



Information for Instructors - Undergraduate

Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science

Fall 2023-24

This document summarizes some key information and policies that are most relevant to instructors of undergraduate courses in the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science. It is intended as an aid to instructors and does not replace the relevant calendar regulations and other policies to which reference is made when appropriate.

1. Key dates

Important dates for the semester are listed in the appropriate [University Diary](#). Some important dates to be aware of are as follows.

- **First day of lectures:** Wednesday, September 6, 2023.
- **Last day of lectures:** Monday, December 4, 2023.
- **Examinations period:** December 7-15, 2023. See 1.1.2 below.
- **Last day to drop** courses without academic prejudice: Tuesday, October 31, 2023. General regulation [6.7.6 Correction and Return of Student Work](#) requires that graded work worth 20% of the course grade be *returned* to students by this date.
- **Semester break** days (no lectures): October 9 – 10, 2023.
- **Statutory holidays** (no lectures): October 2, 2023, and November 13, 2023.
- Lectures will follow an **alternate day schedule:** October 4, 2023 – Monday schedule; October 12, 2023 – Tuesday schedule; November 17, 2023 – Monday schedule.

2. Course syllabus and evaluations

General regulation [6.7.2 Course Syllabus](#) requires that the course syllabus, including the method of evaluation and deadlines, be made available to students before the end of the first week of the semester. Normally this should be provided on the course Brightspace page, but could alternatively be provided on paper or via @mun.ca e-mail. The syllabus must also be provided to the academic unit (Department or Undergrad office). As part of the FEAS Continuous Improvement process (see section 4), we have a [standard syllabus template](#) that includes the required information as well as details about how the course relates to the CEAB Graduate Attributes (GA) and GA indicators, so instructors are encouraged to use this template. The reviewed syllabus for previous offerings of the course should be available from the Department or relevant instructors. The course description is taken directly from the university calendar and cannot be changed without Senate approval through the appropriate Department and Faculty



committees. The Department Curriculum Committee reviews the GA indicators, so they should only be changed with approval from that committee.

1.1. Evaluations

The overall method of evaluation for a course is a decision of the academic unit (General regulation [6.7.1 Method of Evaluation](#)), so an individual instructor should not make substantial changes from approved past practice without consulting with the Department Curriculum Committee.

The schedule of evaluations should be fixed at the start of the semester and clearly communicated in the course syllabus. See [6.7.3 Scheduling of Parts of the Evaluation](#) regarding regulations concerning the schedule of evaluations, in particular:

- Evaluations generally cannot extend beyond normal class/laboratory time without prior approval from the Associate Dean (Undergraduate Studies).
- No evaluation can take place or be due in the last two weeks of lectures or between the end of lectures and the start of the exam period. Exceptions to this are for laboratory exams, project presentations and term/project reports that are assigned in advance of the last two weeks and made known in the course syllabus.

As mentioned above, General regulation [6.7.6 Correction and Return of Student Work](#) requires that graded work worth 20% of the course grade must be *returned* to students by the last day to drop without academic prejudice, so components of the evaluation should be scheduled sufficiently in advance of that deadline to allow for grading and return to students.

Changing the schedule by more than one week should occur only in *exceptional* circumstances and requires approval from the unit head, see [6.7.4 Changing the Method of Evaluation](#).

1.1.1. Return evaluated work and release of grades

Graded evaluations, except final evaluations (e.g., final exams or term papers) should be returned to students in a timely manner ([6.7.6 Correction and Return of Student Work](#)) in a manner with due regard to student privacy as discussed in section 2, below.

Course grades and results of final exams should *not* be discussed with students until the Registrar releases them, normally about one week after the end of the exams. To prevent the unintended release of final exam (or final report) grades, these items should be marked as hidden in the Brightspace grade book.

To facilitate departmental promotions meetings, course final grades are required to be submitted about three days before the scheduled release by the Registrar's office. The precise deadlines and schedule for promotion meetings is circulated a few weeks before the end of the semester. Instructors must manage their time to ensure that grading is done in a timely manner.



1.1.2. Final Examinations

Final exams are scheduled by the Registrar's office and may be scheduled at any time during the exam period. Information required for the scheduling of final exams is collected by Adrian Dobre early in each semester. After the schedule is released to students (by the Registrar's office), it is very difficult to change the schedule, so it is important that accurate information is provided in a timely manner. Instructors cannot change the final exam schedule, room assignment or exam format after the schedule is released. Instructors should plan to attend the final exam, and we cannot promise to accommodate instructors' preferences for schedule.

Procedures for the conduct of final exams are outlined in the FEAS policy on [Conduct of Final Exams](#).

1.1.3. Deferred Evaluations

Students absent from an evaluation for acceptable cause may apply to have it deferred (see [FEAS Deferred Evaluations Policy](#)). As noted in general regulation [6.7.2 Course Syllabus](#), the policy regarding alternate evaluation for students who, for acceptable cause, are unable to write the evaluation other than final exams should be included in the course syllabus. While the FEAS policy indicates that, in the case of evaluations other than final exams, a student may apply to have it deferred, it is the purview of the instructor to choose the most appropriate remedy, which may include, for example, deferral of in-class work or alternative allocation of marks as per general regulation [6.7.5 Exemptions from Parts of the Evaluation](#).

For final examinations, applications for deferral must be submitted to the relevant Department Head, using the [deferred examination request form](#).

Deferred final exams are scheduled by the relevant department or the undergraduate office in coordination with instructors and students. It is the instructor's responsibility to ensure that the exam paper and any needed materials are available at the coordinating office no later than the business day *before* the exam is to be written (i.e., if the exam is scheduled on Monday, then the office needs the paper by Friday). Invigilators will be provided for deferred exams, but the instructor should ensure that, as much as possible, they are available during the exam to answer questions if necessary. Grades for deferred exams should be submitted in a timely manner after the exam is written.

2. Privacy

The university's [privacy policy](#) and associated acts require that we protect the privacy of our students and take appropriate measures to ensure the safety of their personal private information. The [Information Access and Privacy \(IAP\) Office](#) offers lots of resources that can help with this.

Instructors will often be in possession of personal private information related to students and must take care not to disclose it either intentionally or otherwise. Some examples of student personal private information are:

- Name and contact information



- Student number (id)
- E-mail address
- Grades
- Registration status
- Any information about accommodations (Blundon Centre)
- Age, sex, gender identity, national or ethnic origin, sexual orientation ...

As a general rule, it is best to use Brightspace or @mun.ca e-mail to communicate with students and to only communicate an individual's own information to them. Do not post personal information publicly (e.g., in e-mail, on a door, or notice board). Do not leave documents with private information (e.g., marked assignments, mid-terms etc.) in a public place for students to pick up. Graded materials should be returned directly to the students.

If a privacy breach occurs, either accidentally or unknowingly, we are obligated to report it as soon as it is discovered and take specific actions as detailed in the [Procedure for Managing a Privacy Breach](#).

3. Academic Integrity

It is important that we help our students to understand the importance of academic and professional integrity and that we demonstrate our commitment to it by holding everyone to a high standard. The [FEAS Academic Integrity](#) page provides many helpful resources regarding this as well as links to the relevant policies and regulations. Students should be given clear instructions about specific expectations, for example

- the forms of collaboration (e.g., group work) that are acceptable and unacceptable;
- what aids and resources are permitted to be used both on in-class and take-home work;

General regulation [6.12.3 General Procedure](#) specifies that all instances of academic dishonesty are required to be reported to the unit head. For minor offences, an attempt can be made to reach a suitable resolution at the instructor level, but all major offences should be escalated to the unit level ([6.12.5 Procedures for Resolution of Alleged Academic Offences at the Unit Level](#)), or beyond. Academic dishonesty related to a final exam or other evaluation worth more than 40% of the course grade must be referred to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies (SCUGS) ([6.12.6 Procedures for the Resolution of Alleged Academic Offences by the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies](#)).

4. Continuous Improvement

The Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) of [Engineers Canada](#) mandates that FEAS have a Continuous Improvement (CI) process for our undergraduate programs and that certain data be collected as part of those processes. The departmental Curriculum Committees (CC) are responsible for the CI process for the relevant programs, and the FEAS Curriculum Committee coordinates activities between the departmental CC. Instructors are required to participate in



these processes as specified by the CC (see Article 3.02 (a) and (b) of the MUNFA collective agreement and Article 14.02 (b) of the LUMUN collective agreement).

The CEAB requirements specify twelve Graduate Attributes (GA) that broadly define program expectations, and these are further refined by the relevant CC to a set of *GA Indicators* for each program. The CI process requires that we map the indicators to courses where they are delivered at three levels (Introduced, Developed and Applied) and identify assessment tools that are used to evaluate students' progress on these indicators. These indicators and levels are listed on the course syllabus and should only be revised in consultation with the relevant CC. In many cases, the assessment tools are student grades on particular course items (e.g., a specific report or test), and instructors may be asked to provide the grades for these particular items for all students.