



General Faculties Council
Committee on the Learning Environment
Approved Open Session Minutes

Wednesday, January 28, 2015
2-31 South Academic Building (SAB)
2:00 PM - 4:00 PM

ATTENDEES:

Voting Members:

Robert Luth	Chair (Delegate), Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Mikael Adolphson	Member, Associate Dean or Associate Chair, Teaching and Learning (or Equivalent)
John Boeglin	Member, Academic Staff
Scott Delinger	Member (Delegate), Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President (Information Technology)
Shannon Erichsen	Member, Support Staff Representative
Jacqueline Leighton	Member, Chair Representative, Selected by Chairs' Council
Glen Loppnow	Member, Associate Dean or Associate Chair, Teaching and Learning (or Equivalent)
Colin More	Member (Delegate), President of the Graduate Students' Association
Ada Ness	Member (Delegate), Vice-Provost and University Registrar
Norma Nocente	Member (Delegate), Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning
Kathryn Orydzuk	Member, Vice-President (Academic), Students' Union
Fahim Rahman	Member, Undergraduate Student-at-large
Trish Rosseel	Member (Delegate), Vice-Provost and Chief Librarian
Toni Samek	Member, Major Teaching Award Recipient, Staff Representative
Mani Vaidyanathan	Member, Academic Staff
Stanley Varnhagen	Member, Academic Staff
Sarah Wall	Member, Academic Staff (Category A1.0)* and Member of GFC

Presenter(s):

John Boeglin	Chair, GFC Committee on the Learning Environment Subcommittee on Fostering Pedagogy of Technology
Petra Cegieln	Aboriginal Student Advisor, Augustana Campus
Brittany Johnson	Aboriginal Student Representative, Augustana Campus
Ben Louie	University Architect, Facilities and Operations
Robert Luth	Associate Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Instruction) and Chair, GFC Committee on the Learning Environment
Norma Nocente	Associate Director (Educational Technology), Centre for Teaching and Learning

Staff:

Garry Bodnar, Coordinator and Scribe, GFC Committee on the Learning Environment

OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter: Robert Luth, Associate Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Instruction) and Chair, GFC Committee on the Learning Environment

Motion: Delinger/Boeglin

THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment approve the Agenda.

CARRIED

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of December 3, 2014

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter: Robert Luth, Associate Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Instruction) and Chair, GFC Committee on the Learning Environment

Motion: Delinger/Boeglin

THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment approve the Minutes of December 3, 2014.

CARRIED

3. Comments from the Chair

The Chair commented on a number of relevant issues to members.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. GFC Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) Subcommittee on Fostering Pedagogy of Technology – Update

There were no documents.

Presenter: John Boeglin, Chair, GFC Committee on the Learning Environment Subcommittee on Fostering Pedagogy of Technology

Purpose of the Proposal: For information/discussion.

Discussion:

Professor Boeglin provided members with an oral update on the recent progress and activities of the GFC CLE Subcommittee on Fostering Pedagogy of Technology. In his report, he commented on the following:

- Since the last GFC CLE meeting, the repopulation of the Subcommittee. Members now include Professor Boeglin, Dr Stanley Varnhagen (GFC CLE Member), Professor Joe de Costa (Faculty of Education), Professor Norma Nocente (GFC CLE Member), Ms Kathryn Orydzuk (GFC CLE Member), and Mr Colin More (GFC CLE Member).
- Recent meetings of the Subcommittee, with an additional meeting scheduled in early February. A Google Drive has been set up for sharing survey results as well as a number of related documents.

- Issues discussed recently by the Subcommittee, including the establishment of a general framework to guide the packaging and dissemination of the survey results. Subcommittee members' suggestions ranged from returning to the document approved by GFC CLE in the Spring of 2012 in which the idea of conducting surveys of instructors and students on the use of technology in the University's teaching and learning environments was broached to framing and reviewing the survey results within the structure of the Terms of Reference for GFC CLE. Other suggestions made were to examine how the survey results might feed into the Senior Administration's Digital Learning Strategy; and to consider barriers to innovation which might be present at various levels (eg, teaching spaces, pedagogical and technological support, risks, etc).

Professor Boeglin asked members to let him or other Subcommittee members know if they had any additional thoughts on what it is they would like to come out of the review of the survey results, be it at an individual, departmental, and/or Faculty level.

Dr Luth noted that he anticipated the Subcommittee would come back to GFC CLE as early as the March, 2015 meeting with concrete results.

5. University of Alberta's Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL): Update from the Associate Director (Educational Technology)

There were no documents.

Presenter: Norma Nocente, Associate Director (Educational Technology), Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL)

Purpose of the Proposal: For information/discussion.

Discussion:

Professor Nocente provided members with information on recent and upcoming activities hosted by CTL, including:

- Commentary on the recent staff changes made within the Centre, with the introduction of new staff members and a reassignment of duties and responsibilities across the unit's staff complement
- Investigation and development of MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) and instruction design
- A series of blended learning course initiatives
- Communiqués from the Acting Director of CTL , Dr Roger Graves, to the units affected by recent changes to staffing within the Centre
- A series of workshops delivered by CTL, the information on which is set out in detail on the Centre's website, along with a move to some self-paced instruction initiatives

6. Effects and Effectiveness of University of Alberta's Current Planning and Design Practices: Presentation from the University Architect

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Presenter(s): Ben Louie, University Architect, Facilities and Operations; Petra Cegielyny, Aboriginal Student Advisor, Augustana Campus; Brittany Johnson, Aboriginal Student Representative, Augustana Campus

Purpose of the Proposal: For information/discussion.

Discussion:

Mr Louie began by introducing himself and his colleagues, Ms Cegiely and Ms Johnson, to members. He explained what it was he hoped to accomplish by means of his presentation to GFC CLE—he wanted to ensure members were, finally, better educated on what the effects and effectiveness of current practices on planning and design were at the University of Alberta and to explore whether or not there were opportunities for GFC CLE to get involved in said planning. He stated he would cover in his presentation institutional space management practices and project delivery; a Case Study #1, namely, the Aboriginal Student Common on Augustana Campus; and a Case Study #2, namely, the reimagining of health education and discovery, as exemplified by the University's Edmonton Clinic Health Academy (ECHA).

With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louie then spoke to the following: detail on the University of Alberta Space Management Manual, including reference to the general process of space planning and project implementation; spatial metrics and foundational planning processes for space allocation and the initiation of all projects; the flow associated with capital projects and major renovation feasibility and pre-design; and the flow associated with the actual implementation of capital projects and projects for major renovations.

Mr Louie then focussed attention on the 'Aboriginal Student Initiative – Augustana Campus' (ie, Case Study #1), turning to his colleagues to provide their unique perspectives on the development of this important project, including its history, scope, and impact, particularly for an expanding Aboriginal student population on Augustana Campus. Their collective presentation continued, with the presenters speaking to the following: initial feedback from the wider community on this initiative, including a summary of discussion and the results of a survey undertaken; detail on the scope of the work to be completed; a summary of immediate *versus* projected needs for the affected space in Augustana Campus' Forum, based on extensive consultation with key stakeholders, including student representatives; development of the Project Charter, based, again, on extensive consultation; design options associated with the proposed plan for the space, all of which were to be aligned with the Cree story of creation, thereby resulting in a respectful, transitional area for Aboriginal students; visual representations of the flexible space programming and of the affected space, overall; and commentary on what was viewed as an engaging, respectful process for project development, including positive interactions with students, that would serve to strengthen historical, social, spiritual, and cultural life at Augustana Campus.

Mr Louie then shifted his presentation to the reimagining of health education and discovery at the University of Alberta, as embodied in ECHA (Case Study #2). During this part of the presentation, Mr Louie spoke to the following: the vision for this facility, which was to provide a "leading, state-of-the-art enabler of integrated, patient-centred care, education and research"; the academic environment created by this facility; the innovative environment created by ECHA; the 'mechanisms' deployed in the planning and eventual construction of the facility; and the outcomes successfully achieved with the commissioning of ECHA. Mr Louie also projected a YouTube video that demonstrated how ECHA significantly enhances the integration of the health professions and how each can actively engage and learn constructively from the others. [See "HELP! Save Stan Saturday 2012" at <http://youtu.be/eOHpWT4dh1E> .]

During the discussion surrounding this comprehensive presentation, members provided a number of comments and questions, including, but not limited to: a query as to how Facilities and Operations balances the needs of differing groups with differing demands; commentary with regard to the functionality of certain spaces within ECHA and a query how difficulties encountered with new space are resolved; questions with respect to conflict resolution when the Administration is confronted with competing academic needs and varying academic priorities and how, generally, academic priorities in relation to facility development are established in the first instance; what are the overall communication strategies vis-à-vis major projects and how are all stakeholders drawn into these strategies effectively; a query whether

there are other post-secondary institutions to which the University of Alberta turns for inspiration as far as facility-related issues and their support of teaching and learning are concerned; what 'inputs' are considered for supportive environments for teaching and learning, what tools are deployed, and what are the limiting factors; what guiding documents, beyond those mentioned in today's presentation, support facility project development at the University; how do classrooms get developed, who decides what will be used in certain classrooms, and who determines what the 'fit-ups' will be; a query as to what happens to space planning when pedagogical ideologies change over time; what are other campuses around the world doing with respect to the ever-increasing use of electricity to support the proliferation, particularly amongst students, of a very wide range of electronic devices; and whether or not thought has been given by Administration to charging fees for the extra-curricular use of space to ensure its sustainability.

The Chair concluded this discussion by thanking Mr Louie, Ms Cegielnny, and Ms Johnson for their excellent presentation to members and complimented the Committee on the ensuing thoughtful discussion that took place. He noted that this was the start of what was likely to be an ongoing 'conversation' about institutional facilities, the planning thereof, and their relationships with the University's mandates around teaching and learning.

7. Question Period

Ms Orydzuk raised the issue of GFC CLE investigating further matters related to the use of rubrics in institutional grading and assessment and queried what it was this GFC standing committee could do to contribute meaningfully to this issue. Following some discussion on the matter, members agreed that this topic should be discussed more fully at the March, 2015 meeting of GFC CLE, with Ms Orydzuk preparing material for members' review prior to that session. Dr Luth noted he was agreeable to discussing this issue further with Ms Orydzuk prior to the next Committee meeting.

Dr Leighton asked after the status of the Working Group that was to be struck by GFC CLE to look at a range of USRI (Universal Student Ratings of Instruction) issues, following on a series of discussions the Committee had had on related matters back in the Spring and Fall of 2013 and, again, this academic year. Following discussion, during which members raised a range of concerns and issues concerning USRIs, the Committee agreed this issue should once again come back to GFC CLE at its March, 2015 meeting in order to determine what 'next steps' would be appropriate, particularly in light of what has already done by this GFC standing committee in this arena over the past two years.

INFORMATION REPORTS

8. Items Approved by the Committee by E-Mail Ballots

There were no items.

9. Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings

There were no items.

CLOSING SESSION

10. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:05 pm.