APPROVED FOR RELEASE BY THE SENATE
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

MINUTES

A meeting of the Senate of the University of Victoria was held on Friday, November 4, 2005 at 3:30 p.m. in the David Strong Building, Room C116. The Chair of Senate, Dr. David Turpin, was in the Chair.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION: (K. McGowan/R. Mitchell)
The agenda was approved as circulated.

CARRIED

2. MINUTES

a. October 7, 2005

MOTION: (G.Hogya/B.Hall)
That the minutes of the open session of the meeting of the Senate held on October 7, 2005 be approved, and that the approved minutes be circulated in the usual way.

CARRIED

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Nil.

4. REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR

a. President's Report

Dr. Turpin congratulated Dr. Ronald Lou-Poy, who had not been able to attend the September meeting of Senate, on his re-election as Chancellor by acclamation for a second term beginning January 1, 2006. Senators echoed his congratulations with applause. The President reported that B.C. universities were working with the provincial government to finalize the allocations for 2005/06 and expected final budget letters in a few weeks. He also reported on developments at the national level, including the AUCC's advocacy efforts with respect to funding for research and the release of its report, entitled "*Momentum*: The 2005 Report on University Research and Transfer" on the social, economic and other benefits of public investment in university research. Dr. Turpin informed Senators that the November issue of *The Ring* would include a discussion paper on the renewal of the Strategic Plan, as well as an interim report on progress achieved to date. The Planning and Priorities Committee was seeking feedback on the discussion paper and input into the renewal of the plan. It was noted that Senate itself would be consulted in January. Dr. Turpin went on to report on the recent signing of a contract with Alcatel for the installation of cable for the NEPTUNE project and on university rankings compiled by *The Globe and Mail* and ResearchInfoSource.

i. MacLean Magazine Survey Report

Mr. Tony Eder, Director of Institutional Analysis, gave a presentation on the data the university had provided for the MacLean's rankings, which would be released on

November 7. In response to a question, he explained how the reputational rankings are compiled.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

a. University of Victoria Financial Statements as at March 31, 2005

It was noted that no questions had been received concerning the financial statements which had been circulated with the docket.

6. PROPOSALS AND REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

a. Committee on Awards

i. New and Revised Undergraduate Awards

MOTION: (K. Burke/V. Muir)
That Senate approve, and recommend to the Board of Governors for its approval, the following new and revised awards submitted by the Senate Committee on Awards:

Sylvia Brown Entrance Scholarship*
Nellie Holroyd Scholarship in Art History
Nicholas and Karin Koerner Memorial Scholarship in Music (Revised)
Madam Soong Ching Ling Memorial Scholarship * (Revised)
Macville Foundation Entrance Scholarship
Jeffrey Mallett Leadership Award * (Revised)
Bea Scott Scholarship in Voice * (Revised)

* Indicates awards administered by the University of Victoria Foundation

CARRIED

ii. Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Awards

MOTION: (K. McGowan/A. Monahan) **CARRIED**
That Senate receive with thanks the 2004-2005 Annual Report of the Senate Committee on Awards.

Dr. Mitchell noted that his concerns about the conditions for renewal of the Koerner Awards had been addressed.

b. Committee on Planning

i. Centre for Addictions Research of British Columbia

MOTION (M. Taylor/K. Mateer)
That Senate approve and recommend to the Board of Governors that it also approve, the renewal of Approved Centre Status for the Centre for Addictions Research of British Columbia for the period January 1, 2006 December 31, 2010.

CARRIED

Dr. Turpin thanked Dr. Stockwell, Director of the Centre, for his attendance and congratulated him on the Centre's work.

c. Committee on Teaching and Learning

i. Proposed Course Experience Survey

Dr. Turpin recalled that the Senate had endorsed a universal student rating of instruction in 11/01/2002 and had assigned the task of developing such an instrument to the Committee on Teaching and Learning. He invited Dr. Jim Anglin, Associate Vice-President, Academic, to elaborate. Dr. Anglin said that the development of the Course Experience Survey had involved a literature review, the preparation and presentation to Senate of a discussion paper in 2002, further research, psychometric testing of potential survey items, focus groups with students and faculty members, and other forms of consultation and analysis. He indicated that after feedback from Senate had been received and considered, the instrument would be finalized and implemented by a committee that the Vice-President Academic and Provost was establishing. The committee would comprise the Director of the Centre for Learning and Teaching, student representatives, the Administrative Registrar, several Deans and Chairs, and others. Dr. Anglin would chair the Implementation Committee, which would strive to implement the survey in the fall of 2006. An evaluation of the effectiveness of the survey would be conducted after two years and the results would be provided to Senate. He invited input from Senators. Reg Mitchell offered passionate criticism. The following were amongst the comments and suggestions made:

- the questionnaire is long. Students may be reluctant to complete a questionnaire of such length for each class.
- the questionnaire ducks the fundamental question of whether the student would recommend the course or would have taken it had he or she known what it would be like.
- faculty members would find the answers to the questions helpful in refining their courses and teaching.
- the use of the term "really" in Section II, question 7 ("Overall, I really made an effort to do well in this course:") was problematic.
- the description of "somewhat disagree" in the "Response Scale for the Statements in the CES" on page 2 would be improved if it did not invoke feelings of uncertainty, but rather read, "This statement in general does not reflect my experience, however, there were a few times when this was my experience."
- the information derived from the survey would be useful to Chairs in understanding department members' strengths and weaknesses as teachers.

- the survey would best be administered at the beginning other than at the end of a class.
- the survey could serve two different purposes: to assist faculty members to improve their courses and teaching, or to assist the university to assess faculty members' teaching effectiveness. The relative importance of these purposes should be clarified.
- the questions should be aligned so that, for example, a positive answer is always on the left (or the right). A subsequent speaker took issue with this suggestion.
- there should be a question about the instructor.
- students might be more inclined to complete the survey if it were available on-line.
- it would be beneficial to educate students about how the survey results will be used (e.g. self-improvement, promotion and tenure considerations) and about the impact the results can have on instructors.
- it is important that those who deliver and administer the survey be enthusiastic and well-informed.

Dr. Anglin and Dr. Van Gyn indicated that the Implementation Committee would take these comments and suggestions into consideration. In response to questions, they indicated that:

- faculty members may include written comments in their dossiers, but, if they do, they must include all of them (rather than include selectively).
- psychometric testing of items in the instrument had been done.
- the length of the survey had already been reduced. The complexity of teaching and learning militates against effective measurement by means of a small number of questions.
- The method of administering the survey would be addressed by the Implementation Committee.
- faculty members participating in focus groups had expressed a preference for de-personalizing the questions (i.e., that the instructor not be the focal point).

Asked if the survey would be brought back to Senate for approval, Dr. Turpin indicated that that would not be the case: Senate had long ago endorsed such an instrument. Feedback was being sought, so that it could be refined prior to implementation. Senate would be kept apprised of its implementation. A report on its effectiveness would be prepared and presented to Senate two years after implementation.

MOTION (K. McGowan/P. Murphy)
That Senate receive the Proposed Course Experience Survey for information and discussion.

CARRIED

7. PROPOSALS AND REPORTS FROM FACULTIES

a. Faculty of Graduate Studies

i. New and Revised Graduate Awards

MOTION: (G.Hogya/V.Muir)
That the Senate approve, and recommend to the Board of Governors for its approval, the new and revised awards recommended by the Faculty of Graduate Studies.

Po Ting IP and Wai Tsuen Lee Ip Scholarship in Pacific and Asian Studies
Jan and Christina Hulsker Scholarship in History in Art.

CARRIED

8. OTHER BUSINESS

Nil.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.