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   -Update - requirement for use of long form handwriting for examination purposes  
   Sarah Forgie

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. Zero/Low cost Textbook Course Indicator on Bear Tracks  
   Akanksha Bhatnagar
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OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda
   Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.
   Motion: Zentner/Rawlings

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

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of October 31, 2018
   Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.
   Motion: Tupper/Maraj

   THAT the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment approve the Open Session Minutes of October 31, 2018.
   CARRIED

3. Comments from the Chair (no documents)
   The Chair asked for a member to serve on the Teaching and Learning Enhancement Fund (TLEF) Selection Committee; Dr Varnhagen volunteered.

   The Chair noted that there would be a working group established to look into handwritten exams and asked for members interested in participating. Dr Rawlings asked to be included especially as issues of "bring your own device" and exam integrity relate to Information Technology. Members agreed that expertise from outside of CLE should be sought for the working group.

DISCUSSION ITEMS
4. **Curriculum Renewal - Doctor of Dental Surgery (DDS), Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry**

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Steven Patterson, Associate Chair, Academic, School of Dentistry, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry; Gisele Gaudet-Amigo, Curriculum Coordinator, School of Dentistry, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry

**Discussion:**

Dr Patterson gave an overview of the current DDS curriculum. He noted that many of the courses were taken alongside undergraduate medical students which caused issues for course sequencing, professional identity, and foundational, clinical learning. He also noted the significant assessment burden that DDS students faced. Close to 900 individual assessments, over 4 years, were common and Dr Patterson felt there was questionable value to that level of assessment.

Dr Patterson reviewed the curriculum renewal process and the development of the 5 guiding principles: Learning Pathways; Student Experience; Content; Delivery; and Assessment. He thanked his colleagues in the Faculty of Education who helped with this process.

During the discussion members expressed several comments and questions, including but not limited to: the financial outlay required for this change, especially during the initial transition; the next accreditation cycle for the DDS program; the collaborative change management strategies employed; mental health education as a sub-competency of the professionalism section of the curriculum; and promotion of mental health strategies and education throughout the new curriculum.

5. **Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRI) for the Academic Year 2017/18**

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Jeff Rawlings, Director, Relationship Management, Information Services & Technology; Margarita Stewart, Team Leader/Analyst, Information Services & Technology - Teaching & Learning Services

**Discussion:**

Mr Rawlings noted that the USRI response rate of 57.7% had been fairly consistent over the previous 4 years and noted that but that it dipped to 53.5% in 2018. He indicated that this might be attributable to a change in the security system that required students to clear their cache in order to log in.

During the discussion members expressed several comments and questions, including but not limited to: the 7 day window and reminder emails; whether or not more time would increase the response rate; the risk that some labs are missed if their end dates are not correctly entered in campus solutions; how the university could improve ease of access to USRI results and if this would encourage greater student participation; that both the Faculties and IST send communications encouraging participation by students; the trend toward greater use of mobile devices and the positive response to mobile access; strategies for increasing participation such as providing class time for this purpose; and the ability to edit responses up to the submission deadline.

6. **Update - Classroom Evergreening**

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

*Presenter(s):* Jeff Rawlings, Director Digital Learning Environments, Information Services & Technology - Relationship Management; Adam Giraldeau, Manager, Strategy and Infrastructure, Information Services & Technology - Teaching & Learning Services

**Discussion:**
Mr Giraldeau gave an overview of the Evergreening process including the change from analog to digital wiring, and challenges posed due to the exchange rate and tariffs on materials from the US. He noted the tiered tech standard, the significant reduction in cost for the tier 1 standard, and the reduction in classrooms with technology due to space planning and repurposing. He also noted that both the Edmonton Clinic Health Academy (ECHA) and the Centennial Centre for Interdisciplinary Science (CCIS) are 9 years old so are due for an update in the coming year to align with the goal that no classrooms have tech older than 10 years.

Members discussed the minimum standards for tech and the components of tier 1 as well as the other tiers and unique requirements for some classrooms.

7. **Draft Teaching Policy**

*Presenter(s):* Sarah Forgie, Chair GFC CLE and Vice-Provost (Learning Initiatives), Office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

_Discussion:_
The Chair explained that the draft Teaching Policy was part of the process to transition GFC Policy 111 to U of A Policies and Procedures On-Line (UAPPOL).

Members discussed the emphasis on research, Campus Alberta outcomes, and general guidelines.

The Chair noted that she would share the document with the members for their comments.

8. **Updates**

   A. **Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL)** – Dr Miller-Young noted that the Centre was currently undergoing a self-study as the initial stages of their review. They would be having their site visit in June 2019. She asked members for ideas on how to encourage feedback from those in the community who had not engaged with CTL.

   B. **Information Technology** - There was no update.

   C. **Learning Services** – Dr Askey asked members to consider their ideas of the optimum level of service during break periods. He noted that Libraries needed to balance providing good service with being a good employer and that this would come forward for discussion at a later date.

   D. **General Faculties Council** - Ms Richholt gave an update on the November 26, 2018 meeting of GFC. She noted that the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry’s proposal to remove the limit on the number of students who could be admitted to the MD Program through the Indigenous Application process was approved as were the new Terms of Reference for the GFC University Teaching Awards Committee (UTAC). Discussion items included the Digital Scholarship Centre, an update on the Tri-Council Draft Data Management Policy, the new Budget Model, and the Board/GFC/Senate Summit. Two questions were submitted regarding the university’s use of Gmail, and the fairness of decision making regarding the university’s signature areas.

   A member also noted that the Dean of Students spoke about student mental health issues on campus.

   E. **Academic Success Centre** - There was no update.

9. **Question Period**

There were no questions.
INFORMATION REPORTS

10. Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings
There were no items.

11. Items Approved by the Committee by E-Mail Ballots (non-debatable)
There were no items.

CLOSING SESSION

12. Adjournment
The Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.
### Agenda Title
Zero/Low Textbook Cost Course Indicator

### Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by</th>
<th>UASU VP Academic Akanksha Bhatnagar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Akanksha Bhatnagar, Students’ Union Vice President Academic, Chair of the Open Education Advocacy Group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Provost and Vice-President (Academic)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Purpose of the Proposal is</td>
<td>This discussion item will be to look at how the University of Alberta can incorporate an indicator, category, or filter to courses in Bear Tracks with zero or low textbook costs (ZTC, hereafter). ZTC indicators can allow students to find low-cost course options through simple input like selecting a dropdown menu option, and has already been piloted at other Canadian institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(please be specific)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>ZTC course indicators are an efficient, high-impact way to save students money without impacting professors’ academic freedom to select textbooks. The new budget model will incentive professor to maximize enrollment in their courses which could dovetail well with the increased draw of the ZTC designation. The City University of New York (CUNY) system has implemented a ZTC indicator as a simple dropdown menu option in the CUNY equivalent of Bear Tracks; CUNY now has 149 participating courses. A University of Toronto pilot project, comprising 53 participating courses, saved students almost half a million dollars (just over $70 per student per course). 100% of participating faculty and instructors indicated they would participate again. Through a sustainability lens, the U of T project saved 1.7 million pages’ worth of paper. BCcampus has associated ZTC courses with a 10% reduction in dropped courses due to financial hardship. At UAlberta, 6.6% of students have dropped a course due to the cost of textbooks, and 15.7% have avoided taking certain courses for the same reason. (All data from a 2018 UASU survey of 1300 undergraduates.) Dropped courses can have a direct bearing on tuition. Even a modest reduction in dropped courses could make a noticeable difference in revenue. There are obstacles that this movement could face at UAlberta. For example, it is not known how easily the Bear Tracks system could adapt to mark or highlight ZTC courses, or what cost or timeline might be associated with the shift. We will have to create definitions regarding what qualifies a course as a zero- or low-textbook-cost (depending on the chosen indicator), and implementation adds an administrative element. Furthermore, reviewing existing courses can be time-intensive, even when reviewing an element as simple as textbook price.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(outline the specific item – and remember your audience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplementary Notes and context

Engagement and Routing (Include proposed plan)

| Consultation and Stakeholder Participation | - University of Alberta Students’ Union   |
|                                          | - Open Education Advocacy Group           |
|                                          | - National and International Stakeholders at Open Ed 2018 and Open Con 2018. |
|                                          | - Council on Student Affairs               |

Strategic Alignment

Alignment with *For the Public Good*

Please note the Institutional Strategic Plan objective(s)/strategies the proposal supports.

- 1. OBJECTIVE Build a diverse, inclusive community of exceptional undergraduate and graduate students from Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, and the world.
- 14. OBJECTIVE Inspire, model, and support excellence in teaching and learning.

Alignment with Institutional Risk Indicator

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

☐ Faculty and Staff
☐ Reputation
☐ Student Success

Legislative Compliance and jurisdiction

Post-Secondary Learning Act
GFC Committee on the Learning Environment terms of reference

Attachments (each to be numbered 1 - <>)

1. None

Prepared by: <Akanksha Bhatnagar, University of Alberta Students’ Union Vice-President Academic, vp.academic@su.ualberta.ca>
## Item No. 5

**Student Success/Learning Analytics Ethics Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Title</th>
<th>Student Success/Learning Analytics Ethics Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed by</th>
<th>Mike MacGregor, Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-President, Information Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Jeff Rawlings, Director Digital Learning Environments, Information Services and Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>General discussion and feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Executive Summary**

(Outline the specific item – and remember your audience)

Student success/learning analytics has a number of different definitions and varies in scale and scope depending on the objectives of the analytics. In this case, we are using the term student success/learning analytics to refer to the measurement, collection, analysis, and reporting of digital data about student progress and activity in a course, program or discipline, through digital sources in order to enable instructors to make timely interventions and allow students more insight and control into their own learning and program decisions.

Student success/learning analytics is a growing trend and more digital applications are building in analytics as part of the standard suite of features that are offered to the user. However, the U of A does not have an ethical framework or policy on student success/learning analytics. The VP IST Mike MacGregor is looking to create one as the first step in a learning analytics strategy for the U of A.

This discussion topic is being presented to CLE in order to get feedback on what elements a good ethics framework for student success/learning analytics should contain. The document presented is from the University of California is being used as an example for discussion.

### Supplementary Notes and context

### Engagement and Routing (Include proposed plan)

Consultation and Stakeholder Participation

### Strategic Alignment

**Alignment with For the Public Good**

- Objective 5 - Build and strengthen trust, connection, and a sense of belonging among all members of the university community through a focus on shared values.
- Objective 14 - Inspire, model, and support excellence in teaching and learning.
- Objective 21 - Encourage continuous improvement in administrative,
Item No. 5

governance, planning, and stewardship systems, procedures, and policies that enable students, faculty, staff, and the institution as a whole to achieve shared strategic goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment with Institutional Risk Indicator</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>☒ 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</td>
<td>terms of reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments (each to be numbered 1 - <>)

1. University of California: Learning Data Privacy Principles

*Prepared by: Jeff Rawlings, Director Digital Learning Environments, Information Services and Technology*

*Email: jeff.rawlings@ualberta.ca*
University of California: Learning Data Privacy Principles

1. **Ownership**: The University of California (UC), its faculty, and students retain ownership of the data and subsequent computational transformations of the data they produce. Individual data owners have the right to determine how their data will be used. The UC acts as stewards of data on behalf of its faculty and students.

2. **Ethical Use**: Learning data collection, use, and computational transformation are governed by pedagogical and instructional concerns, with an aim toward student success through prescriptive, descriptive, or predictive methodologies. As with grades and other sensitive data, uses of learning analytics should be pursued on a “need to know” basis.

3. **Transparency**: Data owners have a right to understand the specific methods and purposes for which their data are collected, used and transformed, including what data are being transmitted to third-party service providers (and their affiliated partners) and the details of how algorithms are applied that shape summaries, particularly outputs and visualizations.

4. **Freedom of Expression**: Faculty and students retain the right to communicate and engage with each other in the learning process without the concern that their data will be mined for unintended or unknown purposes.

5. **Protection**: Stewards, on behalf of data owners, will ensure learning data are secure and protected in alignment with all federal, state, and university regulations regarding secure disposition.

6. **Access and Control**: Data owners have the right to access their data. Given that faculty and students own their learning data and share in its disposition, access to and ultimate authority and control of the data rests with the faculty and student owners, and the data stewards acting on their behalf. Data retention access and control practices will be governed under UC policies and supplier contractual agreements.

*University of California: Learning Data Privacy Principles and Practices: developed by the Educational Technology Leadership Committee (ETLC) supported by the IT Leadership Committee (ITLC) [10.23.17] and the University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) [11.06.17].*
University of California: Learning Data Privacy Practices

1. **Ownership**: Service providers will recognize learning data ownership and access as a right of the faculty and students.

2. **Usage Right**: Through a user's profile setting, service providers will enable users to control the use of their intellectual property. Thus, it will be the user's choice to grant terms such as, “a royalty-free, transferable, perpetual, irrevocable, non-exclusive, worldwide license to reproduce, modify, publish, publicly display, make derivative works.”

3. **Opt-in**: Other than those data elements distinctly required for instruction, where appropriate, students will have a choice about the use of learning data collected by faculty and service providers in an "opt in" rather than "opt out" approach.

4. **Interoperable Data**: Service providers will provide learning data to the institution in recognized standard interoperability format(s) to minimize integration costs, support cross-platform and cross-application uses, and promote institutional and academic analysis and research.

5. **Data without Fees**: Service providers will not charge the faculty, students, or other university learning data stewards for the right of access, including the delivery of these data to the University.

6. **Transparency**: Service providers will inform the UC about the learning data they collect and how these data will be used, which in the course of an academic term shall be based on pedagogical concerns and curricular improvement.

7. **Service Provider Security**: All service provider platforms on which student learning data are stored will conform with UC and state mandated security procedures governing the reporting of unexpected incidents and corrections that may occur.

8. **Campus Security**: UC learning data stewards will ensure that all faculty and student data are stored securely in conformance with University data security policy. Learning data stewards will report any learning data security incidents as appropriate to faculty and students, and will provide information about their remedy.

*University of California: Learning Data Privacy Principles and Practices: developed by the Educational Technology Leadership Committee (ETLC) supported by the IT Leadership Committee (ITLC) [10.23.17] and the University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) [11.06.17].
## Governance Executive Summary

**Advice, Discussion, Information Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Title</th>
<th>Proposed Teaching Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed by</td>
<td>GFC Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Sarah Forgie, Chair CLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Provost and Vice-President (Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Purpose of the Proposal is (please be specific)</td>
<td>The proposal is before the committee for discussion and in preparation for early consultation at the GFC Executive Committee and GFC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary (outline the specific item – and remember your audience)</td>
<td>Further to direction from GFC in May 2016 to conduct a review on the use of the USRIs for assessment and evaluation of teaching, the Committee on the Learning Environment has been engaged in examining both the USRI and multifaceted evaluation of teaching. Part of this task has been directed towards rescission of the current GFC Policy Manual Section 111 Teaching and Learning and Teaching Evaluation and creation of new UAPPOL policies to support teaching and learning and teaching assessment and evaluation. CLE concluded that this would be best accomplished by transitioning the existing GFC Policy into several policies and procedures. The first is a Teaching Policy, and the second a separate Teaching Evaluation Policy. Cascading under the Teaching Evaluation Policy, there will be procedures around the evaluation of teaching. The proposed Teaching Policy, presented at this time for early consultation, reflects the overarching values on the importance of teaching at the University of Alberta. The Teaching Evaluation Policy suite will come forward in due course with associated procedures which will speak to multi-faceted evaluation, including student perceptions of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Notes and context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Engagement and Routing (Include proposed plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation and Stakeholder Participation</th>
<th>Those who are actively participating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GFC – September 25, October 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Committee on the Learning Environment – December 6, 2017; April 4, May 2, October 3, December 5, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Centre for Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those who have been consulted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• GFC Executive Committee – March 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Faculties Council – March 18, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Strategic Alignment

| Alignment with For the Public | MISSION: Within a vibrant and supportive learning environment, the |
### Item No. 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Good</strong></th>
<th>University of Alberta discovers, disseminates, and applies new knowledge for the benefit of society through teaching and learning, research and creative activity, community involvement, and partnerships.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>VALUES:</strong> We value excellence in teaching, research, and creative activity that enriches learning experiences, advances knowledge, inspires engaged citizenship, and promotes the public good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>For the Public Good</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXCEL as individuals, and together, sustain a culture that fosters and champions distinction and distinctiveness in teaching, learning, research, and service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Attachments**

1. Draft Teaching Policy

*Prepared by:* Sarah Forgie, Chair, GFC Committee on the Learning Environment, and University Governance
Overview

The university has at its heart several overlapping goals which contribute to the uplifting of the whole people: the creation, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge, and the education of citizens in order to thrive and to tackle local, national, and global challenges. A university has at its heart several goals: the creation of knowledge, and the dissemination and preservation of knowledge. Research -- the creation of knowledge through exploration and discovery -- represents one learning component of university life. Teaching -- the dissemination and preservation of that knowledge -- represents another that is equally important. Within a university, what is taught and how it is taught depends upon research, and the impact of research depends upon its communication. This interdependence and integration of research and teaching is what distinguishes a university from other educational institutions. Although the balance between these activities may vary, all members of the university, whether scholars or students, are learners who extend the range of their knowledge through questioning, exploration and discovery, and they are teachers who communicate that knowledge to others.

The University of Alberta is a large, teaching and research intensive institution that emphasizes the seamless relationship of scholarly activities. More than simply recognizing that what we teach flows from the work of scholars, we are convinced that dedicated researcher-teachers and teacher-scholars best accomplish postsecondary and graduate curriculum development and delivery. We are committed to providing supportive and inclusive learning the best and most appropriate environments with purposeful opportunities for student-instructor and student-student interaction, while recognizing that the responsibility for the learning process lies with each student.
The University of Alberta is a multiversity. A wide range of disciplines is professed, various research models followed, and numerous types of teaching are required within its walls. There are varied approaches to teaching, with no single answer to serve all disciplines. Development of new teaching models should emphasize appropriate use, should be derived from within the discipline concerned, and the final arbiter should always be academic excellence.

To fully participate in and benefit from the teaching and learning programs at the University of Alberta, entering students are expected to arrive with a set of attributes and skills that prepares them for academic study. These will be expanded and grow through participation in University community.

Purpose
The policy underscores the University’s commitment to teaching activities.

POLICY

● GUIDING PHILOSOPHY OF UNIVERSITY TEACHING AND LEARNING

Our primary roles are to educate students to the baccalaureate level, and to educate and mentor graduate students and post-doctoral scholars. The University of Alberta is also an intellectual resource for the general and professional community, and we make our faculty and courses available to that community.

The University’s commitment to teaching excellence will be demonstrated through:

a. Delivery of graduates who exhibit the graduate attributes and skills defined by the University.

b. Regular and ongoing review and revision of programs and outcomes.

c. Provision and regular review of supports and instruments for the formative and summative multifaceted evaluation of teaching.

d. Acknowledgement and reward of excellent teaching.

e. Professional development opportunities for instructors to develop their teaching and scholarship.

f. Inclusivity? accessibility?

RELATED LINKS
List any other related links in alphabetical order. Try to link to lead sites that will remain current (e.g., the Government of Alberta’s Queen’s Printer main page. If there are no related links do not delete the RELATED LINKS heading or above message – indicate “No Related Links for this Procedure”.

PUBLISHED PROCEDURES OF THIS POLICY

All procedures linked to this policy are listed here. (Delete this sentence when adding your links)