PRESENT: Katherine Arbuthnott, John Barden (for Harold Riimer), David Boehm, Lynn Cavanagh, Dawn Flood (Chair), Alison Hayford, Mary Jesse, Bev Liski (Recording Secretary), John Metcalfe, James Mulvale, Heather Ryan, Satish Sharma, Donald Sharpe, John Smith, Glenys Sylvestre, Florence Watson, Tyler Willox

GUESTS: Kaytlyn Barber, URSU; Susan Husum, Admissions

REGRETS: Sheila Dresen, Nader Mobed

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

   Jesse - Sylvestre

   moved approval of the agenda as distributed. CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF LAST MEETING – April 8, 2010

   Arbuthnott - Hayford

   moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 8, 2010 as distributed. CARRIED

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

   There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. OLD BUSINESS

   4.1 Report from the RTD Regulations Sub-committee

       The committee has been examining restructuring of the University probation regulation, which may alleviate some pressure on forced withdrawals.

       When will the committee be completing and submitting its report? Work is ongoing and will likely result in a report in perhaps September.

5. NEW BUSINESS

   5.1 Report from the Faculty of Business Administration

       ITEM FOR INFORMATION
The report as presented in Appendix I, page 2 of the agenda material was received for information.

5.2 Report from the Faculty of Fine Arts

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

1. Creation of MU 101

Although the item contained in motion 1 of Appendix II, page 3 of the agenda material was presented as a motion, because it is creation of a course, which does not require approval by this committee, it was changed to an item for information, and received as such.

2. Creation of a General Minor in Fine Arts for non-Fine Arts Majors

Hayford – Cavanagh

Moved to create a general Minor in Fine Arts for non-fine Arts Majors as detailed in Appendix II, page 3 of the agenda material. CARRIED

3. Revision to the “Liberal Arts” Requirements

Hayford – Cavanagh

Moved that the “Liberal Arts” requirements in the Bachelor of Fine Arts and Bachelor of Music degree programs, and in the Bachelor of Arts Visual Arts, Bachelor of Arts (Honours) Visual Arts, and the Bachelor of Theatre Arts programs, be revised as “Critical Competencies as detailed in Appendix II, pages 4 to 7 of the agenda material.

“Critical Competencies are outlined at the end of the motion on pages 6 and 7.

One correction was noted on page 5 in the table for Theatre: BFA Acting/Design/Stage Management. The Natural Science or CS Critical Competencies should read “Research Skills and Methodology”, not “Analytical thinking in the Social and Natural Sciences”.

The question was called on the Hayford-Cavanagh motion as corrected. CARRIED

5.3 Report from the Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

1. Addition of KIN 375 to List of Major Electives for Human Kinetics

Barden – Sylvestre

Moved to approve the addition of KIN 375 (Care and Prevention of Athletic Injury) to the major electives for the Human Kinetics major. CARRIED

2. Inclusion of BIOL 100 and BIOL 101 to the List of Appropriate Science Courses in the Human Kinetics and Adapted Movement Science Majors

Barden – Ryan
Moved to include BIOL 100 and BIOL 101 as options within the Adapted Movement Science and Human Kinetics Majors. CARRIED

3. Inclusion of BUS 205 (Business Communication) as a Sport and Recreation Management Major Elective

Barden – Syvestre

Moved to approve BUS 205 (Business Communication) as a Sport and Recreation Management major elective. CARRIED

4. Administrative Changes – Change to Motion passed by Senate in February to the Admission, Readmission and Transfer to the Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies effective 201020 (Spring 2010)

Barden – Sharpe

Moved to allow the Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies the discretion to admit and/or re-admit students into the ‘OLD’ BKin (201030-201010) in exceptional circumstances up to, and including, 201030.

There appears to be an error in the dates of the old BKin. A friendly amendment was proposed to remove the dates in parentheses.

The question was called on the Barden-Sharpe motion as amended. CARRIED

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

The course information as reported in Appendix III, page 11 of the agenda material was received for information.

5.4 Report from the Faculty of Nursing

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

5.4.1 Use of Canada Language Benchmark (CLB)

Smith – Metcalfe

Moved that the Council Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Studies establish a sub-committee of five members comprised of the Director of Enrolment Services (ES), the Manager of Admissions (ES), a faculty member from each of the Department of English and the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science, and the Acting Dean of Nursing, to examine the possible adoption of the CLB (Canada Language Benchmark) as a test of English competency for the University of Regina.

Would this course be in addition to and not instead of another English proficiency examination? Yes, it would be in addition to the examinations currently being used by the University of Regina.

The following two friendly amendments were proposed:

Add a member from the ESL Program.
Change “Sub-committee” to “Commission”.

What is the distinction between sub-committee and commission? A sub-committee includes only committee members. A commission includes people not on the CCUAS.
The question was called on the Smith-Metcalf motion as amended.  
CARRIED

5.4.2 Revised Admission Requirements to the Faculty of Nursing

Smith – Ryan

Moved that the admission requirements to the Bachelor of Science in Nursing program be adjusted as per the underlined portions as detailed in Appendix IV, pages 13 and 14 of the agenda material.  
CARRIED

5.4.3 Revision to CNUR 303

ITEM FOR INFORMATION

The course information as reported in Appendix IV, page 15 of the agenda material was received for information.

5.5 Report from the Registrar

5.5.1 2011-2012 Academic Calendar

Metcalf – Smith

Moved that the academic dates for the 2011-12 Academic Year be set as outlined in the table entitled “Academic Schedule for 2011-12 (Proposed), as detailed in Appendix V, page 17 of the agenda material.

Add/Drop dates are a problem.  Business courses run under capacity in the high demand classes because of the timing of these dates.  Altering these dates would require a change in university policy.

Similarly, in Studio classes, extra spaces are added, which creates a problem with possible violation of fire regulations.

Perhaps wait listing would be a solution.  Business Administration will consider this option.

Why are there so many more hours in Part of Term 2?  Parts of Term 2 and 3 should be the same but they aren’t.  It’s believed this is affected by the way Monday holidays fall.

The question was called on the Metcalf-Smith motion.  
CARRIED

Some time ago there had been discussion about changing the academic class schedule.  Is this still being considered?  Not at this time.

5.5.2 Request for Advice re 40% Grading

1. Submission of a Mark of 40% Even When a Student Earns a Lower Grade

The Registrar reviewed the concern for which he was seeking advice.  He looked for definitive text on the university’s grading policy.  Many years ago, Executive of Council approved new rules with regard to grading.  The Undergraduate Calendar clearly contemplates grades of 0-39%.  Low grades may mean the student didn’t complete all the course work.  Grades of NP are very confusing and there appears to be uncertainty as to when to use this grade.  The RTD Regulations
Sub-committee will make mention of NPs in its report. Instructors should be recording the actual grade.

If a student doesn’t complete a required portion of the course, they need to understand what NP means. Instructors have some latitude in this.

The current definition of NP is in part for abandonment of the course.

It is easier to use a straight percentage grade.

The deduction associated with not completing a course could be worse than finishing the course and receiving an actual grade, even if it’s low.

It was agreed grades below 40% should be entered. AGREED

2. What Grade is Entered When Student Passes a Course but Fails a Required Part of the Course, such as the Final Examination?

Engineering uses 45% in cases like these.

49% was suggested but the problem with this is that it could initiate an appeal.

Maybe a code is required.

If significant weight is put on a final examination, it should be weighted accordingly. The syllabus must say if students are required to pass the final examination in order to pass the class.

There are numerous inconsistencies with regard to components of a course that, if not completed, would result in the failure of a course.

Not all required portions are significant portions. It may be small assignments which, although they don’t necessarily show mastery of the course, do show that students follow instructions.

What happens to students who chose not to complete all the course work or do all the work but fail a mandatory component? We need to think systematically when grading.

Principles of justice need to be considered when significant weight is put on a piece of work required to successfully complete a course. It is unfair to students to fail the course based on small parts of the course.

There is no one right way to do things and there needs to be general operating procedures and written regulation and policy.

There also needs to be further discussion of this if everyone is doing something different.

If assignment of an NP is not appropriate because it has too many meanings, then perhaps a new code is necessary. And, if NP is eliminated, something has to be created to replace it. Some of this will be absorbed by the RTD Regulations Sub-committee report.

Whatever is used, students need to know what it means.
Maybe there needs to be a broader discussion of the grading system. For example, what does 80% really mean as a passing grade? And with regard to failing, does this mean not completing or not understanding?

This matter requires more attention than meetings at this level.

The Registrar will take all of these comments under advisement.

6. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

6.1 New Representatives on CCUAS

Kaytlyn Barber introduced Tyler Willox who is the new student representative on the CCUAS.

David Boehm will be Acting University Secretary until March 31, 2011, replacing Annette Revet.

6.2 Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the CCUAS will be on June 3rd at 9:00 a.m. in AH 527. The deadline for receipt of agenda items is 4:30 p.m. May 25th.

7. **CONCLUSION**

The meeting concluded at 11:04 a.m.