ACADEMIC COUNCIL

MINUTES

Friday, September 30, 2011, 1:00 p.m., room F-216

Present: M. Abiri, M. Besner, V. Broege, M. DeNora, I. Der Aprahamian, M. Gauthier, R. Herrera, A. Islam, P. Labrinos, S. Lord, E. Lozowy, M. Lynch, L. Meana, M. Passucci, S. Pettifer, M. Sendbuehler
Regrets: A. Goldberg
Non-members: F. Andrews, W. Brown, M. Corriveau, O. Côté, J. Goldman, C. Hanrahan, G. Héroux, T. Ingerman, A. Miron, M. Prentice

The Vice-chair announced that M. Passucci had been nominated officially by the AVCP as one of the association's representatives on Council for this academic year.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved by consensus with the addition of *Agreement between the Municipalité Régionale de Comté des Laurentides and Vanier College* as item 3. a).

2. Approval of Minutes

a) August 26, 2011

The minutes of August 26, 2011 were approved by consensus as submitted.

b) September 9, 2011

The minutes of September 9, 2011 were approved by consensus with some minor corrections.

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

a) Agreement between *Municipalité Régionale de Comté des Laurentides* and Vanier College

The Director General was invited to speak to this item. G. Héroux first distributed copies of a document on the Laurentians partnership project that was part of the PowerPoint presentation he gave at the Academic Council meeting on August 26th. . He briefly went over the information given at that meeting and gave more detailed information on each step listed on the *What's next?* document he had distributed. G. Héroux then explained that the agreement presented at this meeting for a recommendation of support from Council was an initial agreement to go ahead exploring the partnership possibilities between Vanier and the MRC of the Laurentians. It was submitted for approval by the Board of Directors at the meeting of September 27th because of the time line set for a signed agreement as a condition for the use of the facilities. The Director General confirmed that all activities and projects planned will be submitted to Academic Council.

The Vice-chair further explained that, because of the time line of the meetings, the document was submitted to the Board of Directors before being submitted to Academic Council. However, the Board of Directors had asked when approving the agreement that the Director General submit it to Academic Council for consultation as for any other similar agreements. The proposed projects will definitely be submitted to Academic Council for consultation and recommendation of approval by the Board of Directors. S. Pettifer also noted that Academic Council can hold a special meeting when necessary.

Some discussion followed on part B of the agreement, *Obligations du Cégep Vanier*, particularly with regards to the budgetary cuts the College was facing. The Director General explained that the projects would usually be revenue making and that the College will look into the budget of each project and will not commit to invest in

any project without having a full picture of the initiative. M. Sendbuehler reported on the potential stage projects in Environmental and Wildlife Management, and the many opportunities this initiative would bring to the students in this program.

It was moved by M. Lynch and seconded by M. Sendbuehler that Academic Council support the Agreement between the *Municipalité régionale de Comté des Laurentides* and Vanier College.
Approved unanimously with 1 abstention.

The Director General then distributed copies of a press release just published on the budget cuts and presented the highlights of the document. The budget cuts have been reduced from $29.8 million to $19.8 million. The College has to find approximately $500,000. It has been decided that the College will work with the budget presented to the Board in June. There will not be any changes in the course of the year. At the end of the fiscal year, if need be, a transfer would be made from the College's surplus.

b) <u>2011-2012 Academic Council Priorities – Student Centeredness</u>

The Academic Dean reported that, further to the feedback received, the academic management team revised the *Academic Office Goals and Objectives 2011-2012* document and reworded objective 1 exactly as Goal 1.1 of the Strategic Plan:

Develop, publicize, and implement the principles and methods of a student-centered college.

The document has received full support from the Director General and will be posted on the Academic Dean's web page. M. Gauthier explained that, although it was the responsibility of the Director General and the Academic Dean to ensure the achievement of a student-centered college, the community will be invited to give their feedback on Ped Day – now called Vanier Community Connection Day - which theme will be "student-centeredness". The students will also be asked to give their feedback. M. Gauthier then asked Council how she should proceed exploring this concept, whether through discussion at each Council meeting or at another committee.

Discussion followed. The major highlight of the discussion was the lack of agreement on the way to proceed. Several members of the academic management team spoke for the need to first define the concept of a student-centered college in order to have guidelines and principles governing the decision making process throughout the College. Several other Council members spoke for proceeding first by looking at and gathering information on the positive things now being done as well as addressing the current problems – such as insufficient tutorial services and inadequate opening hours for the Print Shop - rather than spending time discussing a definition; such a definition would emerge from implementing this process. A suggestion was also made to have the Academic Dean shadow a teacher or a professional during a day to see what works and what stumbles in terms of student-centeredness. S. Pettifer stated that it might also be useful for teachers to shadow a student for a day, an idea that came from a student telling her she that had just sat through four power point presentations in a row, in a dark classroom.

It was agreed to ask the LRPC to address this issue and come back to Academic Council with recommendations. This committee had already started last year looking at one aspect of the issue, how best to gather information on students in the course of their studies at Vanier.

Regarding insufficient tutorial services, S. Pettifer read an email she received from the Coordinator of the Computer Science Department, Louise Gauthier, on the cuts of these services in her department and her request that this concern be brought up at Council.

c) 2011-2012 Academic Standing Committees

E. Lozowy spoke to the motion he had presented at the last Council meeting that had been tabled. The motion was that the membership of the Long Range Planning Committee be changed to include 3 Faculty Deans instead of 1 administrator; and that the membership of the Academic Space Committee be changed to include 1 Faculty Dean instead of 3. He explained that, while that the feedback heard was that the intention of the motion was to have more administrative control in the LRPC, his intention was not so and was based on the following three points:

1. A comparative analysis of the two committees which clearly shows a lack of balance.
2. The presence of 4 faculty representatives on the LRPC for only 3 on the Academic Space Committee and hence, the lack of representation of Science.
3. The notion of administrator on the LRPC. The administrator should represent the academic sector.

E. Lozowy then withdrew the motion with the approval of the seconder, M. Sendbuehler. He suggested that the Academic Council Standing Committees move ahead and that the issue come back to Council for discussion in March.

Discussion followed and there was consensus to move ahead with the committees with their current composition. It was felt that there was no urgent need or compelling reason to change them at this point and that the issue could be looked at towards the end of the year if necessary. In answer to the concern raised about representation from Science, it was noted that it was the responsibility of the representative of each Faculty to represent all the programs in the Faculty. The meetings of these committees are also open meetings.

The need to have these committees function as soon as possible at the beginning of the academic year was reiterated. A suggestion was made to have the nomination process moved to the end of the previous academic year so as to have the committees ready to function at the beginning of the fall semester. This will be looked into for next year.

d) Fall Enrollment Update

T. Ingerman reported that there were 6602 students to this date. This represents about 60 to 70 more students than last year at the same time. However, the number of course registrations is lower than last fall. Validated numbers will be available at the next meeting.

e) Academic Integrity Report

M. Lynch and A. Islam reported on the second meeting of the sub-committee:

- There is some apprehension in the VCSA about taking on such a big project.
- The idea of having a questionnaire distributed to students was discussed as well as the different ways it could be distributed. Omnivox would be the best way.
- The idea of giving incentives to students for answering the questionnaire was brought up.
- The committee brainstormed on the questions to be asked.
- The committee discussed the possibility of having a link with the questionnaire which would lead students to answers about the various issues. The idea of sending out a document later seemed to be a better idea.
- The committee discussed possible ways re compiling and analyzing the data.

The full report is appended to these minutes.

The Vice-chair thanked the committee for their great work. M. Sendbuehler reported that Clemson University Centre for Academic Integrity had an assessment guide available for purchasing. He will send the link to those interested. S. Pettifer reported that there was a leaflet distributed this week to students in her Faculty on unemployed teachers offering to help students with their assignments for payment.

There was much support given to the idea of the questionnaire. Some suggestions were made re possible questions , the implementation of the questionnaire, a web page and a slide on academic integrity at the

orientation session at the beginning of each semester. The need to give the campaign a positive spin was reiterated.
M. Gauthier thanked the committee and stressed the need to follow up on the initiative. She suggested that this could be a project for a teacher with release time under Volet D. The item will be back on the agenda at the next meeting.

e) Policy Review Process

It was agreed to address the two documents submitted, *Streamlining the Policy Review Process: Proposal* and *Proposal to Academic Council for a Vanier College Academic Policy Committee (APC)*, separately.

Streamlining the Policy Review Process: Proposal
M. DeNora reported that the committee set up at the August 26th meeting met twice to discuss how best to streamline the policy review process. He stressed that the process proposed was very similar to the document the IPESA committee had, the steps are very similar but the timeline is different. The idea is to have consultation of the various bodies but in a shorter time line. M. DeNora then made a PowerPoint presentation on a simulation for the 2012-2013 year based on the proposal.
M. DeNora and M. Gauthier then answered a few questions from the members.

It was moved by M. Lynch and seconded by M. Abiri that Academic Council approve in principle the *Streamlining the Policy Review Process: Proposal*.

It was agreed that this document was a living document which the APC could fine tune as necessary.

The motion was then voted upon and approved unanimously with 1 abstention.

M. Gauthier thanked M. DeNora for his work on this proposal which made the committee's work so much easier.

Proposal to Academic Council for a Vanier College Academic Policy Committee (APC)
M. Gauthier presented this document. She explained that, because of additional duties added to C. Hanrahan's position, the revision and writing of the IPESA and academic policies, had to be taken off her responsibilities. M. Gauthier took this opportunity to thank C. Hanrahan for her great work with this dossier. The proposal therefore is to set up a standing committee, the Academic Policy Committee (APC), to oversee the process. M. Gauthier went over the proposed composition of the committee. Sub-committees could be struck if necessary. The teachers would be given release time to sit on the committee and training would be provided to all members. One of the first tasks of the committee will be to address the CEEC preliminary report on the implementation of our IPESA which the College should receive within the next two weeks. The committee would also formulate its mandate and submit it to Academic Council within its first year. It will start meeting in the fall to prepare for formal work as of January.

It was moved by M. Abiri and seconded by M. DeNora that Academic Council approve in principle the *Proposal to Academic Council for a Vanier College Academic Policy Committee (APC).*

Discussion followed. The major points of the discussion were:
- This document is also a living document which the APC could need to fine tune. The first document presented is subsumed by this one which was written later.

- The idea of having a meta-policy was brought up. It was pointed out that the College does have such a policy in the administrative area.
- The process of approval by the Management Advisory Committee will be looked into.
- It was suggested to hire a temporary consultant to work on this project in light of the amount of work: there are approximately 35 academic policies. It was noted that a consultant was hired to look into the administrative policies of the College, not the academic ones.
- It was agreed to add an academic advisor to the committee.
- The question of release time for teachers was discussed. It was agreed that a two-year term be staggered for the faculty members on the committee.

Discussion then followed on the concern raised by several members re the understaffing of the Academic Dean's Office in terms of pedagogical advisors. It was noted that a lot of release time was spent at Vanier for faculty to do work which in other colleges was handled by such advisors. It was suggested that Academic Council make a recommendation to the Board of Directors to have more pedagogical advisors in the academic sector. The item will be on the agenda for the next meeting. Information on the situation in other colleges across the *reseau* will be provided at that time.

The motion was then voted upon and approved unanimously.

4. Reports, Announcements and Correspondence

a) Board of Directors

M. Gauthier reported the following on the Board of Directors' meeting of September 27, 2011:
- T. Ingerman gave an update on the fall enrollment.
- The Board approved the following items:
    - Agreement of Understanding with Qufu Normal University
    - Entente with la *Municipalité Régionale de Comté des Laurentides*
    - List of graduates to be granted their DEC
    - Long-term borrowing resolution
    - Revised 2011-2012 Capital Budget

The Board also ratified the nomination of M. Passucci on Academic Council for this academic year. Elections were held for the Executive Committee.

b) Joint Coordinators

M. DeNora reported on the Joint Coordinators' meeting of September 14, 2011. The report is appended to these minutes.

5. Varia

A. Islam reported on the VCSA tutor program. The program had been stopped because of the competition with other such departmental programs. However, the Music Department approached the VCSA with a request and the VCSA was able to help them. If other departments need help, they should be told to communicate with her.
The Vice-chair thanked A. Islam and said she would give the information to L. Gauthier.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Wanda Kalina

Academic Integrity Subcommittee Meeting
September 27, 2011
9-10 a.m.

Present: Marianne Lynch, Ginny Iaboni, Ayvi Islam

Ayvi reported that she had made a brief presentation to the VCSA regarding the ideas discussed in the first meeting; the VCSA members expressed apprehension about taking on any sort of large-scale project. However, they expressed a willingness to help in the promotion and/or advertising of any projects that may be developed.

The focus of our meeting then turned to selecting one of the project ideas and exploring its possibilities. We chose to focus on #3: Creating a list of student myths about cheating and plagiarism.

We suggest preparing a **questionnaire for students** (and potentially a parallel questionnaire for teachers—see the final paragraph of this report) that would be disseminated as widely as possible. There were 3 suggestions:

1. A questionnaire handed out through students' English course.
2. An electronic questionnaire posted on Omnivox.
3. A questionnaire available as a handout in Jake's which students complete and bring to the VCSA.
    - The objection to the first option is that using the English department as a means to distribute the questionnaire may tend to make *all* issues of academic integrity seem particular to the English department, when this is clearly not the message we want to send.
    - The objection to the third option is logistical impracticality; moreover, it would likely create a great deal of wasted paper.
    - The second option seems most promising as well as most sustainable! However, we would require IT assistance to do this. In addition, there would need to be clarification about whether this is something that would be sent to *all* students; if so, when? And would students be required to respond? [It may be possible to provide some incentives, say, for the first 'x' students to respond...]

We moved on to brainstorming possible questions for this questionnaire. It seems important to keep it to no more than 5 or 6 questions.

Suggested questions:

1. What does "academic integrity" mean to you? [by this we wish to solicit students' understanding—or more likely, complete bafflement—of the expression]
2. What do you think leads students to cheat?
3. List 5 different actions that you perceive as cheating or plagiarism.
4. List 3 ways you feel can help you *avoid* finding yourself in a situation where you may be accused of cheating or plagiarism. (ex.: what can you do as an individual? Where can you go for help?)
5. What are the consequences of cheating and plagiarism? (both academic consequences and personal—or interpersonal—consequences)
6. What can you do/where can you go if you feel you have been unjustly accused of cheating and/or plagiarism?

We also discussed the possibility of providing a link with the questionnaire that leads students to a series of answers concerning these issues—i.e. information that is already available to students in their agendas, at the learning center, etc.; however, there is a risk that this may be used by students who want to give the 'right' answer (when in fact we are seeking, to some extent, to know what their misconceptions might be!).

A better idea seemed to be to *later* send out a document to all students that addresses the misconceptions or myths on these issues.

Finally, there was brief discussion of what might be required in terms of compiling and analyzing the data that such a questionnaire would generate—staff or faculty assigned to the task, student volunteers who might use this for Star Program volunteer hours, etc.

There was also interest in pursuing the first of the suggestions regarding teachers, i.e. collecting information from teachers regarding the 'tricks' they use to *prevent* cheating and plagiarism (i.e. advice that seems to resonate with students; assignments meant to help students learn the right way to use source material; applications of turnitin.com besides 'catching' plagiarism; etc.). However, we did not have sufficient time to explore this in any further detail.

Report submitted by Marianne Lynch

Report for Academic Council of September 30th, 2011.

Joint Coordinators September 14th, 2011.

1. Caroline Hanrahan asked for final feedback for the Grades Review policy revision.

2. The Academic Dean, Martine Gauthier, presented Vision 2011-2014 and Goals and Objectives for 2011-2012, an overview of the current work of the Academic Dean's office, in consultation with the Faculty Deans and other Academic managers.

3. Martine Gauthier presented a plan for coordinator training sessions.

4. Melodie Hicks presented a summary of the outstanding Malawi Nursing exchange.