

DATE: 17 October 2016
TO: Executive of Council
FROM: Glenys Sylvestre, University Secretary
RE: Meeting of 26 October 2016

A meeting of Executive of Council is scheduled for 26 October 2016, 2:30-4:30 p.m. in AH 527. As per Section 4.6.2 of the Council Rules and Regulations, meetings shall be closed except to persons invited to attend and members of Council who choose to attend as guests.

AGENDA

1. **Approval of the Agenda**
2. **Approval of the Minutes of Meeting 28 September 2016** - *circulated with the Agenda*
3. **Business Arising from the Minutes**
4. **Remarks from the Chair**
5. **Report of the University Secretary**
6. **Reports from Committees of Council**
 - 6.1 Council Committee on Academic Mission, Appendix I, pp. 2 - 8
 - 6.2 Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Studies, Appendix II, pp. 9- 12
7. **Graduand Lists**
 - 7.1 Graduand Lists for Approval - Omnibus Motion – *circulated at the meeting - please return all copies*
 - 7.1.1 Centre for Continuing Education
 - 7.1.2 Faculty of Business Administration
8. **Reports from Faculties and Other Academic Units**
 - 8.1 Arts
 - 8.2 Business Administration
 - 8.3 Education
 - 8.4 Engineering and Applied Science
 - 8.5 Graduate Studies and Research
 - 8.6 Kinesiology and Health Studies
 - 8.7 Media, Art, and Performance
 - 8.8 Nursing
 - 8.9 Science
 - 8.10 Social Work
 - 8.11 Centre for Continuing Education
 - 8.12 La Cité universitaire francophone
 - 8.13 Library
 - 8.14 Federated Colleges
 - 8.14.1 Campion College
 - 8.14.2 First Nations University of Canada
 - 8.14.3 Luther College
9. **Other Business**
 - 9.1 Congress 2018 Discussion Item
10. **Adjournment**

COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MISSION
REPORT TO EXECUTIVE OF COUNCIL

Item for Discussion

Subject: Updates to the Academic Unit Reviews Policy, OPS-130-005

Recommendation: That the Academic Unit Reviews Policy, OPS-130-005 be updated as outlined in Appendix I of the agenda.

Rationale: The Council Committee on Academic Mission (CCAM) recommended changes to the Academic Unit Reviews (AUR) policy, OPS-130-005 at their 6 October 2016 meeting. As this is the first set of AURs to follow this new policy, CCAM recognized the need to update the AUR schedule to reflect a more realistic timeline.

The new timeline will reflect the following changes:

August/September (was July): Unit provides CCAM a verbal response to unit review

October (no change): Unit submits a formal written response to the unit review to CCAM

November (was October): CCAM provides a formal written response to the reviewed unit

These policy changes are attached as Appendix I, Pages 3-8 of the agenda.

Date: 12 October 2016

Prepared By: Bryanna Butz

On Behalf of: Council Committee on Academic Mission

Academic Unit Reviews

Number: OPS-130-005
Audience: All University Employees
Issued: June 28, 2000
Revised: December 19, 2013; November 18, 2014; [26 October 2016](#)
Owner(s): Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Approved by: President and Vice-Chancellor
Contact: Provost and Vice-President (Academic) - 306-585-4384

Introduction

The fundamental purpose for academic unit reviews is to provide information, both qualitative and quantitative, and recommendations that can serve as a basis for innovation and improvement. Reviews should identify strengths and weaknesses, stimulating program development and revision. In a broad sense, the reviews will lead to more focused planning to address teaching and supervision, research opportunities, and unit infrastructure and administration.

Academic unit reviews may be at the departmental level, at the faculty level for non-departmentalized faculties, or across departments and faculties for programs that are interdisciplinary in character. As key academic units, the Library and the Centre for Continuing Education will also be reviewed.

These reviews will focus on the following areas:

- the priorities and aspirations of each unit and the extent to which they are being realized
- the challenges and opportunities faced by the unit
- the structure and quality of undergraduate and graduate programs and instruction
- the contribution of each program to related disciplines and fields of study
- the scope and significance of research being pursued
- the degree to which academic programs meet students' learning needs and goals
- the characteristics of staffing complements
- the degree to which the unit is meeting its internal and external service responsibilities
- the role the unit plays in meeting the University's vision, mission, goals and priorities
- the financial resources of the unit

Definitions

- **CCAM** – Council Committee on Academic Mission

Policy

Regular Academic Unit Reviews are required of all academic units to ensure that effectiveness and efficiency are maintained in line with the University Strategic Plan.

Review Coordination

The coordination of all unit reviews is the responsibility of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) working in partnership with the Council Committee for Academic Mission (CCAM), the Dean of the faculty, and the unit under review. The recommendations of the Committee on the basis of the review process are advisory. Specifically, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and [CCAM](#) will:

- In consultation with Deans' Council, develop a schedule for reviews
- Receive, review and comment on the self-study report
- Appoint the review team
- Develop terms of reference for the review team
- Receive and transmit the report of the review team
- Meet with the Dean and unit head to discuss the report and the unit's response
- Receive the unit's implementation plan
- Report regularly to Executive of Council on the status of reviews
- Identify issues of university-wide concern and make recommendations concerning them to appropriate bodies or individuals

Consequences for Noncompliance

Academic units that do not engage in the cycle of Academic Unit Review will not contribute to the University's continued pursuit of improvement in programming. Ongoing disregard of the need for program review will impact the University's long term viability.

Processes

Review Process

Initiation

Reviews take place in the framework of a 10-year cycle. Where applicable, unit reviews should be scheduled to coincide with (re-)accreditation, and with the review or 5-year update of closely related units.

Time Frame

The review process is typically completed over a 16-month period as indicated below. The responsibilities of the Provost's Office and the Unit under review are indicated. In the case of reviews of the library and large non-departmentalized faculties, alternate time frames may be considered.

	CCAM / PROVOST'S OFFICE	UNIT
October	Meeting between VPA and unit (and dean for departmental units)	
		Submit six names of potential external reviewers
November	Coordinate site visit and make travel arrangements	Compile self study
December		
January		
February		Submit self study
March	Send letters to individuals, groups, etc. requesting input into unit review	Provide contact list of individuals or groups that may be interested in providing input into unit review
	Make general announcements to university community requesting input into unit review at 5 and 2 weeks prior to review	
	Develop itinerary for external reviewers (2 weeks)	Develop site visit schedule
	Send notice of site visit to Dean's council, CCAM, UR International, AVP Student Affairs inviting input (2 weeks)	
April	Send itinerary and daily schedule to Review team members (2 days)	Site visit
	Send memorandum to Review team, Dean, VP Research, Dean FGSR	
May		
June	Unit review report received from Chair of Review team	
July/August/September		Meet with CCAM and give verbal response to unit review
October	Provide a formal written response to the reviewed unit	Submit a formal written response to unit review to Provost's office and CCAM.
November	Provide a formal written response to the reviewed unit	
15 to 18 months		Meet with CCAM to discuss progress on implementation of recommendations (Dean for Faculty reviews or Department head and dean for

		department reviews)
5 years		Submit 5-year update to CCAM

Unit Self-Study

Self-studies should involve all members of the unit. The self-study should address such aspects as the history, current status, pending changes, budget, future prospects and opportunities of the unit. Strengths and limitations of the program(s) under review are critically examined. Although the procedures to do so are for the members of the unit to determine, as many as possible should participate in examining pending changes and future prospects and opportunities. Many program areas in arts, sciences, and fine arts have faculty members in the federated colleges. It is essential that these members participate in the development of the self-study.

The most successful reviews are assisted by reports that are clearly written, and complete but concise. The quality of the self-study report is enhanced if a small steering group is responsible for its preparation and drafts are circulated to all members for comment. In general, the focus for the self-study should be a frank and balanced consideration of both strengths and areas for improvement, and strategies for future change. It is also essential that the self-study take into consideration the larger institutional issues and the vision, mission, goals and priorities of the University. The result of the self-study is a report that serves as a primary document for the external unit review team. Members of CCAM are available to provide advice on the development of the self-study if requested.

CCAM has developed a template for the unit self study and requests that units use this template. The template contains the following categories:

1. Background – a brief description of the unit, including history and structure
2. Staffing and resources
3. Scholarly output – unit published scholarly output and/or professional creative activity over the last ten years, with an emphasis on the impact of that scholarship/activity
4. Community Service Initiatives – community service initiatives carried out by your unit or members of your unit
5. Academic Programs, including service teaching, enrolment trends, and student successes
6. Unit Budget
7. SWOT analysis – unit strengths, weakness, opportunities, threats

The report should also contain a profile of the academic staff in an appendix to the main body of the self-study report. It is highly recommended that the members adopt a uniform and brief format that summarizes the important information from each member's curriculum vitae. CCAM has also prepared a template for academic curricula vitae.

Self-studies will be augmented by data from the Office of Resource Planning including enrolments, teaching credit hours, grants and contracts, space, budget, staff and faculty numbers. Additional material such as University planning documents and calendars will be provided. The goal is to provide the

reviewers with sufficient information to have a broad understanding both of the unit and the context in which it operates. (Note that in the case of the Library, alternate data and information will be necessary.)

Review Team Selection

The size of the review team will be determined by the size and complexity of the unit under review. Typically, the review team will consist of four members. Two of these members, including the chair, will be well-respected, impartial experts in the particular discipline or area chosen from other universities. The other two members will be chosen from the University of Regina community, one representing a closely related discipline or area, and the other representing the University-at-large. When appropriate, any one of the four members may be replaced by a representative of a relevant professional association. For small units a review team of two, one internal and one external may be appropriate. Members of the review team should be chosen to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest (see [GOV-022-010 Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment](#)).

The composition of the review team is vital to the success of the process. All members must have credibility both inside and outside the unit under review. The unit is requested to submit six external and two internal review team nominees to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). A brief statement rationalizing the external nominee choices must accompany the submission.

Terms of Reference

The expectation of the review team is that they will provide an opinion about the strengths and weaknesses of the unit's teaching, research and service programs. This will include an assessment of the numbers and diversity of academic and non-academic staff and their responsibilities, the resources provided, the effectiveness of the unit's organization, the quality of the working environment, the relations of the unit to others, the quality of educational opportunities provided to students—both graduate and undergraduate, and the effectiveness of the evaluation methods used to gauge student and program success. The review team is expected to offer recommendations for improvement and innovation.

As members of a research institution, our faculty and students are expected to contribute to the advancement of knowledge in their particular field of study. It is essential that the review team provide an opinion about the quality of the research and scholarly activities of the program, and the effectiveness of the relationships between teaching and research, particularly at the graduate level.

In addition, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) working with CCAM, the Dean of the faculty and the unit under review will identify specific issues to be addressed by the review team.

Site Visit

The review team for a particular review will meet at the University for an appropriate period of time, normally two days, and prepare a comprehensive report on the unit reviewed. It will consult widely in the preparation of this report with academic and administrative staff, students, administrators and alumni involved with the programs and activities of the unit under review. Departmental faculty from the federated colleges will be invited to participate in the process.

Typically, the review team's time will provide opportunities for consultation within the academic unit (faculty, staff and students); members of the University administration; and other individuals inside and outside of the University who influence or who are influenced by the activities of the unit, and graduates of the program. Particular efforts must be made to ensure student participation. The on-site consultations commence with a working dinner hosted by the University administration and end with an exit interview with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), the Vice-President (Research), the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and the Dean of the faculty.

The visit of the review team is to be advertised widely to the University community with an invitation for those who have a vested interest in the program(s) to contribute a written brief to the team which is normally submitted through the Chair of CCAM, prior to an advertised date. Such briefs are for use by the review team and will be held in confidence by the members of the review team.

The schedule of interviews during the visit will be developed by the unit under review with appropriate input from the office of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic).

Report

While preparing the report, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), the Vice-President (Research), the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and the Dean of the faculty, will be available to provide any additional information requested. The findings and recommendations of the review team should be presented in the form of a brief, concise, written report (with an executive summary) which will be received by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) on behalf of CCAM. Provided that matters of individual sensitivity or confidentiality are handled with appropriate discretion, the report (in its entirety) will be made available to the Dean, the unit under review, CCAM and other interested parties. Normally, the report will be considered a public document and at the completion of the review process will be available, along with the unit's response, to members of Executive of Council.

Response and Implementation

On receipt of the report the members of the unit will meet in committee for discussion. The Dean and the unit head will then meet with CCAM to review the report. Based on the report, comments received from CCAM and any University planning and priority documents, the unit will then prepare a response. The response will address the issues raised and clearly outline priorities, and future directions and initiatives for the unit over the next three to five years. As such it should be prepared in close partnership with the Dean. The response will be transmitted to CCAM which may comment on it. The response and any comments from CCAM will inform the faculty's long-term planning. The Provost and Vice-President (Academic) will provide a formal written response to the report from the unit.

Follow-up

Five years after the review (and mid-way before the next review) CCAM will initiate a follow-up with the unit. The unit will be invited to prepare and submit a brief report in which members of the unit comment on the consequences of the review and initiatives undertaken in response to it and respond to any comments from CCAM. In particular they will be asked to describe initiatives and plans for the coming three to five years until the next review takes place. The follow-up will be reported to Executive of Council and the report and any comments from CCAM will be made available on request.

Related Information

- [GOV-022-010 Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment](#)
- Academic CV Template
- Academic Unit Review Self Study Report Template

**REPORT TO
EXECUTIVE OF COUNCIL MEETING
October 26, 2016
FROM THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE
ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS AND STUDIES**

1. ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

The Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Studies met on October 11, 2016, and has approved the following curriculum, program and policy changes, and hereby recommends them for approval.

1.1 Joint Motion from Enrolment Services and the Faculty of Nursing

MOTION 1: Revision of Restrictions on Transfer Regulations

To revise Section 15.2.1 Restrictions on Transfer as outlined below, effective for the 201730 admission intake.

15.2.1 RESTRICTIONS ON TRANSFER

Applicants ~~wishing to~~ ~~for~~ transfer to the Faculty of Nursing SCBScN program from another faculty, or wishing admission from another post-secondary institution, must apply to the program and meet admission requirements as per §2.4.2 of the University policies on Admission, Re-Admission and Transfer. ~~Transfer applicants who are not in good academic standing will not be considered for admission. Transfer applicants who are registered in post-secondary courses at the time of admission, may be granted conditional acceptance; however, final admission will be contingent on meeting the final admission requirements. Transfer applicants who are on Faculty level or University level probation will not be considered for admission.~~

(end of Motion 1)

Rationale: At the current time, the definition of “good academic standing” that is used for admission purposes at the U of R is the ability to register for courses. Therefore, by using this definition, a student who is on either faculty level probation (ie. a PGPA below a specified level) or university level probation (a UGPA of < 60%) but has completed less than the number of credit hours needed to raise the appropriate average to avoid RTD or MW is considered to be in good academic standing and would be eligible to transfer to the Faculty of Nursing. A student who is admitted with this low of an average will be at significant risk of being unsuccessful in the SCBScN program.

1.2 Faculty of Nursing

MOTION 2: Addition to Faculty Academic Performance Regulations

To approve the revision to Section 15.5.2.2 Evaluation of Academic Performance regulations by adding the following (effective 201710).

15.5.2.2 Faculty Academic Performance Regulations

Students in the SCBScN program must maintain an overall PGPA of at least 65% in required program courses. Students who do not meet these minimum program requirements will be placed on faculty academic probation. If placed on faculty academic probation, students are given 15 credit hours to raise their overall PGPA in required courses to 65%. Students in this situation must realize their progression in the program may be affected because of course sequencing. Completion of the program may be delayed. The Academic Program Coordinator (UofR) may impose mandatory conditions on students on university or faculty academic probation. Students who fail to raise their PGPA to 65% in required courses, will be required to discontinue from the Faculty of Nursing for a minimum of three semesters and must petition for readmission. Readmission is not guaranteed. Faculty probation and RTD letters are sent by email to the student's uregina email in May, September, and January. When RTDs are assessed, they are effective immediately.

The passing grade for all CNUR courses is 60%. The passing grade for all other courses used in the program is 50%. Students who are not successful in meeting the minimum grade in a second attempt of a course that is a requirement in the program will be required to discontinue from the Faculty of Nursing for a minimum of three semesters. An exception to this regulation is ENGL 100, which may be repeated twice (see §§5.11 and 5.12.6.6 for more information). A withdrawal from any clinical course that occurs after the end of the no-record drop period is considered an attempt. Students must demonstrate satisfactory clinical and laboratory performance in courses where clinical and/or laboratory experience is required. Failure to demonstrate adequate clinical or laboratory performance constitutes a failure in the course, regardless of numerical grades achieved on other assessment tools used in that course. In such a case, all aspects of the course must be repeated. A student may be removed from clinical practice or laboratory, and/or barred from writing the final examination for persistent nonattendance/ lateness or unsafe clinical practice. If such action is initiated by the program, the student will not be able to voluntarily withdraw from the course where the removal occurred. Students who have been so disbarred will receive a failing grade in the course and will be required to repeat the course. Students who fail a clinical course for these reasons may have conditions that must be met prior to being registered in another clinical course. For further information regarding grading and types of GPA calculation, refer to §5.9.

A student will be required to discontinue from the Faculty of Nursing for failure to meet a program requirement or for a second failure in a mandatory course for the program. A student who is readmitted after having previously been required to discontinue (RTD) under the Faculty of Nursing regulations or forced to withdraw from the university (MW)

and who is again required to discontinue will be required to discontinue indefinitely from the Faculty.

Students may be required to discontinue from their program of studies when the student is found to be unsuited for the profession of nursing, through consideration of competence or professional fitness as per the Professional Suitability Policy. See the policy in the SCBScN Student Handbook.

(end of Motion 2)

Rationale: This provides clarification for students about the expected time for the Faculty probation and RTD letters to be sent to students' emails. It also provides clarification about the consequences of being RTD a second time. This is current practice; this addition simply provides transparency.

MOTION 3: Revision to the Academic Advising and Registration regulations

To revise the Academic Advising and Registration regulations by adding the following to the Section 15.4.2 Registration regulations effective for the 201710 term.

15.4.2 REGISTRATION

The Faculty of Nursing will register students in required courses. Registration for open elective courses will commence on the days stipulated by the Registrar's Office. Students should consult *UR Self-Service*.

Students who do not have their risk management documents (as required) submitted by the following dates will not be registered in a clinical course for the upcoming term:

April 1 for Spring/Summer term

August 1 for Fall term

December 1 for Winter term

(end of Motion 3)

Rationale: This is current practice and is currently located in the student handbook. Adding it to the calendar will increase the visibility of the information to students by having it present in both places. The information in the student handbook will be enhanced from this to identify the specific risk management documents required for specific courses. Having the specifics in the student handbook rather than in the calendar will provide for ease of changes that arise due to requirements of health care agencies. Health care agencies require the completion of the risk management components (such as CPR, TLR, Fit testing) in order for students to be in the clinical setting. When we wait till later in the term to remove students from clinical courses because they have not completed one of these requirements, the clinical agencies are becoming upset that the changes are made so late and close to the time of the beginning of the experience. We are at risk that they may refuse a clinical placement. This will significantly affect the program as we have just enough placements for our students. We also find that students have actually completed the requirements earlier (sometimes months) but have just not submitted the documentation.

Motion 4: Revision to Time Limit Regulations

To revise Section 15.6.1 Time Limit regulations as outlined below effective for the 201710 term.

15.6.1 TIME LIMITS

Students not actively enrolled in nursing courses for three consecutive semesters who wish to return to the SCBScN program must re-apply for admission to the program. Credit for nursing courses successfully completed will be given if the course was taken within seven (7) years of admission into the program. Students may be required to repeat a ~~clinical~~ one or more courses if more than one (1) year has passed since the student last completed a clinical course.

(end of Motion 4)

Rationale: Students may need to repeat more than one course (including non-clinical courses) if a significant amount of time has passed between clinical courses – ie assessment or pharmacology courses. The purpose of this repetition is to ensure that the student has the content needed to be successful in the clinical course. As it is currently written, students have challenged any requirement to repeat more than one course.

Prepared by:
Coby Stephenson
Registrar's Office

On behalf of:
Adrian Pitariu
Chair

October 14, 2016