MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS AND STUDIES HELD THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2008 AT 10:00 A.M. IN THE BOARDROOM, AD/HUM FIFTH FLOOR

PRESENT: Katherine Arbuthnott, Janelle Bennette, Lynn Cavanagh (Chair), Judy Chapman, Sean Dunham, Karen Finnsson, Dawn Flood, Nick Forsberg, Mary Jesse, Richard Kleer, Bev Liski (Recording Secretary), Jennifer Love-Green (for Harold Riemer), Brien Maguire, Annette Revet, David Senkow (for Glenys Sylvestre), Satish Sharma, Jeannette Teece (for Ruth Chambers), Florence Watson

REGRETS: None

GUESTS: Donalda Kozlowski, Jason Vogelsang, and Steve Weild (Registrar’s Office); Michelle Beitel and Diane Lundine (Student Development Centre); Bonnie Dobson (Faculty of Science); D'arcy Renwick (University Secretariat)

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Jesse - Forsberg

moved approval of the agenda as distributed. CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF LAST MEETING, June 13, 2008

Chapman – Arbuthnott

moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of June 13, 2008 with the correction as noted in item 2.1 of the agenda material. CARRIED

3 BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

The motion pertaining to the Faculty of Arts Revision to the Criteria for Calculation of Honours Averages, as contained in point 5 of Item 5.1 of the June 13, 20008 CCUAS minutes was defeated by Executive of Council at its meeting held June 25th. Executive’s concern related to the implications of disregarding unrepeated failed courses in calculating averages for the Honour’s Major GPA Graduation Requirements.

It was questioned whether other faculties follow a similar format for calculating grades for honours programs as was proposed by the Faculty of Arts. Fine Arts and Kinesiology both indicated this is the procedure they follow. Only classes that pertain to the Honours program are used for calculation of the GPA.

If a course used towards a program was failed, why would it not count? The failed course would have to be repeated and passed, therefore only the passing grade should be used in the calculation.

It was suggested that the motions should be submitted separately and might stand a better chance of passing.

Students graduate based on a program gpa not on a cumulative gpa. The Honours major gpa is no different than the program gpa.

Could the honours program include another major or minor? Yes.

Kleer – Sharma

moved that the two motions be resubmitted to Executive of Council as items for consideration under Business Arising from the Minutes. CARRIED
4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Report from Academic Schedule Sub-committee

A report from the Academic Schedule Sub-committee will be distributed for information to the next meeting. It is intended that the motions contained therein will not be voted on but will be presented for discussion and voted on at a subsequent meeting.

4.2 Report from the Registrar’s Office re: Bachelor of Health Studies Hood Color Correction

Following discussion of the report contained in Appendix I, page 3 of the agenda material, the committee affirmed that the hood color for the Bachelor of Health Studies was as presented, that is: ultra white outside trim, shamrock green inside trim, and silver cord. AGREED

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Report from the Faculty of Engineering

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

1. Engineering Admission from Canadian Universities and Colleges (Including Transfer from other University of Regina Facilities

Sharma – Maguire

moved to revise the additional requirements for students transferring into Engineering 2008-2009 Undergraduate Calendar, page 15, Section 2.4.2, as detailed in Appendix II, page 4 of the agenda material.

Two corrections were noted. The motion should reflect that students are admitted to programs. It should also indicate that this does not apply to the Environmental Health Science program.

The motion should read as follows:

moved to revise additional requirements for students transferring into Engineering programs, 2008-2009 Undergraduate Calendar, page 15, Section 2.4.2 as follows. Note: This does not apply to the Environmental Health Science program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY OF PROGRAM</th>
<th>REQUIREMENTS BY FACULTY</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING (U of R)</td>
<td>Applicants must meet high school admission requirements (see §2.4.1) with a minimum 70% average, and must also have a minimum GPA of 60% on all post-secondary courses attempted. See also §13.2.</td>
<td>Applicants who have failed more than 15 credit hours of university courses are not admissible except by permission of the Faculty. Applicants who have failed a core requirement of the Faculty of Engineering after the maximum number of repeat attempts are not admissible except by permission of the Faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion was called on the Sharma-Maguire motion with the corrections as noted. CARRIED
2. Evaluation of Academic Performance

Sharma – Kleer

moved to revise the following academic performance regulation, 2008-2009 Undergraduate Calendar, page 165, Section 13.5.2.1 to include:

Students on faculty probation who achieve the 60.00% TGPA but who still have a PGPA of less than 60.00% will remain on faculty probation. Students will be reviewed at the end of their next academic semester subject to the faculty probation conditions outlined above. Students will be permitted two continuations of their probationary semesters to increase their PGPA to the required minimum of 60.00%. Failure to achieve this minimum in three probationary semesters will result in a required to discontinue for at least 2 semesters from the Faculty.

Support for the sentiment of the motion was offered but there was a question about the wording. It was suggested the motion should be corrected as follows:

...Students will be permitted two continuations of their additional probationary semesters to increase their PGPA to the required minimum of 60.00%. ... AGREED

The question was called on the Sharma-Kleer motion as corrected. CARRIED

3. Co-operative Internship Program

Sharma – Kleer

moved to approve the Co-operative Education Internship Program.

This motion would formalize what has been offered on a pilot basis.

It was suggested that what is being proposed is not approval of the program but removal of the “Pilot” status.

It was suggested the motion be reworded as follows:

moved that the Co-operative Education Internship Program in the Faculty of Engineering, as detailed in the 2008-2009 Undergraduate Calendar, pages 167 and 168, §13.9.3, and which was previously offered as a pilot project, be approved to be offered on a permanent basis. CARRIED

It was noted the changes proposed in motions 4 – 8 will be effective 200930.

4. Electronic Systems Engineering Program

Sharma – Jesse

moved to revise the ESE Major curriculum as detailed in Appendix II, pages 5 and 6 of the agenda material. CARRIED

5. Environmental Systems Engineering Program

Sharma – Finnsson

moved to revise the EVSE Major curriculum as detailed in Appendix II, pages 7 and 8 of the agenda material. CARRIED
6. Industrial Systems Engineering Program
Sharma – Forsberg
moved to revise the ISE Major curriculum as detailed in Appendix II, pages 8 and 9 of the agenda material. CARRIED

7. Petroleum Systems Engineering Program
Sharma – Teece
moved to revise the PSE Major curriculum as detailed in Appendix II, pages 9 and 10 of the agenda material.

The following corrections were noted:

... Choose three: ENIN 433, ENIN 453, ENIN 456, ENEV 422, ENPE 380, ENPE 470, ENPE 475, ENPE 490  
Humanities Elective (choose one): ENGL 110, PHIL 100, PHIL 241, PHIL 242, PHIL 272, PHIL 273, PHIL 275, RLST 100, WMST 100  

Rationale: i). The new ENGG 330, a numerical methods course will better serve the Petroleum students.  
ii). The newly created ENEV 223 course will be a core required course for all Engineering program majors and is intended to address the engineering science and design as well as complementary studies topics from each of ENGG 103 and ENEV 320, which has been deleted.

The question was called in the Sharma-Teece motion with the corrections as noted. CARRIED

8. Software Systems Engineering Program
Sharma – Revet
moved to revise the SSE Major curriculum as detailed in Appendix II, pages 10 to 12 of the agenda material.

The following corrections were noted:

Core Software:  
ENSE 471, ENSE 473 and  
1 course from the following list  
ENEL 389, ENEL 392, ENEL 395, ENEL 437, ENEL 484, ENEL 486, ENEL 487, ENEL 489, ENEL 494,  
ENEL 495, ENIN 340, ENIN 433, ENIN 440, ENIN 445, ENEV 320, ENEV 334

Rationale: i). The newly created ENEV 223 course will be a core required course for all Engineering program majors and is intended to address the engineering science and design as well as complementary studies topics from each of ENGG 103 and ENEV 320, which has been deleted. ii). CS 250 was taught for the last time in the 2007 Fall semester. Effective 2008 Winter, CS 201 is being taught. In consultation with the CS Department, the new CS 201 was created as a replacement for CS 250. iii). The addition of ENSE 350 will cover the software engineering approach to mathematical programming. Both Math and Programming components of this course are essential to the Software Engineering students. The course is important for accreditation as well.

The question was called on the Sharma-Revet motion with the corrections as noted. CARRIED
ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

The new, changed, and deleted courses, as detailed in Appendix II, pages 12 to 16 of the agenda material, were noted for information.

It was agreed to refer ENSE 350 back to the Faculty of Engineering for reconsideration of the course description. Specifically, the concern related to the “Software engineering approach” to mathematics. AGREED

It was noted that ENGG 401, as detailed on page 14 of the agenda material, has a section for Graduate students.

Page 16, point 4, refers to the proposed name change for the Faculty of Engineering to the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. This affects many levels within the University. Not changing the degree name will make things a bit easier. Faculty name changes are not considered by the Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Studies. The name change must have been approved by the Planning and Priorities Committee first before going to Executive of Council and Senate for approval. Would Engineering want to see the change of Faculty name come forward with program changes? No. The Faculty name changes apply to future programs, not the ones approved today.

What is the procedure for approving faculty name changes? They must go to the Planning and Priorities Committee for consideration, approval and then be recommended to Executive of Council for approval.

5.2 Report from Student Development Centre re ACAD 100

Michelle Beitel and Diane Lundine joined the meeting to speak to this item. Michelle reviewed the history behind UNIV 100 and 110, UNIV 101, and now ACAD 100, which has undergone a significant revision from the previous iterations of the UNIV courses.

Kleer – Forsberg

moved to create ACAD 100 as detailed in Appendix III, page 17 of the agenda material and to delete UNIV 101.

Will there be a series of ACAD courses? No.

Because these courses don’t have an academic home, they must be reviewed and approved by CCUAS prior to their being referred to Executive of Council for approval.

If approved, faculties will be asked to review acceptance of ACAD 100 for credit in their degree programs. Arts may consider proposing this course as an alternate to ENGL 100.

Who teaches this course? Right now, UNIV 101 is taught by sessional lecturers from a variety of areas, as would ACAD 100. Because it doesn’t have an academic home, it is difficult for faculties to accept it. It is important for someone other than sessionals to teach this course.

Could a section of this be timetabled out of Science? Is this a proprietary course? The intent is that it is not proprietary so the answer is no.

If a student took ACAD in Engineering, would it be accepted by Arts, if the student transferred faculties? This would be a decision of the Faculty of Arts.
If ACAD 100 were a possible replacement for ENGL 100, is ENGL 100 mandatory for all programs? ENGL 100 is not a mandatory course for all programs but it is a component of all programs. Would ACAD 100 be equivalent to ENGL 100? No.

Right now ENGL 100 has a different repeat permission than other courses. If a student failed ENGL 100 more than 3 times, could they take ACAD 100 in its place? No.

Could this be tailored for programs? Yes.

The shift in design of this course is deliberate. It is intended for first semester students. The academic limit is 25. There are lots of opportunities for students to tailor the content to their program.

Can it be stated that it would be accepted but only if it were taken in the first or second year? Fourth year students cannot take this course.

Kinesiology is using the hybrid course as a replacement for ENGL 100 on a test basis.

The question was called on the Kleer-Forsberg motion. CARRIED

5.3 Discussion re RTD Policy – Rick Kleer and Brien Maguire

There are some problems with the way the RTD policy works. It is intended to be a ‘wake up’ call for students who, if they don’t address their performance, could end up in disaster.

There needs to be a review of when an RTD is initiated and the possibility of extending a probationary period for students who are doing well.

Reference was made to the Strategic Enrolment plan and the possibility of adopting the University of Alberta’s fresh start program, which has been very successful for students who have been doing poorly.

The RTD policy needs to be reviewed by the CCUAS and the regulations governing undergraduate GPAs. Graduation is based on the PGPA. Many students don’t meet the UGPA but graduate based on their PGPA. Conflicts are created where none need to exist. A way needs to be found to get students to be productive and successful.

Chapman – Arbuthnott

moved creation of a sub-committee to review the university’s RTD policy. The following individuals agreed to serve: Judy Chapman, Annette Revet, and Rick Kleer. There should be a member from FN Univ.

Would the sub-committee explore beyond academic averages? Yes.

Judy agreed that she would work with Brien Maguire and Annette Revet regarding a proposed structure and goals for presentation at the next meeting.

AGREED

6. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

6.1 Report from Registrar’s Office re Proof of Citizenship Procedure

The report on the proposed change in procedures for proof of citizenship was reviewed. Jason Vogelsang, Associate Registrar, Admissions, was present at
the meeting to speak to this item. He indicated that this will speed up admissions for a small group of students. Admissions will rely on a declaration by the student. Students will be clearly aware of the consequences if there is a false declaration.

Who would handle an RTD based on academic misconduct? Should this be non-academic misconduct? It is now defined as academic misconduct. The Associate Registrar, Admissions, would work with the Associate Deans, the faculty and the University Secretary.

6.2 Report from Registrar’s Office re Approval of Hoods for New Degrees

The report on approval of hoods for new degrees was reviewed. It was suggested that this matter should be referred to the Joint Committee of Senate and Council on Ceremonies for review. AGREED

6.3 2008 Fall Meeting Schedule

The fall meeting schedule was reviewed for information.

7. CONCLUSION

The meeting concluded at 11:50 a.m.