OPENING SESSION 2:00 – 2:20 p.m.
1. Approval of the Agenda John Nychka
2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of April 27, 2022 John Nychka
3. GFC Committee Orientation Kate Peters Heather Richholt
4. Comments from the Chair (no documents) John Nychka

ACTION ITEMS 2:20 – 2:40 p.m.
5. Revisions to Examination Procedures and Deferred Exam Procedures in the 2023-2024 University Calendar Norma Rodenburg
   Motion: To Recommend General Faculties Council Approval

DISCUSSION ITEMS 2:40 – 3:00 p.m.
6. Updates
   A. Centre for Teaching and Learning Tommy Mayberry
   B. Facilities and Operations Lara McClelland
   C. Information Technology Jeff Rawlings
   D. Library and Museums Connie Winther
   E. General Faculties Council Kate Peters
7. Student Accessibility Assessment Project Report 3:00 – 3:30 p.m. Allen Ball
   Melissa Padfield
8. Student Perspectives of Teaching (SPOT) Survey update (no documents) 3:30 – 3:45 p.m. John Nychka
9. Question Period 3:45 – 4:00 p.m. John Nychka

INFORMATION REPORTS
11. Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings
    A. Report of the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity Review of Teaching Awards Working Group
CLOSING SESSION

12. Adjournment
   - Next meeting of CLE: October 26, 2022
   - Next meeting of GFC: October 17, 2022

Presenter(s):

John Nychka 
Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair GFC Committee on the Learning Environment

Tommy Mayberry 
Executive Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning

Lara McClelland 
Associate Vice-President, Facilities and Operations

Mike MacGregor 
Associate Vice-President and Chief Information Officer

Connie Winther 
Head for Faculty Engagement (Health Sciences)

Kate Peters 
GFC Secretary and Manager, GFC Services

Heather Richholt 
Assistant Secretary to General Faculties Council

Norma Rodenburg 
Interim Vice-Provost and University Registrar

Allen Ball 
Associate Dean (Student Programs) and Professor, University of Alberta

Sarah Wolgemuth 
Assistant Dean (Student Life)

Documentation was before members unless otherwise noted.

Meeting REGRETS to: Faiza Billo, 780-492-4262, faiza.billo@ualberta.ca
Prepared by: Kate Peters, Secretary to GFC
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OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): John Nychka, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair CLE

Motion: Lai/Thomas

THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning environment approve the agenda.

CARRIED

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of March 30, 2022

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): John Nychka, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair CLE

Motion: Lemelin/Hughes

THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment approve the open session minutes of March 30, 2022.

CARRIED

3. Comments from the Chair (no documents)

Presenter(s): John Nychka, Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair CLE

Discussion:
In his comments, the Chair made note of the following:

- Thanks to outgoing staff and student committee members for their work over the past year;
- Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity Review of Awards and the report that would be available soon;
• The University was working on an Online and Continuing Education Strategy that would include the creation of a hub model to support the development of online programming across the institution; and
• A request for a member of CLE to serve on the Advisory Selection Committee for Faculty Excellence Awards.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. University of Alberta Technology Strategy
Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Mike MacGregor, Associate Vice-President and Chief Information Officer

Discussion:
M MacGregor presented an overview of the University of Alberta Technology Strategy including key themes, draft goals, and workstreams that would be established to deliver the strategy.

Members discussed:
• challenges regarding communication around information technology;
• transparency related to evergreening the university's technology and systems;
• the technology governance approach related to infrastructure and media;
• the role of the Colleges in the Technology Strategy; and
• the changes under the Service Excellence Transformation (SET) restructuring to centralize the University's information technology support.

5. Updates

A. Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL)
Presenter(s): Tommy Mayberry, Executive Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning

Discussion:
T Mayberry provided the following updates:
• The Festival of Teaching and Learning scheduled for May 2 - 4, 2022 with great sessions by UofA instructors and teachers, and two student keynote conversations on Accommodation and Proactive Design; and
• CTL’s new Lead Educational Developer with an Indigenizing Pedagogies focused portfolio would join the unit on May 2, 2022.

B. Library and Museums
Presenter(s): Connie Winther, Head for Faculty Engagement (Health Sciences), Library and Museums

Discussion:
C Winther updated members on the Health Sciences Library and noted that the design had moved to the tender phase. She also spoke about the principles that would be used to decide Library hours for the fall.

C. General Faculties Council
Presenter(s): Kate Peters, GFC Secretary and Manager, GFC Services

Discussion:
K Peters spoke about the items on the agenda for the GFC meeting scheduled for the May 2 meeting which would be held in person in Council Chamber for the first time since spring 2020. She also noted that there would be a remote meeting option on Zoom.
6. **Pursuing Equitable Access Textbook Approach**

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Katherine Huising, Associate Vice-President, Campus Services; Kevin Moffitt, Director Retail Operations Campus Services

*Discussion:*

K Huising and K Moffitt explained that the university was considering a digital first platform for textbooks and course content that could create opportunity for savings far beyond the traditional print model. They noted that the university was currently investigating the feasibility of this program.

Members discussed:

- Open Educational Resources (OER), and the Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) initiative and Campus Solutions indicator;
- academic freedom and innovation;
- student consultation;
- the importance of preserving library resources;
- that students would not be required to participate and could choose to opt out of the program; and
- financial supports available for students to help with fees.

7. **Space Optimization Strategy**

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Lara McClelland, Associate Vice-President, Integrated Planning, Development & Partnerships; Shannon Loughran, Associate Director, Space Optimization

*Discussion:*

L McClelland and S Loughran provided an overview of the Space Optimization Strategy and spoke about the need to reduce the university's physical footprint, optimize existing spaces, reduce the growing deferred maintenance liability, and re-invest in the buildings best positioned for future growth in academic and research excellence.

Members discussed:

- The goal to remove 15% of the university's space from inventory;
- Sensitivities around space;
- Investment and repair needs at Augustana Campus;
- Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) and community building aspects of space optimization;
- Scheduling classes outside the peak hours of 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.; and
- Shared space, including labs.

8. **Question Period**

There were no questions.

**CLOSING SESSION**

9. **Adjournment**

- Next meeting of CLE: September 28, 2022
- Next meeting of GFC: May 2, 2022
Governance Executive Summary  
Advice, Discussion, Information Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Title</th>
<th>GFC Committee on the Learning Environment Committee Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by</th>
<th>General Faculties Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Presenter   | Kate Peters, GFC Secretary and Manager of GFC Services  
Heather Richholt, Assistant Secretary to GFC |

Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Administrative Responsibility</th>
<th>University Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)</td>
<td>The proposal is before the committee to provide governance orientation to committee members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Executive Summary (outline the specific item – and remember your audience) | The first meeting of the year for each GFC Committee typically includes a Committee orientation. This year we would like to focus on the committee’s mandate and the responsibilities of members.  
Please take the time to review the attached Committee Terms of Reference and the GFC and Committee Member Guidebook before the meeting. We welcome your questions related to all things University Governance! |

Engagement and Routing (Include proposed plan)

| Consultation and Stakeholder Participation | GFC Committee Chairs  
General Counsel and University Secretary  
GFC Committees |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------|

Strategic Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment with For the Public Good</th>
<th>Objective 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alignment with Core Risk Area     | Please note below the specific institutional risk(s) this proposal is addressing.  
☐ Enrolment Management  
☐ Faculty and Staff  
☐ Funding and Resource Management  
☐ IT Services, Software and Hardware  
☐ Leadership and Change  
☐ Physical Infrastructure  
☒ Relationship with Stakeholders  
☐ Reputation  
☐ Research Enterprise  
☐ Safety  
☐ Student Success |

| Legislative Compliance and jurisdiction | Post-Secondary Learning Act  
General Faculties Council  
GFC---------- Committee |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|

Attachments

1. GFC Committee on the Learning Environment Committee Terms of Reference  
2. GFC and Committee Member Guidebook (link)

Prepared by: Heather Richholt, Assistant Secretary to GFC, richholt@ualberta.ca
1. **Mandate and Role of the Committee**
   The Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) is a standing committee of GFC charged with advising GFC on policy directions that promote excellence in teaching and learning institutionally. CLE serves as GFC’s primary advisory group on teaching and learning, including such aspects as learning environments, assessment and evaluation, teaching innovations, teaching resources and support, and students’ educational experience.

2. **Areas of Responsibility**
   a. Physical and virtual learning and teaching environment
   b. Teaching and learning policy
   c. Institutional policy on the assessment of teaching
   d. Institutional policy on the evaluation of student learning
   e. Vision and strategy for learning spaces and learning technologies
   f. Fostering excellence in the scholarship and practice of teaching and learning

3. **Composition**
   **Voting Members (19)**
   - **Ex-officio (6)**
     - Provost and Vice-President (Academic), Chair
     - Vice-President (Academic), Students’ Union
     - Vice-President (Academic), Graduate Students’ Association
     - Vice-Provost and Chief Librarian
     - Vice-Provost and University Registrar
     - Vice-Provost and Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
   - **Appointed (1)**
     - 1 academic staff (A1.0) who holds a major teaching award (internal or external award, eg Rutherford, Vargo Chair, 3M, etc.), appointed by the Chair in consultation with the Chair of Nominating Committee
   - **Elected by GFC (12)**
     - 4 academic staff (A1.0) from GFC – one of whom will be elected by the committee to serve as Vice Chair
     - 1 non-academic staff at-large (S1.0, S2.0)
     - 1 librarian from GFC
     - 1 undergraduate student from GFC
     - 1 graduate student from GFC
     - 1 Chair
     - 1 Dean
     - 1 Associate Dean or Associate Chair, Teaching and Learning (or equivalent)
     - 1 academic teaching staff (A2.1, A2.2) at-large
   - **Non-voting Members**
     - Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Information Technology)
     - Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning
     - Director, Space Management, Facilities and Operations
     - University Secretary
     - GFC Secretary
4. Delegated Authority from General Faculties Council

Should be reviewed at least every three years and reported to GFC.

4.1 Approve revisions to teaching assessment and evaluation procedures
4.2 Approve proposals related to teaching and learning that emerge from central administrative units and determine whether to forward to GFC for discussion or information
4.3 Receive and discuss reports on student engagement and the student educational experience and determine whether to forward to GFC for discussion or information

5. Responsibilities Additional to Delegated Authority

5.1 Review and recommend to GFC on policies related to teaching and learning
5.2 Review and recommend to GFC on policies related to assessment of teaching
5.3 Review and provide feedback on learning technologies
5.4 Receive, discuss and provide feedback on new and revised learning spaces, formal and informal, that impact instructor and student educational experiences
5.5 Advise on the vision and strategy for learning spaces and learning technologies
5.6 Receive, discuss and provide feedback on new and innovative teaching pedagogy and delivery initiatives
5.7 Review and recommend to GFC on policy and regulations related to student evaluation that apply to a substantial group of students
5.8 Make recommendations to GFC on student engagement, student educational experience, and support for teaching
5.9 Members may be asked to serve on adjudication bodies related to awards within the CLE mandate

6. Sub-delegations from the Committee on the Learning Environment

Should be reviewed at least every three years and reported to GFC.

None.

7. Limitations to Authority

The following further refines or places limitations on authorities held by or delegated to CLE:

8. Reporting to GFC

The Committee should regularly report to GFC with respect to its activities and decisions.

9. Definitions

Substantial Group of Students – any one (or more) of the following three classes of students: (a) undergraduate students, (b) doctoral level students, and/or (c) graduate students pursuing studies other than those at doctoral level

Academic staff – as defined by the Recruitment Policy (Appendix A) Definition and Categories of Academic Staff, Administrators and Colleagues in UAPPOL

Non-Academic staff – as defined by the Recruitment Policy (Appendix B) Definition and Categories of Support Staff in UAPPOL

10. Links

Teaching Policy
Teaching Assessment and Evaluation Policy and Procedures
Assessment and Grading Policy and Procedures
Academic Regulations – University of Alberta Calendar
Examination Regulations
Course Requirements, Evaluation Procedures and Grading
Centre for Teaching and Learning
Office of the Student Ombuds

Approved by General Faculties Council: November 25, 2019
Governance Executive Summary
Action Item

Agenda Title | Revisions to Examination Procedures and Deferred Exam Procedures in the 2023-2024 University Calendar

Motion
MOTION 1: THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment rescind the recommendation to approve from December 2020 as set forth in attachment 1.

MOTION 2: THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment recommend that the General Faculties Council approve the proposed revisions to the Examination Procedures listed in the University Calendar, as set forth in the attached documents, for inclusion in the 2023-2024 University Calendar.

MOTION 3: THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment recommend that the General Faculties Council approve the proposed revisions to the procedures for Deferred Final Exams listed in the University Calendar, as set forth in the attached documents, for inclusion in the 2023-2024 University Calendar.

Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>☐ Approval</th>
<th>☒ Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by</td>
<td>Norma Rodenburg, Acting Vice-Provost and University Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
<td>Norma Rodenburg, Acting Vice-Provost and University Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Administrative Responsibility</th>
<th>Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)</td>
<td>This proposal is to get approval for revisions to the Examination procedures and Deferred Exam procedures sections on the University Calendar’s Academic Regulations page.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Summary (outline the specific item – and remember your audience)</th>
<th>Examination Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With the increase in online testing starting in Winter Term 2020, it was identified that the examination regulations in the Calendar were written specifically for in-person exams and required interpretation in order to be applied to the online exam environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In December 2020, a proposal was recommended by CLE to GFC. However, given the evolving nature of the pandemic, decision-making was paused. The revised proposal includes additional changes to procedures for deferred final exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed clarifications include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Students who arrive late will not be permitted to write the exam and may apply for a deferred exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Language around the requirement to remain in the exam environment for at least 30 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Item No. 5

| - Additional examples of what it means to communicate during an exam  
| - Clarification on what to do if a student requires a brief absence from an online exam  
| - Language around what it means to be incapacitated during an exam  
| - Language around cancellation of an exam after it has been written/submitted and the opportunity to apply for a reexamination  

### Deferred Exams

The Exams and Timetabling Office at the Office of the Registrar has recently reviewed the Deferred Final Exams section of the Calendar based on feedback received from several faculty partners. In their review, they identified language that was unclear, resulting in confusion for some faculties/departments.

The proposed changes are meant to clarify the language of the preexisting regulations around the scheduling of deferred exams. There is no proposed change to the regulation itself.

| Supplementary Notes and context  
| <This section is for use by University Governance only to outline governance process.>  

### Engagement and Routing (Include meeting dates)

Consultation and Stakeholder Participation (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)

<For information on the protocol see the Governance Resources section Student Participation Protocol>

**Those who are actively participating:**
- Office of the Registrar
  - Deputy Registrar - Norma Rodenburg
  - University Calendar - Carlo Dimailig
  - Exams & Timetabling - Jesse Luyendyk

**Those who have been consulted:**
- Program Support Team – Undergraduate and Non-Credit - June 2, 2022
- Graduate Program Support Team - June 6, 2022

**Those who have been informed:**
- 

Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)

### Strategic Alignment

**Alignment with For the Public Good**

**21. Objective:** Encourage continuous improvement in administrative, governance, planning, and stewardship systems, procedures, and policies that enable students, faculty, staff, and the institution as a whole to achieve shared strategic goals.

**I. Strategy:** Encourage transparency and improve communication across the university through clear consultation and decision-making...
Item No. 5

| making processes, substantive and timely communication of information, and access to shared, reliable institutional data. **IV. Strategy:** Facilitate easy access to and use of university services and systems, reduce duplication and complexity, and encourage cross-institutional administrative and operational collaboration. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment with Core Risk Area</th>
<th>Please note below the specific institutional risk(s) this proposal is addressing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Enrolment Management</td>
<td>☐ Relationship with Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>☐ Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Funding and Resource Management</td>
<td>☐ Research Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ IT Services, Software and Hardware</td>
<td>☐ Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Leadership and Change</td>
<td>x Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Physical Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Compliance and jurisdiction</th>
<th>Post-Secondary Learning Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFC Committee on the Learning Environment Terms of Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments (each to be numbered 1 - <>)

1. Final Motions December 2020 (pages 1-7)
2. Calendar Change for Academic Regulations – Examinations (pages 1 – 3)
3. Calendar Change for Academic Regulations - Deferred Exams not written (pages 1 – 2)
4. Calendar Change for Academic Regulations – Deferred Exams

Prepared by:
Norma Rodenburg, Acting Vice-Provost and University Registrar, norma.rodenburg@ualberta.ca
Carlo Dimailig, University Calendar Editor, carlo@ualberta.ca
The following Motions and Documents were considered by the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment at its Wednesday, December 02, 2020 meeting:

Agenda Title: Proposed Revisions to the Conduct of Examinations Section of the University Calendar

CARRIED MOTION:
THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment recommend to the GFC Executive Committee proposed revisions to the Conduct of Examinations Section of the University Calendar, as contained in Attachment 1, as amended, and to take effect upon final approval by GFC.

FINAL Item 4
Governance Executive Summary

Action Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Title</th>
<th>Proposed Revisions to the Conduct of Examinations Section of the University Calendar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Motion

THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment recommend to the GFC Executive Committee proposed revisions to the Conduct of Examinations Section of the University Calendar, as contained in Attachment 1, as amended, and to take effect upon final approval by GFC.

Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Requested</th>
<th>☐ Approval ☒ Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by</td>
<td>Dr. Tammy Hopper, Vice-Provost (Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
<td>Dr. Tammy Hopper, Vice-Provost (Programs) Carlo Dimailig, University Calendar Editor, Office of the Registrar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Administrative Responsibility</th>
<th>Provost and Vice-President (Academic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)

To revise the Conduct of Examinations section of the University Calendar.

Executive Summary (outline the specific item – and remember your audience)

Issue:
The University Calendar sections related to Examinations is in need of revision to reflect our current context of remote delivery of courses and online assessment.

Background:
The University Calendar regulations establish standards for evaluation practice, including in a remote delivery context. In particular, they indicate:

- Academic standards for weighting of term work and final exams
- Regulations for scheduling and conducting final exams

Considerations:
The regulations are being revised to reflect the contemporary learning environment including remote delivery and an online assessment environment. Instructors and students need clarity around these regulations. Of particular importance is the section on Conduct of Examinations. This section currently reflects in person examination regulations only.

Supplementary Notes and context

<This section is for use by University Governance only to outline governance process.>

Engagement and Routing (Include meeting dates)

Consultation and Stakeholder Participation (parties who have seen the proposal and in what capacity)

- Those actively participating:
  - Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives)
  - Vice-Provost (Programs)
  - Portfolio Initiatives Manager (Office of the Provost)
  - Melissa Padfield (Vice-Provost and University Registrar)
  - Mike McGregor (Vice-Provost, IST)
GFC COMMITTEE ON THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT
For the Meeting of December 2, 2020

Item No. 4

| Helen Vallianatos (Vice-Dean, Dean of Students Office) |
| Kate Peters (GFC Secretary) |
| Carlo Dimailig, University Calendar Editor, Office of the Registrar |
| GFC CLE |
| GFC Executive Committee |
| GFC |

**Those who have been consulted:**
Faculty of Graduate Students and Research Students’ Union Graduate Students’ Association Public Health Response Team, Sub-Committee on Academic Impacts Program Support Team (PST) (Undergraduate and Graduate) Council on Student Affairs (COSA) GFC CLE GFC

**Those who have been informed:**
- Approval Route (Governance) (including meeting dates)
  - GFC CLE, December 2, 2020
  - GFC Executive Committee, January 11, 2020
  - GFC, January 25, 2020

**Strategic Alignment**

**Alignment with For the Public Good**

GOAL: EXCEL as individuals, and together, sustain a culture that fosters and champions distinction and distinctiveness in teaching, learning, research, and service.

Objective 14: Inspire, model, and support excellence in teaching and learning.

GOAL: SUSTAIN our people, our work, and the environment by attracting and stewarding the resources we need to deliver excellence to the benefit of all Albertans.

Objective 21: Encourage continuous improvement in administrative, governance, planning and stewardship systems, procedures, and policies that enable students, faculty, staff, and the institution as a whole to achieve shared strategic goals.

**Alignment with Core Risk Area**

Please note below the specific institutional risk(s) this proposal is addressing.

- Enrolment Management
- Faculty and Staff
- Funding and Resource Management
- IT Services, Software and Hardware
- Leadership and Change
- Physical Infrastructure
- Relationship with Stakeholders
- Reputation
- Research Enterprise
- Safety
- Student Success

**Legislative Compliance and jurisdiction**

Post-Secondary Learning Act (PSLA)
GFC CLE Terms of Reference
GFC Executive Committee Terms of Reference
GFC Terms of Reference
University Calendar
UAPPOL Assessment and Grading Policy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposed Revisions to the Conduct of Examinations Section of the University Calendar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prepared by*: Andrea Patrick, Portfolio Initiatives Manager, Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), [apatrick@ualberta.ca](mailto:apatrick@ualberta.ca); Carlo Dimailig, University Calendar Editor, Office of the Registrar, [carlo@ualberta.ca](mailto:carlo@ualberta.ca)
Academic Regulations

Examinations (Exams)

**Term exam** - any written or oral exam, test or quiz (other than a final exam) which is scheduled as part of the term work of a course.

**Final exam** - summative examination administered to students in a course at the end of the term in which the course is offered.

**Examinations - General**

There is no requirement by General Faculties Council that the final examination be taken in order to obtain credit: Faculties are permitted to make their own regulations in this regard. Final examinations should only be used if they are necessary to evaluate the student's achievement of stated learning outcomes for the course. See the Assessment and Grading Policy for additional information on guiding principles for formative and summative assessments.

**Conduct of Exams**

**Note:** Conduct which violates the rules of conduct for exams may also violate the Code of Student Behaviour. Amendments to the Code of Student Behaviour occur throughout the year. The official version of the Code of Student Behaviour, as amended from time to time is housed on the University Governance website.

Enforcement of the regulations in the Conduct of Exams section are bound by the Discrimination Harassment and Duty to Accommodate Policy and associated procedures, and are subject to exceptions in cases of accommodation. The Academic Success Centre is the office responsible for providing specialized support and accessibility services, and is guided by the mandate of the University of Alberta’s Policy for Students with Disabilities.

In this section, “term exam” is used to refer to any written or oral exam, test or quiz (other than a final exam) which is scheduled as part of the term work of a course.

1. **Student Identification:** Students taking exams in person (i.e., physically in person on the University of Alberta campuses) and online (i.e., remotely via teleconference) writing exams are required to confirm their identities by providing their student ID numbers and signatures and by presenting their student ID cards (ONEcard) or other acceptable identification. Students who are unable to present valid identification at the time of the exam will not be permitted to take the exam. For physical in-person examinations, instructors are advised to circulate an attendance sheet and verify student ID numbers and signatures. Present satisfactory identification at the time of the exam will be permitted to write the exam, but will be required to present themselves with acceptable photo identification to the instructor of the course within two working days of the exam and may be required to provide a sample of their handwriting. Failure to provide proper identification will result in a mark of zero for the exam. Instructors are advised to circulate an attendance sheet at all exams.

1. **Permitted References and Aids:** Only those items specifically authorized by the instructor may be brought into the exam facility. The use of unauthorized personal listening, communication, recording, photographic and/or computational devices is strictly prohibited.
2. **Registration:** Students may not be present in an exam or write an exam in a course section in which they are not registered.

3. **Arriving and Leaving:** Students must arrive at the specified time to take the exam. Once the exam has started, students must remain in the physical in-person or remote environment for at least 30 minutes. Students who arrive 30 or more minutes late for the scheduled start of the exam, whether physically in-person or remotely, will not be permitted to take the exam and may apply for a deferred examination. Students may not enter the exam area after the first half-hour has elapsed, and they may not leave the exam area until one half-hour has elapsed.

4. **Communications:** During the exam, all communications should be addressed to the instructor or exam proctor. Students will not, under any circumstances, or by any means, communicate with other students in the exam environment, or share any part of the examination, leave their answers exposed to view, or in any way share with others any part of the examination. During the exam, all communications should be addressed to a supervisor. Students should not, under any circumstances, speak to or communicate with other candidates or leave their answer papers exposed to view.

5. **Brief Absence from an Exam:** Students who need to use the washroom during a physical in-person exam must leave their exam materials in the custody of a supervisor and retrieve them upon their return. In a remote exam environment, the student must notify the instructor or proctor of the need to leave the exam and suspend work on the exam during that period. If a student visits the washroom during an exam must leave their papers in the custody of a supervisor and retrieve it upon return.

6. **Cancellation of Paper During Exam:** If a student suddenly is unable to finish the exam due to unexpected medical or physical circumstance, or similarly disruptive event, the student must inform the instructor or proctor immediately, submit the unfinished exam, and request that the exam be cancelled. If a student becomes incapacitated because of illness or receives word of domestic affliction during the course of an exam, the student should report at once to the Supervisor, hand in the unfinished paper, and request that it be cancelled.

Students may provide supporting documentation by way of a form from the student's Faculty or a statutory declaration. Medical notes cannot be required. In cases other than illness, adequate documentation must be provided. For more information, contact your faculty or visit What to do when you are sick (students) on the office of the Registrar website.

5. For final exams, the student must provide documentation and apply to their Faculty for a deferred exam within two working days following the cancelled final exam or as soon as the student is able, having regard to the circumstances underlying the cancellation. Students should consult their Faculty for detailed information on requirements. Also see Absence from Final Exams for details.

6. For other exams, instructors may use their discretion to request supporting documentation. The student must contact the instructor within two working days of the exam or as soon as the student is able, having regard to the circumstances underlying the cancellation and present supporting documentation to the instructor if requested.

7. Requests to cancel and reschedule an exam that has already been written and submitted will not be considered. However, students may apply for a deferred examination under extenuating circumstances. A student who requests a deferred examination citing extenuating circumstances that are later determined to be false will be liable under the Code of Student Behaviour. Should a student write an exam, hand in the paper for marking, and later report extenuating circumstances to
support a request for cancellation of the paper and for another exam, such request will not be entertained. Any student who requests a cancellation of their paper and subsequently applies for or obtains an excused absence by making false statements will be liable under the Code of Student Behaviour.

8. **End of Exam:** When the signal is given to end the exam, students must promptly cease writing. If a student does not stop at the signal, the instructor has the discretion either not to grade the exam paper or to lower the grade on the examination.
# Calendar Change Proposal for the Examinations Section
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### Academic Regulations

### Examinations

**Conduct of Exams**

**Note:** Conduct which violates the rules of conduct for exams may also violate the Code of Student Behaviour. Amendments to the Code of Student Behaviour occur throughout the year. The official version of the Code of Student Behaviour, as amended from time to time is housed on the University Governance website.

In this section, “term exam” is used to refer to any written or oral exam, test or quiz (other than a final exam) which is scheduled as part of the term work of a course.

1. **Student Identification:** Students writing exams are required to confirm their identities by providing their student ID numbers and signatures and by presenting their student ID cards (ONEcard) or other acceptable photo identification. Students who are unable to present satisfactory identification at the time of the exam will be permitted to write the exam, but will be required to present themselves with acceptable photo identification to the instructor of the course within two working days of the exam and may be required to provide a sample of their handwriting. Failure to provide proper identification will result in a mark of zero for the exam. Instructors are advised to circulate an attendance sheet at all exams.
2. **Permitted References and Aids:** Only those items specifically authorized by the instructor may be brought into the exam facility. The use of unauthorized personal listening, communication, recording, photographic and/or computational devices is strictly prohibited.

3. **Registration:** Students may not be present in an exam or write an exam in a course section in which they are not registered.

4. **Arriving and Leaving:** Students must arrive at the specified time to take the exam. Once the exam has started, students must remain in the physical in-person or remote environment for at least 30 minutes. Students who arrive more than 30 minutes late for the scheduled start of the exam, whether physically in-person or remotely, will not be permitted to take the exam and may apply for a deferred examination.

5. **Communications:** During the exam, all communications should be addressed to the instructor or exam proctor. Students must not, under any circumstances, speak to or communicate with other candidates or leave their answer papers exposed to view.

6. **Brief Absence from an Exam:** Students who need to use the washroom during a physical in-person exam must leave their exam materials in the custody of a supervisor and retrieve them upon return. In a remote exam environment, the student must notify the instructor or proctor of the need to leave the exam and suspend work on the exam during that period.

7. **Cancellation of Paper During Exam:** If a student becomes incapacitated because of illness or receives word of domestic affliction during the course of an exam, the student should report at once to the Supervisor, hand in the unfinished paper, and request that it be cancelled. Students may provide supporting documentation by way of a form from the student’s Faculty or a statutory declaration.
Medical notes cannot be required. In cases other than illness, adequate documentation must be provided. For more information, contact your faculty or visit What to do when you are sick (students) on the office of the Registrar website.

a. For final exams, the student must provide documentation and apply to their Faculty for a deferred exam within two working days following the cancelled final exam or as soon as the student is able, having regard to the circumstances underlying the cancellation. Students should consult their Faculty for detailed information on requirements. Also see Absence from Final Exams for details.

b. For other exams, instructors may use their discretion to request supporting documentation. The student must contact the instructor within two working days of the exam or as soon as the student is able, having regard to the circumstances underlying the cancellation and present supporting documentation to the instructor if requested.

Should a student write an exam, hand in the paper for marking, and later report extenuating circumstances to support a request for cancellation of the paper and for another exam, such request will not be entertained. Any student who requests a cancellation of their paper and subsequently applies for or obtains an excused absence by making false statements will be liable under the Code of Student Behaviour.

8. End of Exam: When the signal is given to end the exam, students must promptly cease writing. If a student does not stop at the signal, the instructor has the discretion either not to grade the exam paper or to lower the grade on the examination.
Proposal prepared by: Carlo Dimailig (carlo@ualberta.ca), Jesse Luyendyk (jluyendy@ualberta.ca)
Calendar Change Proposal for Deferred Final Exams Not Written

**Rationale:** The current regulations for Deferred Exams Not Written only account for Fall/Winter term. This change will extend these regulations to also include Spring and Summer terms.
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### Academic Regulations

...  

**Deferred Final Exams**  

| 4. **Fall/Winter** Deferred Exams Not Written: | 4. **Deferred Exams Not Written:** Students who have applied for a deferred final exam in accordance with Absence from Final Exams, but who have, for justifiable cause, not written the deferred exam on the scheduled date must reapply for a second and final opportunity to write the deferred exam. Application deadlines are noted below. Students must apply at their Faculty Undergraduate (Graduate) Office. The department will determine the date, time and place of the second deferred final exam and will notify the student. The date scheduled must be no later than the end of July. Once set, the date for a second deferral is final and applications for further deferrals will not be considered or accepted.  

**Absence from Deferred Exam Without Justifiable Cause:** When a student is absent from a deferred final exam without acceptable reason, a final grade will be computed using a raw score of zero for the final exam.  

**Deadline for Application:** The application and the documentation pertaining to the absence must be presented to the Faculty within two working days following the scheduled date of the deferred exam missed or as soon as the student is able, having regard to the circumstances underlying the absence.  

| 4. **Spring or Summer** | 4. **Deferred Exams Not Written:** Students who have applied for a deferred final exam in accordance with Absence from Final Exams, but who have, for justifiable cause, not written the deferred exam on the scheduled date must reapply for a second and final opportunity to write the deferred exam. Application deadlines are noted below. Students must apply at their Faculty Undergraduate (Graduate) Office. The department will determine the date, time and place of the second deferred final exam and will notify the student. **For Fall or Winter Terms,** the date scheduled must be no later than the end of July. **For Spring or Summer Terms,** the date scheduled must be no later than the end of November. Once set, the date for a second deferral is final and applications for further deferrals will not be considered or accepted.  

**Absence from Deferred Exam Without Justifiable Cause:** When a student is absent from a deferred final exam without acceptable reason, a final grade will be computed using a raw score of zero for the final exam.  

**Deadline for Application:** The application and the documentation pertaining to the absence must be presented to the Faculty within two working days following the scheduled date of the deferred exam missed or as soon as the student is able, having regard to the circumstances underlying the absence. |
If the student receiving the privilege of writing a deferred exam does not write the exam by the scheduled deferred exam date, the privilege will be withdrawn and a final grade in the course will be recorded by the Office of the Registrar according to the grade/remark combination achieved by the student before the deferred final exam was granted. Prior to finalizing the student’s grade, the Office of the Registrar will give 30 days written notice to the student’s Faculty.

| Proposal prepared by: Carlo Dimailig (carlo@ualberta.ca) and Jesse Luyendyk (jluyendy@ualberta.ca) |  |
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## Academic Regulations

...  

### Deferred Final Exams

The following information is for students who have received approval for deferred final examination(s) in accordance with Absence from Final Exams.

1. **Fall/Winter Deferred Final Exams:** Within the timelines described below, the time and place of the deferred final exam will be determined by the instructor. Instructors are encouraged to include the date, time and place of a deferred exam in the course outline should one be required.
   
   a. **Fall Term Deferred Final Exams:** Fall Term deferred final exams must be held by the end of Reading Week in accordance with the following provisions:
      
      i. If the date and time of the deferred exam are included in the course outline, the exam may be scheduled at any time prior to the end of Reading Week.
      
      ii. Otherwise, mutually agreeable arrangements must be made with all students eligible for the deferred exam if it is to be held prior to January 19.

      iii. In the absence of either of the above two arrangements, the instructor will submit the time and place of the exam to the department office as early as possible and no later than January 12. It is important that students come to the...
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2. **Spring/Summer Deferred Final Exams**: The time and place of the deferred final exam will be determined by the instructor who will submit the department office no later than January 12. Students must contact the department to obtain this information by January 15.

b. **Winter Term and Fall/Winter Deferred Final Exams**: Winter Term and Fall/Winter deferred final exams must be held by June 30 in accordance with the following provisions:

   i. If the date and time of the deferred exam are included in the course outline given to students, the exam may be scheduled at any time prior to June 29.

   ii. Otherwise, mutually agreeable arrangements must be made with all students eligible for deferred exam if it is to be held prior to May 18.

   iii. In the absence of either of these two arrangements, the instructor will choose a deferred exam date between May 20 and June 30. The time and place of the exam must be submitted to the department office no later than May 8 (exception: students in the MD program should consult the undergraduate office for information on deadlines). Students must contact the department to obtain this information by May 15.

Students who have not been previously informed must check with the department office on the specified date to obtain the time and place of the deferred final exam.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Term and Fall/Winter Deferred Final Exams</th>
<th>Spring/Summer Deferred Final Exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term and Fall/Winter deferred final exams must be held by June 30 in accordance with the following provisions:</td>
<td>The time and place of the deferred final exam will be determined by the instructor who will make this information available to all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. If the date and time of the deferred exam are included in the course outline given to students, the exam may be scheduled at any time prior to June 29.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Otherwise, mutually agreeable arrangements must be made with all students eligible for deferred exam if it is to be held prior to May 18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. In the absence of either of these two arrangements, the instructor will choose a deferred exam date between May 20 and June 30. The time and place of the exam must be submitted to the department office no later than May 8 (exception: students in the MD program should consult the undergraduate office for information on deadlines). Students must contact the department to obtain this information by May 15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
make this information available to all students in the course.
The exam must be held within two weeks of the date of the final examination missed and not later than August 31. In the case of 13-week classes in Engineering programs, the exam must be scheduled by September 14 and held prior to October 21.

3. **Exams Scheduled at the Same Time:** If a student discovers that they have two (or more) deferred exams scheduled at the same time, the student shall inform both instructors as quickly as possible and at least five days before the exam date. The instructors will consult with one another and make appropriate arrangements for the student.

4. **Fall/Winter Deferred Exams Not Written:** Students who have applied for a deferred final exam in accordance with Absence from Final Exams, but who have, for justifiable cause, not written the deferred exam on the scheduled date must reapply for a second and final opportunity to write the deferred exam. Application deadlines are noted below. Students must apply at their Faculty Undergraduate (Graduate) Office. The department will determine the date, time and place of the second deferred final exam and will notify the student. The date scheduled must be no later than the end of July. Once set, the date for a second deferral is final and applications for further deferrals will not be considered or accepted.

**Absence from Deferred Exam Without Justifiable Cause:** When a student is absent from a deferred final exam without acceptable reason, a final grade will be computed using a raw score of zero for the final exam.

**Deadline for Application:** The application and the documentation pertaining to the absence must be presented to the Faculty within two working days following the scheduled date of the deferred exam missed or as soon as the student is able, having regard to the circumstances underlying the absence.

If the student receiving the privilege of writing a deferred exam does not write the exam by the
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Office of Administrative Responsibility</th>
<th>Provost and Vice-President (Academic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)</td>
<td>To discuss the Student Accessibility Assessment Project Report submitted in June 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Executive Summary (outline the specific item – and remember your audience) | The Provost Fellow was tasked with an assessment of student accessibility provision at the University of Alberta. The goals of the Student Accessibility Assessment Project were to:  
1. assess the deficits and strengths of the current state of student accessibility;  
2. identify recommendations for the future of student accessibility services, governance, administration, and information;  
3. develop a high-level, strategic mapping for a proposed five-year Institutional Strategic Plan for Student Accessibility; and,  
4. contribute to the development of our accessible environments.  
The committee is asked to discuss the report recommendations, to provide feedback on gaps and ideas for implementation. |

Supplementary Notes and context
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**Engagement and Routing** (Include proposed plan)
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**Strategic Alignment**
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with Core Risk Area</td>
<td>Please note below the specific institutional risk(s) this proposal is addressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Enrolment Management</td>
<td>☒ Relationship with Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>☒ Reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Funding and Resource Management</td>
<td>☒ Research Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ IT Services, Software and Hardware</td>
<td>☒ Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Leadership and Change</td>
<td>☒ Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ Physical Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</table>
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1. Student Accessibility Assessment Project Report (pps 1-17)
Student Accessibility Assessment Project Summary Report  
Provost's Fellow Professor Allen Ball  
COSA September 2022

Project Overview:
The goals of the Student Accessibility Assessment Project were to:  
1. Assess the deficits and strengths of the current state of student accessibility;  
2. Identify recommendations for the future of student accessibility services, governance, administration, and information;  
3. Develop a high-level, strategic mapping for a proposed five-year Institutional Action Plan for Student Accessibility; and,  
4. contribute to the development of our accessible environments.

As of May 16, 2022, I have conducted 40 interviews with 50 stakeholders from across the University's faculties, central units, and campuses (with the majority of these consultations occurring with administrative staff, academic administrators, and University committees with direct experience with student accessibility), and reviewed data on the current state of accommodations services and needs at the University. Additionally, 2,610 total respondents (comprised of 23.71% administrative staff, 16.78% faculty/instructors, and 59.51% students) provided feedback in the University of Alberta Student Accessibility Assessment Survey, conducted in April-May 2022.

Project Findings:  
The University of Alberta is experiencing unprecedented change due to a number of factors, including our need to respond to significant provincial budget cuts and the unexpected move to the remote learning environment due to the COVID-19 pandemic, followed by the subsequent shift to mixed learning environments. This combination of rapid changes has highlighted and exacerbated student barriers to academic participation, especially among students with documented permanent disabilities and/or chronic physical/mental health conditions who qualify for academic accommodations. All project participants identified the seriousness, extent, and negative impacts of barriers to student accessibility, as well as identifying multi-factorial causes of these barriers in all major University systems (including governance, staffing/financial resourcing, administration, communications, technologies, and instruction).

While instructors' support of accommodations is clearly evident, accommodation provision—and broader campus accessibility—have been negatively impacted by a range of challenges:  
- **Differential & Uncoordinated Accommodation Delivery:** The Office of the Dean of Students’ closed its Exam Centre and restructured some services as part of its reorganization, resulting in the decentralization and downloading of various accommodation responsibilities to instructors and departments. Across the University, the diversity of exam systems, proctoring methods, and instructional practices have resulted in significant variation in course participation and assessment, increased staff/instructor workloads, and differential student accommodation access.
- **Limited Accommodation Resources to Address Increasing Demand:** Following an 80.4% increase in the number of students registered for accommodations from 2014 to 2019 (with no comparable funding or staffing increases), accommodation demand continues to increase. In 2020-2021, 2,082 students were registered for accommodations (a 12.0% increase from 2019-2020), and 14,216
accommodated exams were facilitated (a 23.3% increase from 2019-2020 and a 71.9% increase from 2015-2016). Further, the University of Alberta of Tomorrow initiative aims to increase program enrolment to 50,000 students. Based on current accommodation data, the estimates are that, by 2025/2026, 2,850 students will be registered for accommodations (a 36.8% increase from 2020/2021) and 29,342 accommodated exams will occur annually (a 106.4% increase from 2020/2021).

- **Implementation of the University’s Discrimination, Harassment and Duty to Accommodate policy:** The Office of Safe Disclosure and Human Rights has received increased reports of de facto discrimination, differential accommodation access, increased mental health challenges (including suicidal ideation), and academic progress disruptions due to absent, inadequate, or incorrect student accommodation provision. The results of the University of Alberta Student Accessibility Assessment Survey 2022 demonstrate the broader impacts of these accessibility barriers:
  - 32.06% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I receive help when I encounter barriers to learning,” while only 21.97% student respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “It is easy to access student accommodations.”
  - 51.38% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “University of Alberta buildings are accessible,” while 47.64% of student respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “University of Alberta classrooms are accessible.”
  - While 71.97% of all respondents indicated they were aware of student accommodations based on medical protected grounds, only 45.40% of all respondents were aware of student accommodations based on non-medical grounds.

These findings reveal the impacts of uncoordinated institutional accessibility services, planning, and commitments. Moreover, students are increasingly impacted as more barriers to accessibility emerge. The reputational and legal risks to the University increase as well.

**Project Recommendations:** Regardless of the reasons for these challenges, student accessibility is an equity issue. We have a legal and ethical obligation to meet the needs of students registered for academic accommodations, as well as of the estimated 22% of students who have disabilities and may qualify for accommodations.² It is imperative that we address our structural barriers to accessibility now in order to enable our current students’ success and to avoid entrenching these barriers in our planned growth.

We must design and enact systemic solutions in five key areas:

1. centralized responsibility for student accessibility.
2. centralized exam and assessment centre(s).
3. accommodation policy and procedure review and amendments.
4. central/college/faculty/program coordinated accommodation service provision.
5. ongoing institution-wide accessibility training and communications strategies.

These solutions require a holistic framework, focused leadership, and appropriate resource allocation. An institutional action plan for student accessibility will best develop these solutions, as well as closely aligning them with the University’s Strategic Plan for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity and Indigenous
Institutional Strategic Plan (among other initiatives). A substantive commitment to equity will ensure that the institutional plan for student accessibility exemplifies the University’s mission to provide vibrant and supportive learning environments for all of its students.

Report of the

Equity, Diversity, & Inclusivity
Review of Teaching Awards Working Group

MAY 2022
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Introduction

The University of Alberta values the contributions of its staff, faculty, instructors, students, and community partners. As stated in the mission within the 2019 Strategic Plan for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity:

"We envision—and will cultivate—a community that recognizes equity and diversity as fundamental to achieving inclusive excellence in learning, teaching, research, service, and community engagement.“ [p.4]

One important way the University demonstrates this commitment is through formal recognition such as internal awards. The University of Alberta offers a multitude of internal awards in teaching research and service. Such awards are available to different ranks of academic staff and different employment categories (see the Awards Grid table in the Appendix).

In addition to historical awards statistics collected by the Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), an equity audit conducted by the University of Alberta Academic Women's Association examining award recipients from 1968-2016 revealed the full extent of the systemic inequities inherent throughout the suite of awards at the University of Alberta including a stark lack of diversity in genders and race of nominees and recipients, and a lack of diversity in the Faculty (or Unit) of the nominees and recipients (see Historical Diversity Data tables in the Appendix). To examine this more closely, the Provost initiated a formal review of awards.

Purpose

Following an open call for members, a Working Group was established to perform a review of the awards that fall under the purview of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) (the Faculty Excellence and University Teaching Awards) through the lenses of equity, diversity, and inclusivity. The diverse Working Group included fulsome representation of various perspectives, beliefs, genders, and values held by members of University of Alberta campuses.
Mandate

The Working Group's mandate was to:

1) Identify **Desired Outcomes** of the awards review;
2) Identify **Barriers** within the nomination and adjudication processes;
3) Provide **Recommendations to ameliorate pervasive systemic barriers within the Faculty Excellence Awards and the University Teaching Awards**

Desired Outcomes

After much discussion and reflection, the Working Group identified the following desired goals and considerations:

- **The University of Alberta's Awards and Recognition Culture will strive to:**
  - ensure consideration for Indigenous initiatives (such as languages, values, ways of knowing and being) and equity, diversity, and inclusion;
  - Engage thoughtfully with change, and listen to how our community is willing to experience the discomfort of change;
  - use awards to help dismantle barriers to inclusion;
  - highlight ways to share varied knowledges, skills, values, and dispel stereotypes, biases, and assumptions.

- **We will attend to Excellence by:**
  - demonstrating and celebrating “excellence” (with or without awards);
  - demonstrating learning, unlearning, and relearning around interpretations about “excellence”;
  - thinking of ways to reimagine, redefine, expand our understandings of *excellences* (what, who, why);
  - shifting to inclusive excellence: move forward on opening up the awards to allow for a narrative about different forms of “excellence.”

- **Our Values and Intentions with Awards and Recognition are:**
  - to uphold the institutional values as stated in the strategic plan [For the Public Good](#);
    - Above all, we value *intellectual integrity, freedom of inquiry and expression*, and the *equality and dignity of all persons* as the foundation of ethical conduct in research, teaching, learning, and service.
    - We value *excellence* in teaching, research, and creative activity that enriches learning experiences, advances knowledge, inspires engaged citizenship, and promotes the public good.
- We value learners at all stages of life and strive to provide an intellectually rewarding educational environment for all.
- We value academic freedom and institutional autonomy as fundamental to open inquiry and the pursuit of truth.
- We value diversity, inclusivity, and equity across and among our people, campuses, and disciplines.
- We value creativity and innovation from the genesis of ideas through to the dissemination of knowledge.
- We value the history and traditions of our university, celebrating with pride our people, achievements, and contributions to society.
  - respect for reconciliation with Indigenous peoples;
  - to clarify the values we wish people to embody as the institutional values, and to recognize such embodiment with associated awards and recognitions;
    - in such a way our values will be showcased through people in the ways that are meaningful to them;
  - to show/message our values (all of them; teaching and beyond, beyond classroom teaching; service);
  - to be intentional about what we are celebrating and reflect our values;
  - to honor the work we do (showing appreciation and valuing);
  - to demonstrate expertise we have as an institution; and
  - to support institutional principles (as stated in the 2019 Strategic Plan for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity, pg. 5):
    - Diversity,
    - Equity,
    - Inclusion,
    - Human Rights,
    - Equality (substantive),
    - Intersectionality, and
    - Accessibility.

- Recognition is an important aspect of:
  - welcoming people to: feel seen, and be seen; to feel heard, and be heard; to feel understood (esp. Junior colleagues), and be understood; to feel recognized, and be recognized; and
  - publicly recognizing the value of teaching, service, and research.

- Reflection and Growth are important processes in professional development to:
  - encourage reflection on teaching (reflective and reflexive);
  - demonstrate growth in our teaching and service; and
  - serve an opportunity to strengthen CVs.
- **Collaboration is often a part of our work, and we need to:**
  - acknowledge the collective and shared nature of teaching and research;
  - acknowledge that awards have the capability to 'uplift the whole people'; and
  - recognize collaborations in teaching, learning, research, and service.

- **Community should be represented through:**
  - awards, and the notion of excellence should be tied to how it uplifts, enables robust and rich research and learning within our communities;
  - formal and public recognition of the communities who partner with the University;
  - better consideration of citizenship and community-based activities; and
  - consideration of the impact to communities--why does it matter?

- **Administrative Process Revisions:**
  - review self-nominations--allow or disallow?
  - modify nomination process to reduce barriers; and
  - staged application process (e.g., expression of interest then submission of a full application).

**Gaps**

The Working Group identified the following as **types of work, teaching, service, and research that are not currently being recognized, or are not as prevalent as they should be:**

- emotional labor;
- community work;
- educational leadership for the senior awards;
- the impact nominees have had on others to inspire and improve others' teaching;
- teaching (educational) innovations that have impacted the applicant and others at the university and beyond where applicable; and
- community engaged and Indigenous approaches to research and teaching.

The Working Group also identified **gaps in representation throughout awards:**

- members of equity-denied groups (e.g., Indigenous, BPOC, members of disability communities, members of 2SLGBTQI communities, women);
- those on leave (e.g., parental, medical, disability, compassionate)
- Indigenous Elders;
- community;
- graduate students; and
- individuals where English is not their first language (e.g., Francophone).
Awards Procedures

The Working Group was tasked with reviewing the teaching awards under the Awards for Faculty Excellence and Awards for Teaching Excellence. After careful review, the following considerations were identified:

- Should the award be continued??
  - Why or why not?

- What should change in the various sections of the descriptions?
  - Language (to be more inclusive),
  - Eligibility,
  - Nomination process,
  - Application process:
    - Are all the elements required?
    - Can other forms of evidence be submitted?
  - Deadline and submission, and
  - Selection process.

- Should new awards be established??
  - Why or why not?
  - What would the award recognize, and what would be the eligibility criteria?

Barriers

During their review, the Working Group closely examined how the current nomination processes (procedures and criteria) and administration of the awards suites create barriers to members of the academy, Departments, and Faculties. The identified barriers are outlined below.

Structural Barriers

Nomination Procedure

- Nomination processes can be arduous and requires support to complete:
  - Ask for letters of reference (multiple touch points to get them on time);
  - Student evaluations (search, find, engage someone to analyze, present data);   
  - Need to work closely with nominee to get their pieces;

---

1 Ratings of instruction can contain embedded inequities in student evaluation and perception, which can disproportionally affect people in equity-denied groups, and in recognition of this aspect to data, there is mandated need for multifaceted evaluation of teaching though various employment agreements.
○ Formatting and integrating (time intensive; staff person available in some cases); and
○ Constrained by limited resources (manpower, knowledge, and/or time).

- Lack of available support, and resources, potential nominees do not perceive themselves as being eligible or qualified (e.g., Chairs are in a good position to know faculty members’ work).
- Service work is not recognized - how can we ensure the work of nominators is seen as valuable work and a contribution to the institution?
  - Many equity-denied groups lack recognition for their:
    ■ Additional informal mentorship to students who are also members of equity-denied groups, as part of their teaching and research roles; and
    ■ Additional community service.

- Rhetorical aspect to applications - take a certain kind of experience to know how to create a successful nomination package.

**Administration of Award (Adjudication Process)**

- Who is adjudicating the awards? Have they considered and applied evidence-based equity, diversity, and inclusivity and anti-bias best practices before and during the adjudication process?
- Adjudication committees are not reflective of the community.
- Some members of the academy are asked to sit on several committees, multiple times, and are burned out.
- Lack of feedback about nomination packages for nominators.
- Biases held by nominators and reviewers.

**Additional Structural Barriers**

- Faculty and instructors who are Black, or people of color, are more likely to have precarious employment (short term contracts) and this limits career progress and also eligibility for awards. Historical racism results in the advantaging of faculty who are white and disadvantaging faculty who are Indigenous, Black, or people of colour.
- Other structural barriers result in other forms of exclusion, for example ableism and sanism can disproportionally affect queer/gender non-binary faculty and instructors.
- Concept of ‘visible minority’ contributes to stereotypes and racism—there needs to be a shift, and some education, in how we talk about one another in respectful ways.
- Access to teaching opportunities can limit access to awards (e.g., graduate students who don’t have access to TAships).
- Not all the institutional values seem to be EDI focused.
- There are inequities in course allocations, big vs. small classrooms. Also some courses receive more attention than others.
- How awards are communicated out; who gets to hear about them, access to information
as a kind of privilege.

- Homogenizing equity seeking groups in ways that erases embedded inequalities within and across groups.
- Exclusionary practices and minimal mentorship of equity seeking groups.
- How we recognize different teaching contributions is often not accounted for in the qualifying criteria (e.g., course development).
- Perceived value to awards; for some, awards are not considered “newsworthy” on an institutional level, or they are perceived to be unattainable so they self-select out of the processes.

**Cultural Barriers**

- Over time, because ‘major’ award winners tend to win IN faculty first, lack of structural capacity doubly impacts our ability to see Indigenous studies award winners.
- Service and mentorship not considered or valued as highly as teaching and researching in awards.
- “Excellence” is defined differently in different contexts.
- Some people in the BPOC community have experienced so much racism that it can become internalized and they are less likely to self-promote, approach people to assist with nominations, or it weakens their confidence in applying for awards (negative perceptions of self-promotion for certain groups, Imposter syndrome and/or humility in relation to self-nomination).
- Procedural unfairness - perceived and actual.

**Political Barriers**

- Larger Faculties have more members to sit on the committees and have ‘played the game’ for longer, better ensuring favorable outcomes.
- Precarious employment - contract instructors and graduate students engaged in teaching often don’t have the time to spend on processes with no guarantees of compensation.
- Impact on hiring and promotions for future positions.
- Political and social capital are often required to receive nominations.
- Inequity of who is recognized (some have to prove their worth more than others).
- Power relations (e.g., within ranks of Faculty).
- Internal department politics that privileges individuals from certain cliques—oftentimes to which equity-seeking groups do not belong.
- Social capital begets more social capital, how can we provide ‘incubator’ environments/resources for new faculty or faculty who work in disciplines that are less visible and powerful?
Recommendations

After careful consideration and deliberation, the Working Group identified the following recommendations.

Revision to Nomination Process

- Establish guidelines for self-nomination.
- Develop a method/process for nominators to account for their labour/mentorship/sponsorship (especially where members of equity deserving/denied communities are involved).
- Provide mentorship to novice applicants, nominees, and nominators.
- Revise calls for nominations to reflect the new vision for inclusive excellence.
- Self-nominations - should they be disallowed? / Implement an initial self-nomination process to increase the applicant pool.
- Broaden thinking about the "ideal" nominee.
- Revise to reduce the burden of applying to some awards.
- Include clarifying language and provisions around awards and leaves of absence.

Revision to Nomination Package

- Ask for letters of reference (anonymize letter writers).
- Reflections on student evaluations.
- Application process: checkbox for applying “as a team” or “alone”.
- Applicants should demonstrate EDI practices in the classrooms for all the awards; require attention to EDI in the nomination process and package.
- Invite applications in languages other than English (e.g., French, Indigenous languages).
  - Translation costs should be provided by the institution.
- Create space for reflections on teaching / reflexive practice as part of the submission.

Revision to Adjudication Process

- Streamlining the nomination procedure at the faculty level to make sure all eligible applicants are considered.
- Ensuring that adjudicating committees are diverse and trained on best adjudicating practices.
- Consider how to better assess the work of faculty and instructors from equity-denied groups.
- Maternity leave provisions and provision for other leaves.
Other Recommendations

1. Reflecting on the Current Portfolio of Awards

For example, consider increasing the number of awards given that they have not kept pace with the growth of faculty over the years; consider creating new awards to reflect changing institutional priorities and identify 'missing' areas (e.g., community award, Indigenous Education and Research Award); consider how awards cover various career stages (e.g., early-stage career, graduate student awards).

- Identify missing awards and develop necessary criteria and procedures.
- Increase the number of awards where applicable, in particular, the Provost's Award for Early Achievement (e.g., increase possibility for more awards at all ranks).
- Consider creating specific awards for equity–denied groups.

2. Recognizing Concrete Ways to Mentor, Sponsor, and Support Award Nominees

For example, what can Chairs / Deans do to: sponsor /mentor faculty; recognize diverse forms of excellence; what types of networks of support and mentorship need to be and can be created.

- Chair or Dean School sessions - sponsoring faculty, recognizing different forms of excellence, making way for a different way of thinking, forestall the reproduction of old ways of thinking, value difference instead of sameness.
- Networks of support / mentors: encouragers.
- Develop support for nominees, especially in instances where self-nominations will be permitted.

3. Raising Awareness of Awards and What / Who We are Celebrating

For example, holding a symposium on teaching awards; being intentional about what is being celebrated and values reflected in our awards; learning about who awards are named for / or consider renaming; define and think intentionally about what the university is trying to accomplish with an awards culture.

- Define what the University community is collectively trying to accomplish in creating an awards culture.
- Develop a 'handbook' based on this work for other units to use as they re-evaluate their own awards.
Conclusions

The Working Group identified numerous Desired Outcomes and Barriers within the nomination and adjudication processes, and created a number of Recommendations.

- The range and variety of challenges associated with barriers is of critical importance in rethinking the re-design of awards—in order for University members and community partners to feel like they belong, and are celebrated, considerable changes are required.

Minor Suggested Changes

In some cases, there emerged tangible (and immediately implementable) ideas for how to revise the awards and processes:

1. The language in the award descriptions needs to be changed to be gender neutral and more inclusive.

2. It is evident that accountability for who is, and how they are nominated, should be included in the awards nomination process (the exemplar is what has been incorporated into the Vice-President (Research and Innovation) Internal Awards and Recognitions Procedures—and such changes will be applied to all awards reviewed herein).

3. Changes related to Governance, requiring General Faculties Council approval, such as:
   a. Updating the policies to reflect inclusive excellence:
      i. Awards for Teaching Excellence Policy
      ii. Awards for Faculty Excellence Policy

Major Suggested Changes

1. Some major changes will need to be undertaken with respect to the UAPPOL Procedures for the award descriptions, to be approved by the Provost & Vice-President Academic:
   a. Faculty Excellence Awards
   b. Teaching Excellence Awards

2. In many other cases, potential changes will need to be built from the ground up:
   a. There should be additional awards for:
      i. Indigenous Teaching and Research;
      ii. Communities;
      iii. Early career faculty and staff.
b. A new, two-stage nomination process should be explored to reduce the burden of nomination package creation.
   
i. Provide support (either a website, or personnel) to potential nominees, or nominators.

3. The idea of creating one adjudication committee for all the awards in each award suite should be explored. The training of the adjudication committee members should include:
   
a. Bias awareness training;
   b. Assessing work of individuals, or teams, in diverse contexts (e.g., Math, Music, Community Research, and Clinical Education).

**Communications**

Planned changes should be widely and clearly identified and communicated (e.g., UAPPOL Policies and Procedures, award descriptions, nomination procedures, nomination process, and adjudication process).

There should be awareness, and dedication, to having an open mind and asking for feedback prior to going live, and for making adjustments on a regular basis (concomitant with communications indicating any changes in awards or associated processes).

A communication plan should be developed in consultation with the Office of the Vice-President (External Relations).

In consideration of other work being done across the institution, for example within UAPPOL Policies and Procedures, the changes in awards related to teaching should better align with the Effective Teaching Framework, which is embedded in the Teaching, Learning and Evaluation (TLE) Policy Suite. Communication of the alignment of awards and new UAPPOL Policies and Procedures should be alongside support provided, for example, Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) resources on multifaceted-evaluation of teaching (which will be mapped to the Effective Teaching Framework in time).
## Appendix A: Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Nychka</strong></td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evelyn Hamdon</strong></td>
<td>EDI Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Advisor, Equity and Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chris Andersen</strong></td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Native Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David Draper</strong></td>
<td>2020 - 21 Vice-President (Academic), SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President (Academic), Students' Union (SU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abner Monteiro</strong></td>
<td>2021 - 22 Vice-President (Academic), SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President (Academic), Students' Union (SU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sachiketha Reddy</strong></td>
<td>2020 - 21 Vice-President (Academic), GSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President (Academic), Graduate Students’ Association (GSA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kathy Haddadkar</strong></td>
<td>2021 - 22 Vice-President (Academic), GSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President (Academic), Graduate Students’ Association (GSA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bukola Salami</strong></td>
<td>Academic Staff Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor, Faculty of Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andy Knight</strong></td>
<td>Academic Staff Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Faculty of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parker Lieb (Leflar)</strong></td>
<td>Support Staff Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Safe Disclosure and Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jennifer Tupper</strong></td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Faculty of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karen D. Hughes</strong></td>
<td>Academic Staff Member; EDI scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Faculty of Arts and Alberta School of Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carol S. Hodgson</strong></td>
<td>Associate Professor, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry Academic Staff Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crystal Gail Fraser</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Faculties of Arts and Native Studies Academic Staff Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Kariuki</strong></td>
<td>Associate Dean (Teaching) &amp; Professor, Augustana Associate Dean (Teaching); Academic Staff Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deanna Davis</strong></td>
<td>Senior Lead, Educational Curriculum Developer Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research (FGSR) Resource Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tommy Mayberry (he/she/they)</strong></td>
<td>Executive Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning Senior Administrative Member; EDI Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theresa Curry</strong></td>
<td>Financial Officer Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) Resource Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andrea Patrick</strong></td>
<td>Selection and Reviews Initiatives Manager Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) Resource Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suzanne French</strong></td>
<td>Portfolio Initiatives Coordinator Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) Resource Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carley Roth</strong></td>
<td>Portfolio Initiatives Manager Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) Resource Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Awards Grid (2019)

Appendix C: Historical Diversity Data: Sex² (2019)

² The category for "sex" was used because that was the demographic information available at the time of data collection, and that the working group is aware it does not reflect the gender diversity.
### Appendix D: Historical Diversity Data: Awardees' Faculty (2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Faculty/Unit</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UofA Distinguished Professors</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Professors (current)</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Marshall Tory Chairs (HMT) (current)</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Cup</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural, Life &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Saint-Jean</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vargo Teaching Chair</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural, Life &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augustana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>