MINUTES
Friday, September 10, 2010
2:30 P.M., NR 110.3

PRESENT: Katherine Arbuthnott, David Boehm, Mary Jesse, Bev Liski (Recording Secretary), Cameron Louis, John Metcalfe, Nader Mobed, James Mulvale, Kevin O’Brien, Allan Patenaude, Harold Riemer, Nick Ruddick, Heather Ryan, Angelique Sawczko, John Smith, Glenys Sylvestre, Robert Truszkowski (Chair), Florence Watson, Tyler Willox

GUESTS: Lynn Wells

REGRETS: Wes Pearce, Satish Sharma

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ryan - Riemer

moved approval of the agenda as distributed. CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF LAST MEETING – June 3, 2010

Sylvestre - Riemer

moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of June 3, 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 is continuing to meet and will be submitting a report for consideration in time for inclusion in the next UG calendar.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Item for Discussion from the Associate Vice-President (Academic) re Council Discipline Committee Issue

It was explained that the issue pertained to a recent appeal by a student regarding a take home examination. The student was advised in the last week of the class that there would be a take home exam and that they would have three days to submit it. The exam was a 5000 word essay. There was no reference in the syllabus that this would be required although the instructor had alluded to a take-home exam in the middle of the term and had mentioned students would have five days to complete it. No other specific requirements were provided.
Regulations with regard to final examinations state that “No final examinations for on-campus credit courses will be scheduled in the last three hours of scheduled classes, nor in the day(s) between the end of lectures and the first day of the final examination period, without prior written approval from the instructor’s dean, with a copy to the Registrar. The due date of take-home and mid-term examinations and quizzes worth more than 10% in the total evaluation of the course, fall within the terms of this statement; but due dates for term papers, projects, essays, and practical exams (laboratory, presentations, recitals, exhibitions) do not.” Beyond this statement, there are no regulations specifically governing take-home exams. These should be clearly articulated in the UG calendar.

Some classes don’t have scheduled examinations.

In the case of this student, it appears the take-home examination was actually another assignment, which was not clear in the syllabus and had no specified due date. Plus, a 5000 word essay with a three-day turn-around time seems excessive.

The University should be monitoring take-home examinations and there should be none during the final examination period. The examination date should be when it’s due. The option should be open to the instructor but there should be clear guidelines. The purpose of take-home examinations is different than sit-down examinations. If there is a scheduled time for take-home examinations, they should not need to be fitted into the examination schedule. Section 5.6.3 of the UG Calendar needs to be reworded to accommodate take-home examinations.

Metcalfes – Jesse

Moved that a sub-committee of four members be established to review the work load around the examination period as it relates to take-home examinations. Further the difference between an examination and a term paper or assignment needs to be defined. The committee will comprise John Metcalfe, Tyler Willox, Mary Jesse, and Heather Ryan.

CARRIED

5.2 Proposed Changes to the Undergraduate Admission Requirements

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

The Director of Enrolment Services reviewed the need for changes to these admission requirements. The UG Calendar has policy as well as procedural information and much of the process is out of sync because of publication deadlines.

Motion 1:

Saweczko – Mobed

Moved that the general application procedures as outlined in section 2.3 of the UG Calendar (Application Procedures for Program Admissions) be removed as detailed in Appendix II, pages 4 and 5 of the agenda material.

Advisors start with the calendar. Will there be something to direct them to the Viewbook? The website will be clear.

Will the reference to applicants not in satisfactory standing at another institution still be there? Will section 2.7 be referenced? Yes, this information will be contained within the Transfer Credit section.
The table currently contained in Section 2.3.1 will be kept but the text will be removed. Does this provide enough information? Prospective students don’t look at the calendar but will need to consult the Viewbook for information.

Procedural information does not then get circulated, but the Viewbook information could be circulated to all faculties and areas that need it, including CCUAS.

The question was called on the Saweczko-Mobed motion.

CARRIED

Motion 2:

Saweczko – Mobed

Moved to revise the admission requirements for applicants applying from a Canadian university or college as detailed in Appendix II, pages 5 and 6 of the agenda material.

Make sure there’s an addition for students in bad standing at another institution. The reference to section 2.7 is clear.

No high school transcript could be problematic.

Requirements in the chart are clear, and students are required to ‘provide evidence of the requirements’.

Why was 24 minimum credits chosen? This is a fairly good indication of a student’s ability to succeed and is consistent with the university’s academic standing as well as that of most universities across Canada.

With regard to faculty prerequisites, what would the steps be if a student presents without the prerequisite evidence? They would be asked to provide evidence or could be asked for a high school transcript. How would evidence be authenticated? This would be done through the Admissions Office.

The question was called on the Saweczko-Mobed motion with the addition of a statement regarding students in bad standing at another institution.

CARRIED

Motion 3:

Saweczko – Boehm

Moved to revise the mature student admission requirements as detailed in Appendix II, pages 6 and 7 of the agenda material.

The University of Regina is still requiring high school transcripts for mature students, which can be problematic and not particularly relevant. There are better ways to determine eligibility for admission.

A 21 years of age requirement could run contrary to the ‘out of school for 2 years’ requirement.

Who assesses the resume that may be required? Is there an evaluation? Enrolment Services Admissions would assess this as part of the process for admission. A petition for admission is assessed by the faculty.

Why are these students treated differently? The university has a history of assessing petitioning students.
The Indigenous Education Program, i.e. NORTEP and SUNTEP, has specific requirements and these proposed changes would remove these requirements. The Faculty of Education has not been consulted on this and they need to be.

The practice of not admitting mature students to spring/summer has not been reviewed. Why would we not accept students in this term? Because the term is so compressed, students may find it difficult.

The 21 years of age requirement could be a barrier – 19 would make more sense. Students could be admitted under other bases. This age as stated is standard across the country.

With regard to the proposed change identified on page 7 of the agenda material eliminating the references to specific faculties, was this an intentional omission? Yes. Indicating only faculties who’ve specified seemed redundant.

Faculty discretion should be used in determining a student’s readiness for particular programs, thereby determining their eligibility for admission. The evaluation should determine a student’s ability to succeed in a program. Right now we don’t get that much information.

These changes are not intended to add more layers to the process but to simply provide confirmation.

If the current process is working well, why would another layer be added?

Why are CCE and Casual Students being singled out? CCE Transfer credit is considerate to be a new application because it is switching from non-credit to credit.

Students in unsuccessful standing at another institution may not be admitted.

Saweczko – Ryan

Moved that the reference to FNUC Indigenous Education programs be added back into the policy. Also, the reference to section 5.10 should be corrected. CARRIED

The question was called on the Saweczko-Boehm motion as amended. CARRIED 1 opposed

5.3 Item for Discussion from the Task Force on Executive of Council Meeting Processes

As indicated in the report, the task force has asked the CCUAS to review the amount of information it is submitting with the agenda material and discuss whether it might be possible to submit less information without sacrificing the necessary content required for E of C to make an informed decision.

Much of the material being submitted is in chart form, which takes up a lot of space, and may contain minimal changes. Perhaps only the changes could be submitted.

The committee reviewed its terms of reference to determine what it is required to consider and submit under these conditions.

It was suggested Executive of Council should advise the committee about what they don’t want to receive.

The information from CCUAS should be standardized in such a way that the volume of information is reduced.
Perhaps the committee could package differently the material it is submitting to E of C.

A new program may require many motions. Typically, when possible, E of C considers these as omnibus motions.

The nature of the work of this committee often requires large amounts of information.

Perhaps a template and chart highlighting the changes could be submitted or a short text description of the changes with reference to the specific detail considered by the CCUAS.

An attempt will be made to condense the information being submitted to E of C without eliminating the pertinent content.

6. **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION**

6.1 **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the CCUAS will be held at 2:30 p.m. on Friday, October 8, 2010 in AH 527.

7. **CONCLUSION**

Patenaude - Ryan

Moved conclusion of the meeting at 4:00 p.m.  

CARRIED