

Minutes, June 9, 2021

Special meeting of the Commission of Studies
held on June 9, 2021, at 9:00 am
By videoconference

Minutes

MINUTES of a special meeting of the CEGEP Champlain – St. Lawrence Commission of Studies held by videoconference on June 9, 2021

Sitting members present

C. Andrew,	Professional Union Member representative
E. Berryman,	Director of the Constituent College, President of the Commission
P. Bleau,	Business Program representative
T. Connolly,	General Education representative
G. Dröge-Grondin,	General Education representative
C-A. Gauthier,	Social Science Program representative
A-A. Giguère,	ALC Program representative
M. Huard,	Math Department representative
C. Nadeau,	Support Staff representative
A. Roussel,	Professional Union Member representative
A. Stevens,	Dean of Faculty
C. St-Laurent-Pedneault,	Science Program representative
C. Talbot,	Coordinator of Pedagogical and Institutional Development
M. Thériault,	Tourism Program representative
I. Zhang,	Student representative

Sitting members regrets

T. Delisle,	Student representative
F. Séguin,	General Education representative

Persons other than Commissioners in attendance

T. Mills,	Support Staff
-----------	---------------

Quorum attained with 15 of 17 sitting members present.



Special meeting of the Commission of Studies
June 9, 2021, at 9:00 am
By videoconference

Agenda

1. Opening remarks and confirmation of the quorum
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Recommendation of the IPESA
4. Varia
5. Adjournment

1. Opening remarks and confirmation of the quorum

Everyone was welcomed. Quorum was confirmed at 9:00 am.

2. Adoption of the agenda

G. Dröge-Grondin asked to add an item to the agenda. After discussion, it was agreed her item could be discussed under item 3. Recommendation of the IPESA.

It was moved that the agenda be adopted.

MOVED BY C. Andrew
SECONDED BY I. Zhang
THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Recommendation of the IPESA

G. Dröge-Grondin was invited to speak. She explained that she thought the discussion and recommendation should be postponed. She thought there were many reasons for this. We had a difficult year. There was not enough time to properly consult the document. Teachers are likely to request additional changes. She feels it is still not satisfactory in many aspects. She feels that postponing would allow for addressing the complaints policy.

C. Talbot confirmed that the implementation schedule must be confirmed by the Governing Board. But the current proposal is that it be implemented in the winter of 2022.

G. Dröge-Grondin thought that delay would be advantageous if we are not implementing till the winter 2022.

E. Berryman explained that this IPESA has gone through extensive consultation. He is proposing a January 2022 deployment to the Governing Board. This would allow for changes to the course outlines and the informing of all stakeholders. Regarding the appeals and complaints procedures (and the development of an appeals and complaints policy), he does not see that this should cause a delay. He considers that we should recommend, today, the adoption of the revised IPESA.

C. Talbot explained that, regarding the appeals and complaints policy, there will be extensive consultation – going beyond the IPESA. Many in the College will be involved. Furthermore, if we adopt the IPESA now it will allow Ped Counsellors to plan training and support workshops in the fall. If we delay, we will not be able to plan training, workshops, and support in the fall. We must prepare for implementation and so she thought the IPESA should be recommended now. We have consulted with professional staff, students, and labor relations. The work of consultation has been done. The Commission of Studies does not have to rewrite the IPESA but rather determine if it feels the IPESA is appropriate for the College.

C. St-Laurent-Pedneault would like to delay the recommendation of the IPESA to the fall. Most of our concerns have been heard. The concerns are not major. He feels that workshops could still be set up in the fall. At this point, we are only proposing minor tweaking of the document – not rewriting it completely. He said some departments would like to make some small changes. A delay to the fall would be welcome.

C. Talbot asked for clarification as to what needs to be tweaked. What is blocking it at this point?

G. Dröge-Grondin thought the question of presence, student presence, has not been adequately resolved. (This is the question as to whether 10% of the final mark could be awarded to students for their presence in class.) She has made recommended changes on this topic. For her, changes should be made to this point.

C. Talbot explained that presence was removed because it is not related to student evaluation. The goal of the IPESA is to set guidelines for student achievement. Presence could be included in a Code of Student Conduct. Presence is not typically in an IPESA.

C. St-Laurent-Pedneault, on the question of removing 20% on a late assignment, commented that English has proposed this but Social Science is not in agreement. Can a compromise be reached?

C. Talbot clarified that a department can request an exception to this requirement. There is an article that allows for one department to have an exception to this provision.

C. St-Laurent-Pedneault still did not feel that the IPESA was ready; he asked for clarification about the exception.

C. Talbot explained that the exception applies to the department – all courses within one department.

C. St-Laurent-Pedneault dislikes the wide discretion given to the Academic Advisor when determining legitimate absences. He would like this to be codified.

P. Bleau thought that a recommendation was not far away but thought that it's tough to recommend at this point because it is the end of the year and because of COVID. He proposes recommendation in September.

P. Bleau asked when the Student Code of Conduct is planned to be completed.

C. Talbot explained that a Code of Student Conduct is not being developed at this point.

A-A. Giguère respectfully disagreed with the position that a student presence requirement for 10% of the final mark should not be in the IPESA. Regarding removing 20% of a grade for a late assignment, she questioned whether the exception cited by C. Talbot is the appropriate way of resolving this question. She thought that different departments with different approaches might cause problems. Finally, to recommend she needs to feel that all the departments have been appropriately consulted.

M. Huard would like a partial list of legitimate excuses for absences. Also, with regards to section 4.9.1. he thinks that a word is missing. He supports his colleagues on the Commission and would not like to recommend at this time.

C. Talbot thinks a list of acceptable absences could be worked on in the fall. She clarified again that an IPESA is a policy on evaluation. She thought that the guidelines (acceptable absences) should not be included in the IPESA. But, rather, they could exist outside the IPESA.

G. Dröge-Grondin appreciated the openness regarding the creation of guidelines. She felt regardless that student presence is stumbling block; regardless of the explanation provided, she would still like it in the IPESA.

C. St-Laurent-Pedneault agreed with C. Talbot that guidelines regarding legitimate absences should be in the Student Code of Conduct. He re-iterated his view that legitimate absence (guidelines) should be codified and that the decision should not fall to the Academic Advisor and the Dean (by appeal). He expressed reservations on accepting the IPESA as is. But re-iterated that he doesn't think we are far from a consensus.

G. Dröge-Grondin proposed the following motion:

Whereas in a difficult year of online teaching and meetings there was not enough time to properly consult departments;

Whereas not all faculty members can be present at today's meeting;

Whereas the presented IPESA is still not satisfactory in a number of aspects;

Whereas the majority of faculty members on the Commission of Studies are also department and/or program coordinators who have to deal with a last-minute problematic change in the scheduling structure;

Whereas the rescheduling of the adoption of the new IPESA in the fall would create a more favorable environment for its adoption;

Whereas the rescheduling of the adoption of the new IPESA in the fall would allow the creation of an adequate complaints policy which would avoid bringing the IPESA back to the table for amendments very soon after the initial adoption;

Whereas the rescheduling of the adoption of the new IPESA in the fall would allow the incorporation of a policy concerning presence in class;

Be it resolved that the adoption of the new IPESA be postponed to the fall semester 2021.

MOVED BY G. Dröge-Grondin
SECONDED BY C. St-Laurent-Pedneault

E. Berryman called a vote

10 voted in favor (Aye)
5 opposed the motion (No)
15/15 people voted.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH 10/15 VOTES IN FAVOR.

4. Varia

There was no Varia item.

5. Adjournment

C. Nadeau moved for the meeting to be adjourned. The motion was carried unanimously.
The meeting was adjourned.