PRESENT: Katherine Arbuthnott, Blaide Boehmer (for Janelle Bennett), Lynn Cavanagh (Chair), Ruth Chambers, Nick Forsberg, Richard Kleer, Donalda Kozlowski (Recording Secretary), Bev Liski, Brien Maguire, Annette Revet, Harold Riemer, Satish Sharma, Glenys Sylvestre, Florence Watson, Steve Weild

REGRETS: Mary Jesse

GUESTS: Glenda Good and Jason Vogelsang both of the Registrar's Office

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

   Forsberg - Revet
   
   moved approval of the agenda as distributed with the following addition:

   Add as Item 5.6 Report from Admissions on the High School Math Requirements.

   CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF LAST MEETING – December 4, 2008

   Riemer - Liski
   
   moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of December 4, 2008 as circulated.

   CARRIED

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

   Two items that went forward from CCUAS to Executive of Council were amended.

   1. The word “respective” was removed from the motion regarding the BHS minors.
   2. ARTS 007 and BUS 007 were not removed from the BHS program as this motion did not pass at the Faculty of KHS meeting.

   In order to simplify matters at Executive of Council, no motions are to be brought to CCUAS until they have been approved at the faculty level.

4. OLD BUSINESS

   4.1 Report from the Academic Schedule Subcommittee.

   Recommendations 2 through 9 were deferred from the December meeting.
   CCUAS members are not prepared to vote on any of the recommendations at this time. Upon review of the minutes it was noted that Recommendation #1 was presented and defeated. There was an additional motion to have the Registrar’s Office move forward on the study and testing of the proposed new class schedule template. This has not yet been done due to time constraints and movement of staff.

   Recommendations 2 through 9 can stand on their own without waiting for resolution to Recommendation #1.
It is still unclear what problem we are attempting to solve. Is the issue the time between classes? Is it class time offerings? We need evidence to prove the schedule will be satisfactory to all faculties.

A proposal was made to defer these discussions until next meeting when everyone has the information before them. Recommendations 2 through 9 are tabled until the next meeting and will be itemized on the next agenda together with the supporting documentation.

Can we put a time frame on testing Recommendation #1? Each faculty should attempt to schedule their own courses in the recommended schedule and see if they fit.

Recommendation #7 refers to investigating software systems. Is this what we are asking the RO to do? Essentially yes. The RO would work to engage all faculties to ensure the system would work for them. It is still unclear as to what we would be achieving. What is the specific goal we are trying to reach? We want a schedule that causes fewer conflicts. We need to test this model to see if it is better than what we already have. What constitutes “better”? We need to know what faculties are having difficulty with. The RO is being asked to continue the work to pin down what are the issues that need to be solved. What we have now does not work for every faculty and they are creating their own schedules. We are looking for something that works for everyone.

There are only 2 out of the 4 original members of the sub-committee left. Judy Chapman’s knowledge cannot be replaced. Should we have additional new members on this committee?

KHS has reviewed the schedule and finds that it provides a lot of flexibility. Judy Chapman attended a meeting with Fine Arts and was able to explain how the schedule would fit their requirements. Does the Biology department need more information on how the proposed schedule would work? Glenys Sylvestre is willing to continue to work on this committee and examine the proposed schedule further.

4.2 Report from the RTD Sub-committee.

The committee has some concerns on how we define movement between the different stages and the RTD processes. It has been mentioned that the Undergraduate 60% UGPA rule after 24 credit hours will be gone.

They are looking at various levels of probation. The first level of probation should be “concern and contact”. If we determine that a student may be in difficulties, they should be contacted. The 2nd level would increase the concern level to a more hands-on approach. There would be a last chance option followed by a short-term RTD or move to a program similar to the U of Alberta’s Fresh Start Program. This program would require the student to identify courses that he/she would take to get where they need to be. A snakes and ladders analogy was used. The student could fall back, but would be given the opportunity to climb back up. If someone is absolutely hopeless, they would be out in the current time frame.
Will students continue to be contacted only by letter? This has caused difficulty in the past when the information is not updated in Banner and letters are sent to old addresses. Can the committee make recommendations on various forms of contact? How do we communicate with and engage the students? One way would be to put holds on their accounts which would encourage the students to get advising.

Currently there are faculty actions and university actions. Will faculties still have some flexibility with their own programs? Resources are a problem.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Report from the Faculty of Arts

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

A. School of Journalism
   Kleer – Maguire
   moved to revise the Pre-Journalism program.  CARRIED

B. Department of Philosophy and Classics
   Kleer - Maguire
   moved to revise the list of courses for each of the areas for Philosophy Majors.
   Can these motions go to Executive of Council for information only? Yes.
   The question was called on Kleer - Maguire motion.  CARRIED

C. Department of Justice Studies
   Kleer - Riemer
   moved to count JS 315 as an optional elective and not to be required of any concentration in the BHJ program.
   Page 12 of the Agenda material was referenced to assist in the explanation of the changes.
   The question was called on Kleer - Riemer motion.  CARRIED
   Kleer – Forsberg
   moved that JS 316 be a required course for the Criminal Justice/Restorative justice concentration.
   Page 12 of the Agenda material was referenced to assist in the explanation of the changes.
   The question was called on Kleer - Forsberg motion.  CARRIED
The first two motions as detailed in Item 1C of Appendix I, page 4 of the agenda material were considered at the same time.

Kleer – Riemer

moved to create a “Corrections and Public Safety and Policing” designation for eligible BHJ graduates.

Moved to eliminate the Criminal Justice and Restorative Justice (Corrections and Public Safety and Policing) concentration.

Will this designation appear on the diploma? The definition of designation was questioned. The designations of “Coop”, “Honours”, “Internship” and “International” are institutional honours and appear on the diploma. This is not an institutional honour.

Designations cannot be tracked in Banner.

The question was called on the two Kleer - Riemer motions. CARRIED

The Faculty of Arts is attempting to do is to get rid of one concentration because the two are very close.

The definition of “concentration” was read from the Undergraduate Course Calendar.

This would leave the Faculty of Arts with one concentration and one designation. The Registrar and Lynn Cavanagh will ensure the wording and intent of the motion forwarded to Executive of Council is clear.

Kleer - Riemer

moved that JS 384 be a required course for the Social Justice and Human Rights concentration. CARRIED

The motion that students be strongly encouraged to declare their BHJ concentration prior to or upon completing 33 credit hours of their program major was not put forward. It is being taken back to the Faculty for further discussion.

Kleer - Sylvester

moved to renumber the HJ courses to JS and to revise the BHJ requirements to include only two 400-level courses.

There is no connection between the motion and the rational.

The question was called on the Kleer - Sylvester motion. DEFEATED
The Faculty of Arts was asked to reword the motion before bringing this item back to the table.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

The items as detailed in Appendix I, pages 7 – 21 of the agenda material were received for information.

5.2 Report from the Faculty of Business Administration

ITEM FOR APPROVAL

Sylvestre - Chambers

moved that the following criteria for the Dean’s Honours List be accepted:

The Dean’s Honours List is compiled each semester and includes students in undergraduate programs of study in the Faculty of Business Administration who achieve a GPA of at least 85.00% in all of the most recent semesters needed to complete a minimum of 12 credit hours of numerically-graded University of Regina courses since the semester in which they were last on the Dean’s Honours List (or, in the case of students who have never previously been on the Dean’s Honours List, since they were admitted to the University of Regina). This honour appears on the student’s official transcript.

CARRIED

5.3 Report from the Faculty of Engineering

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

Sharma – Maguire

Moved to replace STAT 289 with STAT 160 for all undergraduate systems engineering programs, effective Spring/Summer 2009.

Does this need to go to Executive of Council as a motion? Yes. Will it require the approval of Senate? Small program changes do not go to Senate as a motion; they go as items for information only.

This motion is just exchanging one class for another equivalent one. It is considered a small program change.

The question was called on the Sharma - Maguire motion.

CARRIED

5.4 Report from the Faculty of Fine Arts

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

Chambers - Riemer

moved that Applicants who have attempted 24 credit hours or more of approved post-secondary education must have a minimum UGPA of
60.00% on all post-secondary courses attempted. Students who have attempted fewer than 24 credit hours of post-secondary education will be admitted based on the high school admission criteria (see #2.4.1). Mature applicants refer to #2.4.6.

Is this contrary to faculty transfer policy? Students must meet the faculty requirements in what the faculty approved for transfer. This will make their requirements the same as the Faculty of Arts. Does this include mature students? If so, another motion will be required for mature applicants and amendments made to 2.4.6 of the Undergraduate Calendar.

The question was called on the Chambers - Riemer motion. CARRIED

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

The items as detailed in Appendix IV, page 24 of the agenda material were received for information.

5.5 Report from the Registrar re Change in CCUAS Terms of Reference.

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

Liski – Revet

Moved that the committee approve a change in its terms of reference to remove point 6 as follows:

Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Studies (CCUAS)
A. Term of Office
   3 years for elected members
   All members are expected to attend meetings

B. Membership

   Ex Officio (ex officio means “by virtue of one’s office”)
   - Associate Vice-President (Student Affairs)
   - University Secretary
   - Registrar

Standing (standing is used “wherever there is a choice”):
- the appropriate Associate or Assistant Dean (or designate) from each undergraduate Faculty including: Arts, Business Administration Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Kinesiology and Health Studies, Science, and Social Work
- the Head of the Certificates Division or the Head of the Off-Campus Degree Credit Division from the Centre for Continuing Education (or designate)
- 1 designate from each Federated College named by the Federated College
- 2 students selected by the Students’ Union from the student members of Council
- 3 elected members of Council recommended by the Nominating Committee of Council and approved by Executive of Council (One member will replaced each year and the member serving their third year of office will act as Chair)

C. Terms of Reference

1) To receive for information new, revised, and deleted undergraduate courses. The Committee reserves the right to raise any such course to the table for approval.
2) To recommend proposals for new, revised, and deleted undergraduate degree and non-degree programmes to Executive of Council bringing to their attention those areas of concern bearing on academic policy. Such programs if deemed to be “Major” will have first been vetted through a letter of intent to be considered by the Planning and Priorities Committee.
3) To recommend proposals for new, revised, and deleted academic policies and standards to Executive of Council.
4) To recommend proposals for new, revised, and deleted standards for undergraduate admission and graduation to Executive of Council.
5) To advise the Registrar on matters relating to the content of the Undergraduate Calendar bringing to attention those areas of concern bearing on the representation of academic policy. The report was distributed electronically in advance of the meeting and is attached to these minutes as Appendix I.
6) To recommend proposals to Executive of Council on matters related to undergraduate academic regalia.

CARRIED

5.5 Report from Admissions.

The four western provinces and three territories are recommending a common curriculum for math. There will be 3 streams:
(1) Apprenticeship and work place math
(2) Foundations of mathematics
(3) Pre-calculus

Students will have to make the choice in Grade 10 as to which stream they want to follow. We will have to adjust our admission requirements to reflect these changes. This will affect the fall 2013 term.

Jason has asked to form a working group to deal with admission requirements within the faculties. He recommended the following be on this committee:
- one member from the Admissions office
- one member from the Student Development Centre
- one member from Engineering or Science
- one member from Business Administration or KHS
- one member from Arts, Fine Arts, Education or Social Work

If it is agreed that the committee be formulated in this way, Jason will send out emails asking for volunteers. These representatives will consult with the other faculties.
Engineering would like to be part of this. An email should be sent to Melody Murray. Education would like to be on the committee. Send an email to Nick Forsberg. Science will want the pre-calculus stream.

One question that will have to be answered is how will movement from one stream to another be allowed?

We will have to have an idea by fall of how our admission requirements will reflect these changes. We will not be able to finalize anything until the government has determined how these courses will appear on the High School transcript.

6. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

There were no items for information

7. CONCLUSION

The meeting concluded at 4:20 p.m.