

**Minutes, May 27, 2021**

Regular meeting of the Commission of Studies  
held on May 27, 2021, at 2:00 pm  
By Videoconference

Minutes

MINUTES of a regular meeting of the CEGEP Champlain – St. Lawrence Commission of Studies held by videoconference on May 27, 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
F. Séguin,	General Education 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
-------------	------------------------

**Persons other than Commissioners in attendance**

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

**Quorum attained with 16 of 17 sitting members present.**



Regular meeting of the Commission of Studies  
May 27, 2021, at 2:00 pm  
By Videoconference

### Agenda

1. Opening remarks and confirmation of the quorum
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Adoption of the minutes of the last meetings and business arising
4. Discussion on the draft of the IPESA
5. Information
  - a. Student Success Plan
  - b. Preparation for the fall 2021 semester (COVID)
  - c. CEEC visit
  - d. Business program revision
6. Varia
7. Adjournment

**1. Opening remarks and confirmation of the quorum**

At 2:00 pm quorum was met. The meeting began. E. Berryman welcomed everybody.

**2. Adoption of the agenda**

E. Berryman added an item under 5. Information: 5. e. Bill 96.

It was moved that the agenda be adopted with the abovementioned addition.

MOVED BY C. Nadeau  
SECONDED BY P. Bleau  
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**3. Adoption of the minutes of the last meetings and business arising**

It was moved that the March 31, 2021, minutes be adopted as presented.

MOVED BY C. St-Laurent-Pedneault  
SECONDED BY C. Andrew  
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The April 14, 2021, minutes were then discussed.

M. Huard asked for additional detail to be added to the April 14, 2021, minutes under item 3: prior to the vote, the question was asked whether the Chairman could vote. It was clarified that, according to the regulations in place, the Chairman can vote.

Under item 3, I. Zhang asked that a change be made to an item listed under "Some of the main points stemming from the discussion." She asked that "and requested 7 evaluation days" be changed to "and asked if it was possible to have 7 evaluation days."

Also, under item 3, P. Bleau asked that further detail be added to the first bullet point, making it clear that the Business Department preferred an August 23 start date because a later start date would be better to allow for as many people to be vaccinated as possible - to "get COVID as far behind us as possible."

It was moved that the April 14, 2021, minutes be adopted with the abovementioned changes.

MOVED BY P. Bleau  
SECONDED BY T. Connolly  
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

M. Huard asked about an update on item "5.2. Strat Plan update" in the March 31, 2021, minutes.

E. Berryman explained that management is following up on the SWOT analysis. The main subjects to be brought to all stakeholders for consultation are still being developed. This consultation will take place in the fall. E. Berryman further explained that the adoption of the strategic and student success plans has been delayed to the fall semester.

Regarding item "5.5. Development of the Student Success Plan" in the March 31, 2021, minutes, A-A. Giguère asked about how the statistics will be used.

E. Berryman explained that he will cover this subject during today's meeting under an information item.

#### **4. Discussion on the draft of the IPESA**

A draft of the IPESA was shared in the binder for today's meeting. This version, shared today, is based on extensive consultation. Within the document, changes are in blue and modifications are in red.

E. Berryman opened the floor for comments, discussion, and consultation.

G. Dröge-Grondin had two points

1. She asked about including the policy on student attendance, i.e. the rule which would award students 10% based on attendance. She noted that there is no item regarding attendance of classes within the most recent version of the IPESA.
2. She thought that the two-week period for marking essays and giving essays back to students is too short.

Regarding point number 2, E. Berryman commented that a deadline for returning written work was seen as necessary to provide students with timely feedback.

Regarding point number 1, C. Talbot commented that an attendance policy can exist but doesn't necessarily have to be in the IPESA which is meant to be about evaluation.

On a different subject, M. Huard asked about the production of an appeals and complaints policy, i.e. when it would be produced. He also asked whether the appeals and complaints policy, once drafted, would be brought to the Commission of Studies for its recommendation prior to adoption.

E. Berryman explained that the IPESA needs to be focused on its main objective, evaluation. The proposal is for the appeals and complaints policy to be included in the annex of the IPESA for now. This appeals and complaints policy should not be part of the IPESA even though it is related to the IPESA. The goal is to begin developing the appeals and complaints policy next year. Now, with regards to the question of adoption, the Governing Board approves policies. Whether or not a policy like this would need to be recommended by the Commission of Studies is an open question. The steps that we need to go through will need to be verified.

A-A. Giguère thanked the team drafting the IPESA for implementing the changes requested by her department. Regarding Section 9: Appeals and Complaints, she asked for written assurance that this section will be re-written next year. She expressed the view that any later adoption of this section in the form of a policy or otherwise would need to return to the Commission of Studies for recommendation to the Governing Board. She would like to know when these changes would be made.

On a different subject, C. St-Laurent-Pedneault understands that rules governing absences do not have to be in the IPESA. But he pointed out that, in the IPESA, the Academic Advisor assesses the legitimacy of an absence. He wanted to know: Where are the rules or guidelines that the Academic Advisor must consider when evaluating the legitimacy of an absence?

A. Roussel replied that the Academic Advisor needs discretion when assessing the legitimacy of absences and expressed the view that precise criteria would not be helpful. Regardless, he suggested that, if guidelines were to be developed, they be included in the Student Success Plan or some other policy – not the IPESA.

C. St-Laurent-Pedneault explained that his main concern is work related absences. This is not acceptable.

A. Roussel agreed.

There was then some further discussion about this topic. It was thought that expectations and requirements should be clear for students. It was pointed out that, in some exceptional situations, work may be an acceptable absence; for example, if a student is in the Army and must complete a work-related requirement that cannot otherwise be rescheduled.

P. Bleau brought attention to points Sections 4.11 and 4.11.1 of the IPESA which are related to internships. He pointed out that internships were a challenge last year and this year. Sometimes, they were replaced by special projects or other accommodations were made. Regardless, he is wondering if it were possible, under special circumstances, to allow for the supervision of interns by a family member. In other words, he wanted to know whether some IPESA sections could be changed to allow for more flexibility in the assigning of supervisors. Furthermore, he thought that internships at a distance (by videoconferencing) should be permitted.

C. Talbot pointed out that the IPESA does not prohibit interns from working remotely. However, it does prohibit an individual from supervising and or evaluating a family member. C. Talbot clarified that the obligation for the College to respect its own IPESA to its fullest was lifted by the government during the pandemic and that, as a result, the College was able to make accommodations to facilitate access to internships during the pandemic.

P. Bleau clarified that according to his understanding of the IPESA an intern can work in a family business but the supervisor or evaluator may not be a family member.

I. Zhang, regarding section 4.3.2 on Summative Evaluation, pointed out the section states that all students in a given group must perform fully in group assignments. This is also mentioned in section 11.1 Students. She expressed the view that there is no way of ensuring that students participate fully and that there are no consequences for non-participation.

C. Talbot explained that this section is purposefully vague. Ultimately, it is up to the teachers, within the context of the assignment, to determine how fully students are engaged in the group work.

I. Zhang, regarding section 4.8 on Final Evaluation, asked why the rules around the scheduling of exams and assignments were changed.

C. Talbot explained that it was changed because the previous version was unclear.

I. Zhang thought that the previous version was clearer.

A-A. Giguère commented. She explained that, in certain courses, the previous wording of the section blocked some courses from completing an evaluation at the end of the session before the exam period.

E. Berryman called for further questions.

I. Zhang, regarding section 4.9.1 on Deadlines, thought that the phrase "calendar days" created ambiguity

Her concern was acknowledged and C. Talbot said she would look into this.

Regarding 11.2 Faculty item j), I. Zhang asked why the phrase was crossed out. She thought that removing the phrase did not make sense when referring to article 4.6.

C. Talbot agreed that the language of 11.2 Faculty item j) and its coherence with other sections and needs to be reviewed.

I. Zhang, regarding sections 4.7 and 4.9, asked why these sections were separate when they appear to be inter-related.

C. Talbot replied that these sections are inter-related. But they are separate because a student may have a problem with a deadline without having a problem related to attending an evaluation.

I. Zhang noted some acronyms in the document that are not explained. For example, Section 11: "GCP."

I. Zhang questioned the wording of the phrase "between 0 and 100" under Final Course grade on page 30 in the glossary.

C. St-Laurent-Pedneault wanted to know if a student were caught cheating and he wanted to award a grade of zero (0), whether he was required to include this in the department guidelines can he simply put it in his course outline.

C. Talbot noted that the material crossed out in Section 6.1.1. should not have been crossed out. She confirmed that students will receive a grade of zero (0) if found cheating.

E. Berryman summarized some of the main points highlighted in the discussion. Regarding the question of the annex, the appeals and complains procedures, he explained that a new policy would be developed.

C. Talbot explained that the IPESA could be adopted as is with the appeals and complaints procedures included in the annex of the IPESA. Eventually, this procedure could be developed into an independent appeals and complaints policy.

E. Berryman explained that we will make the requested changes to the IPESA discussed today. We could then consider recommending the IPESA at a future meeting.

A-A. Giguère, regarding section 9 Appeals and Complaints, questioned how to rephrase the sentence at the top of the section and asked whether or not a timeline should be imposed on the implementation of a policy.

M. Huard asked --- in the event that the IPESA (with an appeals and complaints procedure in the annex) was recommended by the Commission of Studies and then adopted by the Governing Board --- that the Commission of Studies be consulted for its recommendation prior to the removal of the appeals and complaints procedure from the annex.

E. Berryman provided M. Huard with assurances and asked that it be recorded in the minutes.

P. Bleau asked that the minutes show that, according to the IPESA, there is no in person requirement for internships. In other words, an internship may be completed at a distance according to the IPESA.

There were no further comments or discussion.

## **5. Information**

### **5. a. Student Success Plan**

E. Berryman provided an update. We are still working on improving the dashboards. We will be sending you an updated version of the dashboards. The short-term purpose of the dashboards allows for departments to do a self-assessment of student success.

He explained further that, while we are open to feedback and suggestions, we have to remain focused on our objectives and respect a timeline. Furthermore, we are hoping to get some feedback from departments and programs about student success. We want this to be a tool that will be useful in the coming years. Student Success is an integral part of the development goals.

P. Bleau commented: students are stressed about immense workloads; often teachers will add assignments but not remove them; some teachers are overloading students; they may not be aware of the overall workload for students; could we include in the dashboard a function that would allow for student reporting on working hours vis-à-vis estimated workload hours.

E. Berryman thought departments have a role to play in this when approving course outlines.

E. Berryman thought that the idea of a student perspective on workloads is interesting; this has popped up as an issue in the past. He expressed openness to examining this more closely but re-iterated that the departments have a role to play.

### **5. b. Preparation for the fall 2021 semester (COVID)**

Three scenarios are being considered:

1. Full return
2. Partial return
3. Online

We are waiting for guidelines from the Ministry of Education.

I. Zhang asked when students would be given information about the fall semester.

E. Berryman replied that a communication plan is in place.

#### **5. c. CEEC visit**

The CEEC has recently provided management with a verbal report.

Main observations of the CEEC:

- Real engagement for student success
- The good reputation of the college is something employees are committed to
- There is a genuine concern that academics be well supervised (“bien encadrer la pédagogie”); commended for the creation of the position of coordinator of pedagogical and institutional development.
- Our current IPESA is fully deployed
- Annual report from department and programs
- Regular meetings with coordinators
- Programs of studies are well supervised
- Strong special needs sector
- Excellent work done by the Academic Advisor
- We do not have a Student Success Plan but nonetheless deploy numerous measures to support student success
- Dans l'ensemble pour les 2 dimensions : « la gestion est de qualité »

#### **5. d. Business program revision**

The Business program revision process is in its third year.

There are three programs impacted

1. Accounting
2. Gestion de Commerce (Marketing)
3. Bureautique

Changes are expected for Gestion de Commerce and Bureautique. The overall plan is to eliminate these two programs and build a new general business program.

Steps for program revision

1. Analyse de profession
2. Analyse de la profession complémentaire (this step is underway)
3. Projet de formation; defines the foundations of the program; consultations are expected to take place in the fall
4. The first version of the revised program (winter 2022); release of the first version of the program
5. Approval of the program by the ministry
6. Fall 2024 or Fall 2025 are expected mandatory implementation dates for the program; fall 2025 is thought to be more realistic

It's a long process. Competencies have not yet been defined.



### **5. e. Bill 96**

E. Berryman summarized some implications of the bill. Students would have to do a *Preuve uniforme de française* exam instead of the English Exit Exam (EEE).

We would need to build a structure to prepare some students for the *Epreuve uniforme de française*.

A-A. Giguère pointed out that more than one French course is required to prepare students for the *Preuve uniforme de française* exam.

M. Huard asked about the Ministry's timeline for implementation.

E. Berryman explained that there is a parliamentary commission in the fall. The adoption of the bill would be in the winter. We expect it to impact Fall 2022 admissions.

### **6. Varia**

There were no items under Varia.

### **7. Adjournment**

C. St-Laurent-Pedneault moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was unanimously carried. The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.