time and could colour the final opinion. Praneet asks what exactly Ernesto means. Ernesto clarifies that he means putting the final product up on Blackboard and getting the word out. The committee affirms that that's a good idea. Praneet mentions going to the External Director for each department in terms of Faculty engagement. Once the booklet is ready, the committee could reach out to the External Directors to get the word out about it being posted online.



**University of Toronto Engineering Society
June 2014 Academic Advocacy Committee Meeting**

*June 3, 2014
7:00pm
EngComm*

Marissa says that class rep outreach should be sufficient for getting feedback. Praneet agrees and states that they have firsthand knowledge of both their own experiences and their classes experiences. Ernesto asks if we should reach out to academic directors if they exist. The committee agrees. It is decided that the committee will take more time to hash out the structure, and feedback will be obtained from online forms.

Ryan affirms that the rotating in of standing committee reps onto the remaining 3 seats on the committee is how those votes will be distributed. All other members agree.

Ryan motions to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 8:10



Attendance

Officer		
VP Academic	Ryan Gomes	X
Directors of the Board		
At-Large	Praneet Bagga	X
At-Large	Marissa Zhang	X
Civil Representative	Ernesto Diaz Lozano Patino	X
Standing Committee Representatives		
Standing Committee Rep #1	<i>Vacant</i>	
Standing Committee Rep #2	<i>Vacant</i>	
Standing Committee Rep #3	<i>Vacant</i>	

A – Absent

AwR – Absent with Regrets

P – Proxy