



January 2015 Academic Advocacy Committee Meeting

1. Adoption of the Agenda

Ryan Gomes moves to approve the agenda. Seconded by Sean Doughty

Agenda approved at 5:15pm

2. Approval of Minutes

- a. November Meeting: November 19, 2014

Motion passes unanimously

3. MOTION by Ryan Gomes to discuss upcoming mid-course evaluations

Seconded by Marissa Zhang

Ryan introduces the main topic of today's meeting: mid term course evals. He states that they were run last term for 1st years, and that he is planning on doing it on a faculty wide level this term. He passes around a copy of the eval that was given last term. He states that he'd like some feedback on what was done last year, as there is room for improvement. Ryan says that he's hoping to have support from VP Comm in terms of mass mailing people to fill them out. He says that he'd like to see a higher turnout than last semester (15% or so)

Patrick mentions that he'd like to see some sort of question polling how useful a course is. He says that adding a question about how useful the projects/problem sets are would be a good idea too.

Eric asks why the textbook is included in the midterm eval questions.

Patrick says there's value in having it, even if it's at the midterm.

Jacob mentions that sections can be taught by different profs, so it might be useful to denote what section they're giving feedback on.

Praneet asks how many have that situation.

Sean mentions that there are quite a few in first year

Jacob mentions there are two profs for a lot of EngSci courses until third year too

Patrick says that there isn't too much difference in assignments, but teaching methods can vary wildly. He says it's the same for TA

Sean says maybe they can just designate by prof



Eric says that where there are separate profs who teach half a section, it might not be as helpful, but could still help the prof teach the second half of the course

Jacob asks about response rates compared to end of term rates

Ryan says (58% for faculty), but number has declined since it went over to online

Patrick asks if it's just a google form. Ryan says yes

Marissa says EngSoc should emphasise that the class reps should push this. Ryan agrees and says the results will be given to profs by them

Jacob asks how the form is set up. Ryan says the courses are listed in a scroll bar, and they can be selected

Praneet mentions electives are going to be a gray area. Ryan clarifies that they won't be covered

Praneet says that it makes sense to focus on core courses. Patrick agrees.

Oghosa says that maybe adding a question saying that electives are being an issue, just so we can note it for our own records.

Praneet says that people will probably fill out forms for the courses they have problems with. Patrick says that's not a bad thing, as we'll be focusing on the issue. It's nice to commend people but it's not necessary in the long run.

Jacob says that if it's not too difficult to implement, having a write in box for electives might be useful.

Oghosa mentions that we might want to push it later. Ryan says that that would be bad because Patrick asks if I could send the results out again to alert them of problems from last semester, to keep in mind for this semester. Ryan says there's definitely value in that, and hopefully by building up data we can note this in future years

Praneet asks if we can poll for 1st semester courses so that we can build up the anti-calendar. Jacob mentions it'd have to be called something different then.

Eric says it might be better to send them out separately

Marissa talks about how the anticalendar was criticised as being rushed and only contacting class reps. She says it might not be good data to use mid-course evals for anti-calendars, but at least we have data for the Board to get behind

Ryan talks about discipline club issues (Chem, Civ, EngSci)



Praneet says collect results anyways. He says EngSoc shouldn't be a patchwork

Marissa says that Civ is kinda separate

Praneet says we want to do a faculty wide system to cover every student equally.

Eric asks if we could unify this with Civ

Praneet talks about how we tried last summer, but there was a lack of responses and then they argued that we didn't consult with them.

Eric asks if we can invite them to participate.

Praneet says that we can, but a similar result probably will occur

Patrick says different discipline clubs operate differently. It's challenging to have everything covered, as some care more about this than others.

Ryan says he hopes that some collaboration occur. He says that collecting data for the first semester data for anti-calendars should run separately from mid-course evals so as to not overload people

Marissa says that we can always improve this as we go along, it's more of a matter of justifying this to the board.

Patrick says so long as you state it's an opinion, it should be fine. Even if it's a low number, it's better than nothing.

Marissa says we did that last time, and we still got criticized, even using the class reps

Patrick says the problem there is that the Board has no idea what they're doing. He says that the discipline clubs should have been more on board and reached out.

Praneet says the other criticism was that it was redundant to the handbook. He says they're separate because that is a 'joke-sy' anti-calendar.

Eric says we should move back to the discussion about evals. He asks why we don't use paper

Ryan clarifies that would be a massive undertaking and that he doesn't have the man-power to realistically do that.

Jacob says that we're going to get a lot of opinions in the comments, so will there be a synthesis on the opinions for the anticalendar

Marissa says at best it'll be an average, but perhaps it might be good to do a 'rate my professor' type thing.



Ryan says it's worth pursuing, as it would be a good mechanism to let me know what they feel. He asks if this would supplant the anti-calendar

Marissa says that it could still be run and be included, but that this would be a real-time type feedback system.

Eric says you could also use it to maintain the anti-calendar through that.

Patrick says that it opens it up to irrelevant feedback, so that's something to consider.

Praneet says that an open forum would still be a good point, although it could be shut down by the Board.

Patrick says you might need another director to manage it.

Eric mentions that we should go back to course evals. He says we should review the feedback that's been given so far

Ryan summarizes

Marissa says we need to focus on marketing.

Patrick says the questions are good, but maybe have one or two more questions about goals.

Eric says it might be useful to say "for example, the textbook, prof, TA etc" for the 'please elaborate' question box. Ryan agrees that it would be a good idea.

4. MOTION by Ryan Gomes to discuss Faculty Council Standing Committees updates

Seconded by Patrick Zerr

Ryan asks about which committees have met since the break. Sean mentions that his has.

Sean talks about the exams committee. He says not too much happened, but that 3 days' worth of meetings dealing with petitions occurred. The committee approved the courses on ROSI so now nothing will change. He says that the petitions are all done now.

Ryan asks if the petitions were dealt with fairly. Sean says they were, and that so long as documentation was present, it was dealt with appropriately. Praneet agrees and says that when he was on the committee, they were also pretty fair and that discussion usually centered on which 'fair' remedy should be used.

Motion passes unanimously

5. OTHER BUSINESS



University of Toronto Engineering Society
January 2015 Academic Advocacy Committee Meeting

January 29, 2015
5:00pm
EngComm

Oghosa asks about the status of the new intro to engineering course mentioned in the fall. Ryan says that EngSoc hasn't heard back on it yet.

Sean asks about the process for uploading exams to courses.skule.ca. Ryan elaborates on EngSoc's procedure, specifically regarding how they are scanned and how EngSoc does not receive midterms from the faculty

6. ADJOURNMENT – 6:04

Moved by Ryan Gomes, seconded by Eric Bryce. Motion passes.



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	AwR
Standing Committee Representatives		
Standing Committee Rep #1	Patrick Zerr	X
Standing Committee Rep #2	Eric Bryce	X
Standing Committee Rep #3	Jacob Richie	X

A – Absent AwR – Absent with Regrets P – Proxy

Also in attendance: Oghosa Igbinakenzua