OPENING SESSION

1. Approval of the Agenda

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file.

Motion: Erichsen/Varnhagen

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

CARRIED

2. Approval of the Open Session Minutes of April 26, 2017

Materials before members are contained in the official meeting file. A member asked that the minutes be revised to reflect that the committee noted that parallel questions exist in the evaluation of research. Approval was deferred to the next meeting.

3. Comments from the Chair

The Chair thanked outgoing members for their service to the committee and welcomed new members.
DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. Learning Outcomes Retreat - Update

*Presenter(s): Sarah Forgie*

There were no documents.

The Chair provided the committee with an update on the May 2 retreat, a joint venture between the Provost's Office, the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research (FGSR). She noted that the focus of the retreat was to socialize the goal of learning outcomes. Attendance at the retreat included Deans/delegates, Associate Deans and representatives from the Campus Alberta Quality Council (CAQC); the material was well received by the approximately 40 participants. The retreat included a presentation on the role of learning outcomes, and panel discussions on implementing and assessing learning outcomes. A brief report with a high level summary will be compiled. Follow up sessions will include more concrete examples or case studies. In addition, workshops will be available through CTL. Parallel work will occur on graduate student learning outcomes specific to course based and thesis based masters, and PhDs; these will be advertised on the CTL website.

5. Provost's Teaching Awards

*Presenter(s): Sarah Forgie*

There were no documents.

The Chair reported that she had spoken with the Deans about the decline in applications for teaching awards including the University Teaching Awards, Provost’s teaching awards, and outside awards like the 3M. She asked the committee for ideas on how to celebrate exceptional teachers and increase the number of names coming forward for these awards.

During the discussion, members noted the following challenges and opportunities: the amount of work required to develop an application and the suggestion that some tangible assistance, perhaps centrally, was required; awards are not widely known; every Faculty should be encouraged to put forward nominees for these awards; faculty should be given credit by their Faculty for the time and effort spent developing applications; the role of Vice-Deans or subcommittees at the Faculty level in putting forward nominees; and equity concerns. In the discussion of how to increase the number of applicants, members suggested mentorship, workshops, a change of culture around nominations, and having a mechanism in place to tap shoulders or potential applicants to encourage them to apply.

6. Report and Recommendations of the ad hoc Committee on Academic Governance Including Delegated Authority with respect to the GFC Committee on the Learning Environment

*Presenter(s): Sarah Forgie; Meg Brolly*

Ms Brolley, GFC Secretary and Manager of GFC Services, provided members with an overview of the foundational documents approved by GFC related to the role and responsibilities or members, committee composition, delegations of authority and procedural rules. She noted that the proposed revisions to the committee terms of reference include improved alignment with GFC through membership, an improved, standardized template for the terms of reference across all of GFC’s standing committees, and more clearly defined committee responsibilities. Additionally, the report recognized that CLE will need to do further work on the draft terms before they are ready for GFC approval, and encouraged the committee to do so.

Members discussed the recommendations of the ad hoc committee noting that it represented a welcome shift in academic governance. A member noted that Learning Services exists between learning and research and
raised the question of how it would exist between a newly named ARPC (Academic and Research Planning Committee) and CLE. The committee raised the following points: there is a lack of forum for items such as the ebook preferred policy; CLE has a role in identifying and disseminating best practice; the learning environment and teaching environment parts of the committee’s areas of responsibility cross portfolios; there is no representative on the committee from Facilities and Operations; and that there should be a clear understanding of the division between operations and governance. A member suggested the formation of a working group to focus on the terms of reference.

The Chair noted that this would be an ongoing discussion at the committee over the next year.

7. **Question Period**

There were no questions.

**INFORMATION REPORTS**

8. **Items Approved by the Committee by E-Mail Ballots (non-debatable)**

There were no items.

9. **Information Items Forwarded to Committee Members Between Meetings**

There were no items.

**CLOSING SESSION**

10. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.