PRESENT: Katherine Arbuthnott, Bev Liski (Recording Secretary), Cameron Louis, John Metcalfe, Nader Mobed, James Mulvale, Kevin O'Brien, Wes Pearce, Annette Revet, Harold Riemer, Nick Ruddick, Satish Sharma, Glenys Sylvestre, Robert Truszkowski (Chair), Florence Watson

GUESTS: None

REGRETS: Ang Saweczko, John Smith

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Riemer - Arbuthnott

Moved approval of the agenda as distributed. CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF LAST MEETING – February 28, 2011

It was agreed to defer approval of these minutes to the next meeting. AGREED

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Update on Report from the RTD Regulations Sub-committee

The Registrar, on behalf of the sub-committee, reviewed the report and the role of the committee. The committee looked at the university-wide threshold pertaining to RTD regulations and the resulting report reflects progress in improving the regulations. A minimum standard was set for the university as a whole. It was not the committee’s mandate to review faculty regulations. The committee agreed there should be a probationary warning system which should occur earlier and last longer.

In reviewing the report, the following points were highlighted:

- Motion 4 - 60% is the retained threshold to activate academic probation.
- There is a first-term assessment which occurs after the first nine credit hours are attempted.
- Faculties will have the capability to extend the probationary period.
- To eliminate confusion, the terminology for a university forced withdrawal or expulsion will be an MW (Must Withdraw). RTD will pertain to withdrawals at the faculty level.
- The withdrawal period will be for 3 full and consecutive terms.
- Motion 15 - The committee looked at developing a mandatory remediation program. This is still in the planning stage.
- Motion 16 - The NP rule is being removed. The committee is suggesting creation of a committee to look at non-numeric grades.
• Motion 19 - Readmission after a forced withdrawal requires completion of 24 credit hours with a 60% GPA.
• Motion 20 - A ‘category’ or ‘status for students’ will be created for students who are required to discontinue after the deadline to transfer to another faculty.
• Motion 21 addresses the maintenance of a student’s full-time status and regularizes what is the current practice. This was done because faculties can’t make decisions quickly enough and is a safeguard for students when the university fails to act in a timely fashion.
• Motion 22 addresses students who successfully complete a course before the RTD is applied and permits the student to retain the credit.
• With regard to the Fresh Start program, there may need to be a group to look at this. It was the committee’s view that the Fresh Start program should not be automatic on readmission but rather students should be required to successfully complete 12 credit hours before applying for Fresh Start, following which transfer to another faculty could occur.

Discussion of the report ensued, with the following points being raised:

• Under the MW regulation, will withdrawal for academic discipline be left alone? Suspension/expulsion should be used for academic discipline but a different language is preferred.
• With regard to motions 7 and 8, appeals will come to the University Secretary if the faculty denies an extension. Did the committee talk about this? Yes. The proposed regulation provides some ‘wiggle room’. Is it binding? Yes, but there is flexibility if students are showing improvement.
• What’s the difference between a college-level course and a university course? College is non-university.
• Will faculties make all university decisions on academic probation or do colleges do this as well? They both make these decisions now, and this will not change.
• From a procedural perspective, there may need to be some redrafting of the report for presentation to Executive of Council. Perhaps the motions could be considered together and the report with motions, preamble and rationales could be kept intact and presented in its entirety.
• If these motions pass, when would these regulations be effective? An effective date was purposely omitted to allow the Registrar to determine an appropriate effective date. There needs to be some discussion with faculties.
• Will this be a problem for students under the old RTD conditions? No. In fact, the new regulations may be better. There was some uncertainty about grandfathering and contractual rights. Implementation of these new regulations will affect about 127 students, which would likely make grandfathering unnecessary.
• It is likely there would be no students who would be required to discontinue under the new regulations that would not be required to discontinue under the old rules.
• Engineering wants to see the remediation program in place before it would endorse the new regulations. Such a program would be an extension of the current regulations and would not delay the report.

Riemer – Mulvale

Moved approval of motions 1 to 29 of the report as detailed in Appendix I, pages 2 to 14 of the agenda material.

CARRIED

Thanks was extended to everyone who helped with development of the report.

4.2 Sub-committee to Review Work Load around Examination Period (Item 5.1 of September 10, 2010 Minutes)

No report.
5. **NEW BUSINESS**

5.1 Academic Schedule for 2012-2013  
Metcalf - Pearce

Moved approval of the 2012-2013 Academic Schedule as detailed in Appendix II, page 15 of the agenda material.

It was questioned whether there is an appetite for add and drop dates to be reviewed? It was explained that Add/Drop dates should be closer together and perhaps the dates for when students need to pay their tuition are what should be used. The winter term in 2012 starts January 7th and the last day to add classes is January 11th, which is only four days. The dates for the fall term allows more time.

There would need to be a policy change in order for these dates to be altered.

The question was called on the Melcalfe-Pearce motion.  

CARRIED

5.2 Report from the Faculty of Fine Arts

**ITEMS FOR APPROVAL**

1. Pearce - Arbuthnott

Moved that the residency requirements for students registered in the Faculty of Fine Arts be amended as detailed in Motion 1 of Appendix III, page 16 of the agenda material.

Is this a common regulation in other faculties? No.

How will the Faculty of Fine Arts track this? It would be done manually by the faculty advisor.

The order of completing a program is irrelevant and we shouldn’t be interfering with this.

What are the consequences to students who don’t do this? The Faculty office would make arrangements for late transfer to one of the listed classes.

Fine Arts appears to be a ‘holding area’ for students to sufficiently raise their gpa to qualify for admission to another faculty. They register as undeclared majors.

Does ‘undeclared’ count as a major? No, it is the subject within a student’s major.

When admitted, could their admission be conditional? Yes, and this could be done without making a regulation for a handful of students.

The question was called on the Pearce-Arthurhnott motion.  

DEFEATED

2. Pearce - Revet

Moved that the minor in Theatre Arts be amended as detailed in Motion 2 of Appendix III, page 16 of the agenda material.  

CARRIED
ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

The course material as detailed in Appendix III, page 17 of the agenda material was noted for information.

It was reported that FA 401 will continue to be cross-listed with BUS 435AT.

5.3 Report from the Faculty of Arts

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

1. Department of English
   Louis – O’Brien
   Moved to add ENGL 499 to the requirements for the Honours major in English as detailed in Appendix IV, pages 18 and 19 of the agenda material. CARRIED

2. Department of Geography
   Louis - Riemer
   Moved to amend the Geography minor requirements as detailed in Appendix IV, page 19 of the agenda material. CARRIED

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

The course material as detailed in Appendix IV, pages 19 to 23 of the agenda material was noted for information.

5.4 Joint Submission from the Faculty of Arts and the Centre for Continuing Education – Liberal Arts Certificate and Diploma Program

ITEM FOR APPROVAL

O’Brien - Louis

Moved to eliminate the credit hour restriction on the Liberal Arts Certificate and Diploma. CARRIED

5.5 Joint Submission from the Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies – Health Studies Program

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

1. Admission to the Bachelor of Health Studies
   Riemer - Mobed
   Moved to change the admission requirements to the Bachelor of Health Studies to direct-entry through admissions using the established criteria for high school and post-secondary transfer/admission CARRIED
2. Changes to Courses Allowed/Required in the Bachelor of Health Studies

Riemer - Louis

Moved to make the additions/deletions/corrections to the Bachelor of Health Studies (note: additions (bold and underline) / deletions (strikethrough) / corrections (bold) as detailed in Appendix VI, pages 25 and 26 of the agenda material.

CARRIED

3. Certificate in Health Studies

Riemer - Pearce

Moved to approve the Certificate in Health Studies as detailed in Appendix VI, pages 26 and 27 of the agenda material.

CARRIED

It was reported this program will shortly be entirely available from a distance.

Are there differences between Arts and Kinesiology admission? No, they are the same in that students enter either program directly from high school.

5.5 Report from the Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies

ITEM FOR APPROVAL

Riemer – Jesse

Moved to approve the 2+2 partnership with Karunya University, India as detailed in Appendix VII, page 31 of the agenda material. The faculty endorses, in principle, the proposed 2+2 program with Karyuna University in India, with the caveat that, for these articulation agreements, consideration must be given regarding resources in the faculty.

Is approval of articulation agreements the purview of this committee? These programs have typically come through this committee.

The question was called on the Riemer-Jesse motion.

CARRIED

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

The course material as detailed in Appendix VII, pages 31 to 46 of the agenda material was noted for information.

6. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

6.1 Date of Next Meeting

This item was noted for information.

7. CONCLUSION

Pearce

Moved conclusion of the meeting at 11:40 a.m.

CARRIED