University of Waterloo
SENATE GRADUATE & RESEARCH COUNCIL
Minutes of the 14 November 2022 Meeting
[in agenda order]
Needles Hall 3318/3308

Present: Steven Bednarski (for Drysdale), David Clausi, Charmaine Dean, Rob de Loe (for Clarke), Peter Deadman, Bernie Duncker, Anna Esselment, Ana Ferrer, Bertrand Guenin, Alison Hitchens, Ryan Johnson, Zerihun Kinate, Brian Laird, William McIlroy, Liz Nilsen, Jennifer Reid, Mike Szarka, Kathy Winter (secretary).

Resources: Carrie MacKinnon, Amanda McKenzie.

Guests: N. Asokan, Aldo Caputo, Carol Ann MacGregor, Dina Meunier, Johanna Wandel, Richard Wikkerink, Stan Woo

Regrets: Jeff Casello*, Aiman Fatima, Aiden Huffman, Julie Joza*, Anita Layton, Ian Milligan*, Martin Ross, Siva Sivoththaman*, Marianne Simm, Julian Surdi, John Thompson.

Organization of Meeting: Charmaine Dean, co-chair of the council, took the chair, and Kathy Winter acted as secretary. The secretary advised that due notice of the meeting had been given, a quorum was present, and the meeting was properly constituted.

DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST
No conflicts of interest were declared.

CONSENT AGENDA
Council heard a motion to approve or receive for information the items of the consent agenda. Ferrer and Guenin. Carried.

1. MINUTES OF 3 October 2022
Council approved the minutes of the meeting as distributed.

2. GRADUATE AWARDS
Council approved items a and b, as presented. Council received items c and d for information.

REGULAR AGENDA
3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES
There was no business arising.

4. CO-CHAIRS' REMARKS
Dean reminded council of: (a) the upcoming Research Data Management (RDM) Institutional Strategy town hall and the draft strategy to follow for comment and (b) that the Senate Governance Review memo, which will provide standardized guidance questions to committees and councils of Senate, is forthcoming from the Secretariat.

5. DIGTIAL LEARNING PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES
Council heard a motion to recommend to Senate the approval of the Digital Learning Principles and Guidelines as spoken to by Aldo Caputo in his presentation (at Appendix A). Caputo clarified: that the *Principles and Guidelines would* apply to online courses that had been taught prior to development of these guidelines but would not apply to "not for credit" endeavors (such as WATSPEED). Council requested one minor change—for *Universal Principles for Digital Learning #2 and #3* to be presented separately as these are legal requirements (vs. principles) which was addressed by Caputo by adding a first section to the document entitled "Legal Framework"—a conventional heading found within some university Policies and Guidelines. Council also remarked, more broadly, about similar guidelines and processes not existing for in-person courses which Nilsen will follow up.

Although not part of the motion at hand, Caputo also clarified that the *Review and Approval Process*, as presented, is still in the process of being developed and is not anticipated to be the sole function of CEL (i.e., approval pathways beyond CEL will be investigated). Council expressed interest in understanding more about how the *Review and Approval Process* will be developed/communicated/approved; and council requested that, once established, the *Review and Approval Process* come back to this body for review and feedback.

Deadman and Bednarski. Carried with one abstention.

6. RENEWAL-CYBERSECURITY AND PRIVACY INSTITUTE

On behalf of Senate, council approved the renewal of the Cybersecurity and Privacy Institute for a 5-year term, as presented. Council raised the topic of budget (noting concern regarding the significant carry forward for this—and other centres/institutes*) and it was clarified that there is no budget commitment from Provost for this review cycle for this institute. Duncker and Ferrer. Carried.

*On the topic of significant budget carry forward for some university-level centres/institutes, the following was discussed: (a) implications of this in contrast to the faculty-level centres/institutes, (b) existence of surplus and permission to carry forward are pandemic-related and interim, and (c) surplus carry forward is under review and is set to discontinue following a transition period said Duncker.

7. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

On behalf of Senate, council heard a motion to approve the following, as presented:

a. Final Assessment Report: Master of Catholic Thought. Bednarski and Esselment. Carried.
b. Final Assessment Report: Doctor of Optometry and Vision Science / Two-year Progress Report: Doctor of Optometry and Vision Science. Hitchens and Reid. Carried.
c. Two-year Progress Report: Graduate Diploma in Climate Risk Management. Deadman and Bednarski. Carried.

8. QUALITY COUNCIL UPDATE

Council received for information that the Quality Council has a new Quality Assurance framework that requires student input and recommendations. The Quality Council has not provided specific parameters thereon, but McKenzie provided guidance to all Associate Deans and faculties (at Appendix B). Please ensure that reporting is in aggregate only so as to be protective of personal privacy.

9. CURRICULAR SUBMISSIONS

On behalf of Senate, council heard an omnibus motion to approve items, as presented. Laird and Duncker. Carried.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

11. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held Monday 12 December 2022 from 10:30 a.m. to 12 noon in NH3318.

18 November2022

Kathy Winter, PhD, CPsych,
Assistant University Secretary

Digital Learning Principles & Guidelines

WHAT?

- A set of principles and guidelines intended to serve as both as a baseline for digital teaching and learning at Waterloo, to be endorsed by Senate

- A proposed review and approval process (but these are procedural matters that do not require Senate endorsement in the same way)

Digital Learning Principles & Guidelines

WHY?

- ensuring that digital teaching and learning is done in a manner that complies with university policies and Canadian law, meets Waterloo's standards for quality, and clearly communicates to students the expectations around mode of delivery

- in light of the development of remote courses during the pandemic, many instructors want to offer courses online and the Chairs want a means to assess whether something is 'above the bar' for regular offering

- more digital learning materials are increasingly being developed without CEL partnership, which ensured compliance with guidelines

Digital Learning Principles

1. The learning materials and delivery platforms must conform to all relevant University policies, including meeting security, privacy, ancillary fee, and course outline requirements.

2. The platforms and materials must meet or exceed AODA accessibility requirements.

3. The learning materials must conform to Canadian Copyright law and UW Copyright guidelines.

4. Learning materials are subject to Policy 73 (see brief https://uwaterloo.ca/associate-vice-president-academic/remote-teaching-and-learning-intellectual-property) unless covered by separate development agreement or licensing (e.g., Creative Commons or Ontario Open License).

5. Waterloo encourages the reuse of digital materials created at Waterloo as well as the use open educational materials (OERs) developed elsewhere, in an effort to reduce costs to the institution and to students.

6. Instruction should make use of university-supported platforms that provide adequate instructor and student support and ensure a more consistent teaching and learning experience.

Consultation for Major Modifications

Presented by: Amanda McKenzie & Angela Christelis

Quality Assurance Office

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

Academic Quality Assurance

- Every university is accountable to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council) and their Quality Assurance Framework (QAF)
- Waterloo has an Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) document, which aligns with the QAF
- The IQAP is the responsibility of the Provost and is delegated to the AVPA and AVPGSPA with support from the Quality Assurance Office

Major Modifications are a significant change to an existing program:

- **A change in the learning outcomes** (Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations UDLES or graduate Degree Level Expectations GDLES);
- **A change in requirements that differ significantly** from the way the program is offered since its last cyclical program review (e.g., introduction of co-op option, merger of two or more programs);
- Or **significant changes to the faculty delivering the program** (e.g., large number of new hires or retirements)
- **And/or essential resources to the program** (e.g., change to existing delivery by moving a program fully online or to a different campus)."

Examples of Major Modifications

- Introducing a new Minor or Option
- Adding a co-op stream
- Moving program to online delivery
- Changing the name of the program

New QC requirement for all Major Modifications

”Input from current students and recent graduates of the program should be considered as part of the development of the [major modification], with the Proposal [written rationale] including a statement on the way in which the proposed major modification will improve the student experience”

(Quality Assurance Framework, n.d.)

How to Consult about Major Modifications

- Ask students who would be most impacted (e.g., students in the program but also perhaps other departments or Faculty-wide depending on the modification).
- Consider asking recent graduates related to the program for their opinion (Note: *the way you approach recent grads will need to be explored with Alumni Relations*).
- Feedback could be sought by a very brief (i.e., 3 -4 questions) questionnaire sent by email or using a survey tool like Qualtrics.
- You could also do focus groups, but these would be a bit more time intensive.
- You do not need ethics approval to survey or hold focus groups students for Quality Assurance purposes.
- **We recommend you aim to for a sample of students or alumni** rather than targeting everyone in each group to avoid survey fatigue etc.

What evidence do you need to provide?

- When you submit your information and rationale for the major modification to the Secretary of SUC or SGRC, you will need to include *some* evidence of consultation with students (and alumni where possible).
- A short summary or brief table of results from the consultation you have conducted will suffice.
- Specific requirements may evolve over time.
- More details may become available after the Quality Council conducts its first review of our major modifications in late summer of 2023.

Questions & Potential Issues?