Memo

To: Christene Carpenter Cleland, Chair, T&LPC

From: Rajiv Jhangiani, Vice Provost, Teaching and Learning
Giulia Forsythe, Director, Teaching and Learning
Matt Clare, Director, Technology Enabled Learning

Date: February 6, 2022

Subject: **Discussion of potential revisions to FHB 3.A.10. (Evaluation)**

In support of the work plan of the Teaching & Learning Policy Committee (T&LPC), the Centre for Pedagogical Innovation has conducted a review of the language in this section of the Faculty Handbook and consulted with relevant units or groups across the university to identify potential areas that may require revision. The feedback of T&LPC members will inform draft revisions that will be brought to an upcoming T&LPC meeting for consideration.

The following is a summary of the potential revisions, grouped by category:

1) Clarify scope of the policy
   a) Indicate that examinations are addressed by a different policy (FHB 3.A.9)

2) Clarify language
   a) Clarify language around timing of various requirements (e.g., "beginning of each course")
   b) Clarify the respective roles of Deans, Chairs, USAC, departmental committees, etc.
   c) Clarify guidance concerning evaluation information provided to students at the beginning of each course
   d) Consolidate the many references to deposition and reflect the examination retention policy
   e) Clarify whether references to goals for a course refer to course learning outcomes and what is meant by "essential course requirements"

3) Better align language
   a) Relocate policy language better suited to other sections of the Faculty Handbook to prevent repetition (e.g., the paragraph concerning admission standards and prerequisites in 10.2.1 may be moved to 3.0 Admissions)
   b) Where relevant, align with language in the academic plan

4) Improve language
   a) Revise description of grading schemes (which currently includes phrases such as "a rare talent," "craftsman-like," "of a certain flair," "incisive mind," etc.)
   b) Remove references to a specific vendor/software such as Turnitin (use a more generic descriptor instead such as "phrase matching software")
   c) Be more precise (e.g., references to evaluation being conducted "fairly" vs. reliable and valid evaluation)
   d) Standardize use of terms such as academic unit/department, etc.
   e) Standardize capitalization of terms such as "academic integrity" and "academic misconduct"
   f) Minimize waffly language and replace with clear and direct instruction (e.g., "Whenever and wherever reasonably possible")
   g) Use inclusive terminology where possible

     h) Other cases where language might be improved (e.g., information "transmitted" to students)

5) Update language to reflect current practice
     a) Reflect actual timing of distribution of examination schedules
     b) Reflect university retention schedules
     c) Reflect the current academic integrity policy
     d) Reflect university practices around student accommodations and accessibility
     e) Address independent studies courses and how these are treated differently (e.g., the expectation in many independent studies courses that students and instructors negotiate grade weights, etc.)

6) Review the meaning of attendance given the expanded set of course delivery modes

7) Review the use of the Composition of Final Grade form

8) Revisit the question of which grade stands in the case of a repeated course

9) Review the timing of when information about penalties for a late submission of an assignment should be communicated to students

10) Address evaluation in clinical or practical settings

11) Revise the section on phrase matching tools
     a) Review the set of reasonable alternatives that must be provided to students who object to participating in the use of phrase matching tools
     b) Remove the term "offline" from this section
     c) Update the Phrase Matching Software section to clarify multiple services instructors may consider submitting student work to, while underscoring the need to use university procured technologies that have gone through proper vetting for privacy, information security, etc.
     d) Include language related to the use of artificial intelligence detection tools

12) Consider including guidelines about variety of assessments and maximum percentages.
     a) Introduce a maximum weight for a single assessment
     b) Clearly indicate when a mandatory single assessment renders a course as pass/fail
     c) Consider specifying a minimum number of assessments to help clarify what a "reasonable diversity" means in practice

13) Consider removing the equivalent letter grade component of final grade submission and retain only a numerical grade (10.1.6)

14) Create a clear list of what must be included in a course syllabus regarding evaluation