Opening Session

1. Opening Circle and Smudge Ceremony

   *Presenter(s)*: Orest Zwozdesky, Indigepreneur and Chief Value Officer (CVO) of Orest Zwozdesky International

   *Discussion*: The Chair began by reminding members that CLE had committed to decolonizing their meeting practices and that he had invited O Zwozdesky to support the committee in this process. Members were invited to participate in a Smudge and to share in circle talents or strengths that they bring to the work of the committee.

2. Approval of the Agenda

   Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

   *Presenter(s)*: Karsten Mündel, Acting Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair CLE

   THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment approve the agenda

   CARRIED

3. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of January 25, 2023

   Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

   *Presenter(s)*: Karsten Mündel, Acting Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair CLE
Discussion: There was no discussion during the approval of the minutes; however, during the discussion on Item 4, members revisited comments made in the January 25, 2023 meeting concerning a statement that statistics are a colonial construct. Members discussed additional context related to the ways in which statistics and western ways of knowing have been used in oppressive and discriminatory ways; members expressed a commitment to purposeful engagement with statistics with attention to the potential to replicate existing inequities and discussed whether additional context should be provided. Members agreed that they would review the comments and discussed how statistics have been utilized in ways that can subjugate others.

THAT the GFC CLE Committee approve the Open Session minutes of January 25, 2023.

CARRIED

2. Comments from the Chair (no documents)

Presenter(s): Karsten Mündel, Acting Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair CLE

Discussion:
The Chair reminded members that there was no longer a standing item with updates from CTL, IST and University Libraries and that instead, these units had been invited to provide items as necessary. He pointed members to Item 9, and asked T Mayberry to provide an update on the Festival of Teaching and the CTL Instructor Survey.

The Chair noted that in his role of Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives) he was collaborating with Information Services and Technology (IST) and meeting regularly with the Director, Digital Learning Environment, Information Services & Technology. He committed to bringing back updates to the committee.

J Luyendyk responded to a question posed during the January 25 meeting of CLE concerning the admissions process for Indigenous students. He shared some of the initiatives led through the Office of the Registrar to streamline the process for Indigenous students to apply and to obtain bursaries.

ACTION ITEMS

4. Revised Appendix A: Student Perspectives of Teaching (SPOT) Survey, Teaching, Learning and Evaluation Policy

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Discussion: The Chair began by providing background information on the long history of inquiry and work to revise the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI) questions. He shared some of the feedback received at the January 30, 2023 meeting of the General Faculties Council (GFC). He noted the need to develop questions that can be adapted to different learning environments.

He suggested that the committee proceed in a circle and opened the floor:

Members, resource members and invited guests discussed and shared their perspectives on the questions, noting:

- That while they didn’t agree with the language used in all the questions, they believed the questions were a significant improvement on the USRI questions;
- That from a student perspective, the questions were improved and a question as to how the questions will allow for comments;
- That questions were ready to move forward to GFC and that work will continue at CLE to monitor implementation;
- That the character limit was a contradiction and that 15 minutes was not enough class time for students to give meaningful feedback which often comes from the comments;
- That the questions were one tool among others and a question about how we can push students to fill in these surveys including through class time;
- A suggestion that GFC members should be led to focus on outcomes and the historic context, rather than the questions themselves;
- That this was a culture shift and there was a need for more communication with the campus community including the multifaceted approach;
- That CLE was proposing revisions to the Appendix, not the procedure, and that part of the larger Framework is supporting instructors in integrating multiple opportunities for students to provide feedback and what meaningful feedback was;
- That students and instructors needed to be educated to ensure they see value in providing and using feedback to improve their teaching and to increase student response rates;
- That GFC should focus on the design rationale, perhaps including some of the key points that have been considered.
- That the value and interpretation of statistics needed further discussion;
- That instructors are encouraged to implement the survey in ways that make sense for them such as encouraging students to complete the survey over a longer period of time, to submit additional, long-form feedback, or speak one-on-one with the instructor or other responsible person.
- That CLE should review implementation of the questions in a short timeframe;

By the end of a second circle guided by O Zwosdesky, there was consensus that the committee was ready to recommend that GFC approve the proposal. Members agreed that it would be valuable to draft comments to share with GFC and the GFC Secretary committed to circulating a draft to members.

*Given time constraints, the Chair suggested that Items 5 and 6 be discussed in concert.*

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

5. **Implications of UAPPOL Appendix A: Student Perspectives of Teaching (SPOT) Survey Revisions on the UAPPOL Student Input to the Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Procedure**

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Karsten Mündel, Acting Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair CLE

*Discussion:* The Chair noted that the CLE Terms of Reference give the committee the authority to approve revisions to the Student Input to the Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Procedure. He explained that the procedure sets out a framework for use of SPOT data and that it had been developed when Likert style questions were contemplated. He informed members that he was working with colleagues in the Centre for Research in Applied Measurement and Evaluation (CRAME) who have recommended the use of a radar chart going forward. He committed to bringing back the procedure for further discussion on how to reflect the use of data in university processes.

Members discussed:
- That the authority of GFC over the policy is limited by Faculty Evaluation Committee guidelines and the collective agreement;
- The need to think through tools that can be used for multifaceted evaluation;
- A request to discuss these matters with from someone with expertise in the collective agreement;
- The need for multifaceted evaluation which is to be formative and summative;
- A suggestion from the Human Rights Commissioner’s Special Report, *Disaggregated demographic data collection in British Columbia: The grandmother’s perspective* to hold community dialogue sessions on the issues of disintegrated data collection with minority groups and that Indigenous data consultation should be conducted with more than ten participants.

6. **Future appendices under the Teaching Learning and Evaluation Policy**

*Presenter(s):* Karsten Mündel, Acting Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair CLE

*Discussion:* The Chair provided a very brief overview and asked the committee to provide feedback to guide early development of future appendices of the Teaching, Learning, and Evaluation Policy.

Members made suggestions, comments and provided feedback, including:
- The need to hear from more diverse students and to craft an inclusive consultation process that carefully includes minority perspectives;
- The value of learning from the process to develop SPOT questions and streamlining it to make it more effective;
- That the literature on “good teaching and learning” is important, but that ultimately, the students’ experience should inform the development of appendices through focus groups, open houses, and one-on-one conversations with students;
- That we need to hear from different disciplinary perspectives and keep a modular perspective but that this should not limit the work moving forward;
- That post-COVID, both home and the University are part of our new reality of teaching and learning;
- A suggestion to use a generative inquiry or participatory or co-design approach with a mixed team made up from different stakeholder groups;
- That a decolonization framework should be used to ensure that the University continues to undo the work that is harming Indigenous peoples. This framework should respect Indigenous self-determination, the expertise of Indigenous leaders, and the issue of data sovereignty for Indigenous content; and
- That a decolonizing approach requires that we bring our whole selves - bodies, minds, emotions - to the work.

6. **Update on University Teaching and Faculty Excellence Awards (no documents)**

*Presenter(s):* Karsten Mündel, Acting Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair CLE

*Discussion:* Noting that time was limited, the Chair provided a quick summary on plans to move forward with Teaching and Faculty Excellence awards. He reminded the committee that CLE has broad responsibility over excellence in teaching and that the GFC committee responsible for Teaching Awards had been replenished to work on Teaching Award policy revisions. He committed to bringing an item back to CLE to discuss their progress. He also explained that work continues to relaunch Faculty Excellence Awards and that the Office of the Provost will soon be announcing revised award details and process for the University Cup, University Distinguished Professor and Vargo Teaching Chair.

7. **CLE Terms of Reference**

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Kate Peters, Secretary to General Faculties Council
Discussion: K Peters provided a brief background on GFC’s commitment to a 3 year review cycle of Standing Committees terms of reference (TOR) and asked CLE members for feedback on the CLE TOR. K Peters highlighted the need to review:

- Composition, particularly the possibility of adding an Indigenous Resource member and other underrepresented voices;
- Clarifying terminology and language used in the terms of reference; and
- Whether the references to physical and virtual teaching and learning environments were still appropriate.

She committed to circulating a feedback form to capture CLE feedback and suggestions.

8. Question Period

Presenter(s): Karsten Mündel, Acting Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Chair CLE

Discussion: There were no questions.

CLOSING SESSION

10. Adjournment

- Next Meeting of CLE: Special Session, March 29, 2023, 2023
- Next Meeting of GFC: February 27, 2023, 2023