PRESENT: Mary Jesse, Jesse Leontowicz (for Melissa Blackhurst), Bev Liski (Recording Secretary), Cameron Louis, John Metcalfe, Nader Mobed, Gary Morin, James Mulvale, Frank Obrigewitsch, Allan Patenaude, Wes Pearce, Harold Riemer, Heather Ryan, Ang Saweczko, Glenys Sylvestre, Lianda Tanner (for Larry Gauthier), Robert Truszkowski (Chair)

GUEST: Allen Herman (Mathematics Department)

REGRETS: Robin Evans, Annette Revet, Nick Ruddick, Satish Sharma, John Smith

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ryan - Patenaude

Moved approval of the agenda as distributed with the addition of the following item and two corrections:

Addition: 5.5 Invigilation of Distance Learning Examinations.
Corrections: 1. The day of the meeting should be changed from Friday to Monday.
2. The numbering of the fourth point under 5. New Business should be changed from 5.5 to 5.4

CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF LAST MEETING, January 6, 2012

Because the minutes were not yet prepared, it was agreed to defer approval of the minutes to the next meeting.

AGREED

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

3.1 Motion to Executive of Council re Motion from Grading Assignments Task Force (Item 4.1.1 of December 1, 2011 Minutes)

Metcalfe – Obrigewitsch

Moved that the definition of NP be changed as detailed in Appendix I, page 2 of the agenda material.

It was felt this is a clearer interpretation of NP. NP would now stand for ‘not passed’ instead of ‘no paper’.

If a student doesn’t pass the final examination but passes the course, they would not be given an NP in this case.

“Successfully” is confusing. This would only be applicable if it is in the regulations.

There was support for including the word ‘successfully’.

There are some instructors who are assigning a grade of 40% to students who do not show up. Instructors should be adding the earned grade not converting it to 40%.
The University of Regina is one of very few institutions that give credit for a grade less than 50%.

The question was called on the Metcalfe-Obrigewitsch motion. CARRIED

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Reports from Task Forces, Commissions or Sub-committees

4.1.1 Commission to Review Fresh Start Program

No report.

4.1.2 Sub-committee to Review Work Load around Examination Period

Mary Jesse reviewed the report and highlighted the factors considered in its development.

1. Jesse – Ryan

Moved that take-home final examinations have specific due-dates scheduled within the formal examination period as determined by the examination matrix, which generates dates for the sitting of on-campus examinations; and,

That the instructor’s intention to use this mode of examination must be made public no later than the last day to drop the relevant course.

If passed, all final examinations will be placed in the exam matrix so exams would be fairly distributed and not at the instructor’s discretion.

It was suggested that the last sentence of the rationale be ignored. There was resistance to this suggestion.

Students should have the exam in their hands before the last day of classes so they can better prepare.

These might be better presented as guidelines instead of policies.

Instructors should provide a timeline as well and the amount of time before the due date of a take home exam must be made public.

If the course syllabus could state when the exam will be given (release date), then the due date is in the exam schedule.

There was concern about take home exams being within the exam matrix. Instructors would have no control over when the exam is held. It is preferable to leave this up to instructors.

This inclusion was in response to appeals. Take home exams should be clearly stated in the syllabus.

Could the due date be posted? That is what’s being proposed.

Can an exam date be appealed by an instructor? Release of an exam is challenging.

There should be an issue of having a take home exam on the first day of the exam period.

Including take home exams in the exam matrix solves the problem of instructors arbitrarily setting take home exam dates.
Preparing for a take home exam is one thing, but writing it is another. Pedagogically, there’s a concern with giving students the exam before the class ends.

Having the exam in advance could be helpful from a preparation perspective. Expectations are clear.

It was suggested that the second part of the motion be amended as underlined:

“that the instructor’s intention to use this mode of examination, and the release date of the examination, is must be made public no later than the last day to drop the relevant course.

The question was called on the Jesse-Ryan motion as amended. CARRIED
1 opposed

2. Jesse – Ryan

Moved that the due date for term work is no later than the last day of regularly scheduled classes of the relevant term or part-of-term.

Does this apply to classes that have no final exam? Yes.

Honours courses were being given to the end of the semester to submit theses. Perhaps a different part-of-term should be developed to accommodate Honours papers.

It was suggested the proposed entry for Section 5.6.3 be amended as follows:

5.6.3 Examination Scheduling: No final examinations (including take-home examinations), mid-term examinations and quizzes worth more than 10% in the total evaluation of the course will be scheduled for on-campus credit courses will be scheduled in the last three hours of the scheduled lectures or 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. Practical assessments such as exhibitions, juries and recitals are exempt. 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.

The question was called on the Jesse-Ryan motion with the amended calendar entry. CARRIED

3. Jesse – Ryan

Moved that students not be required to sit for more than two final examinations that begin and end within a single 24 hour period; and,

That, normally, the second or middle examination will be moved.

How do instructors address this? Faculties address the problems and provide alternatives.

Where does responsibility of the student begin in these cases? A survey was conducted and the results were split 50/50.
This is a common problem. When there is a conflict and the student has the option to choose a different course to resolve the conflict, they should.

Why is it always the second exam that moves? It is hoped there is sufficient flexibility provided by inclusion of “normally” in the motion.

If there are costs associated with rescheduling an exam, would these be borne by the Dean’s Office? This wasn’t considered. The Registrar’s Office can move the course and provide a room but not invigilators.

The Faculty of Business Administration contacts all of its students who have third order conflicts. If they choose not to alter their schedules to resolve these conflicts, the onus is then on the student to fulfill the conditions of the courses.

Where students have no selection (i.e. those in prescribed programs), this new regulation would help.

Instructors will be upset if take home exams get added into the exam matrix.

Could this be changed to read ‘where the program is highly prescriptive and there is no choice…” or “where there is no flexibility to adjust the exam schedule through course selection…”?

Common periods are locked out of the matrix so exams could be moved to these time slots.

Large classes would be difficult to move if they happen to be the middle exam.

It is unreasonable to move an exam for one individual.

Academic advisors in a number of faculties were asked to review this proposal and indicated in response that they saw no problem with students having three exams in a 24 hour period and felt this was not excessively onerous. The bigger issue is how much time is between each exam, so students can better prepare.

In general, we seem to be reducing our expectation of a student’s work load.

Maybe this could be taken back to the committee to consider providing options. Students could also be consulted (Glenys agreed to do this).

AGREED

4. Jesse – Ryan

Moved that students whose final exam(s) fall on a religious holy day may be accommodated. Such students must contact the dean of their faculty/college of primary registration at least six weeks before the scheduled examination date in order to receive this relief.

It was suggested “established” should be inserted before “religious”.

This is sending a rhetorical message regarding the importance of established religious observance.

Why was six weeks suggested? This seemed like a reasonable amount of time for students to provide notification of a required accommodation.

Does this have to be in the calendar? Yes. This is akin to accommodating disabilities.
This seems to be an accommodation for a relatively small number of students.

It is important to accommodate not just final examinations and it was suggested the motion should be amended to reflect this.

Mulvane – Ryan

Moved that the motion be amended to include “or other required course work” following “exam(s)”.  

It was suggested this could be included in Section 1 of the calendar pertaining to important dates and deadlines.  

It was agreed this needs to be sent back to the committee for reworking.  

**AGREED**

4.1.2 University Regulations Sub-committee

No report.

**5. NEW BUSINESS**

5.1 Report from the Faculty of Arts

**ITEM FOR APPROVAL**

1. Department of Geography

Louis – Patenaude

Moved to create the Bachelor of Geographic Information Science as detailed in Appendix III, pages 6-8 of the agenda material.

The Advisory Group on Planning, Evaluation and Allocation (AGPEA) has endorsed creation of this program.

The question was called on the Louis-Patenaude motion.  

**CARRIED**

5.2 Report from the Faculty of Education

**ITEMS FOR APPROVAL**

1. BEd Arts Education – Replacement of English Elective in Semester 10

Ryan – Patenaude

Moved that the ENGL elective in semester 10 be revised to a minor course, as detailed in Appendix IV, page 10 of the agenda material.  

**CARRIED**

2. Revision to Arts Education Program Music Major

Ryan – Jesse

Moved that the minor course in semester 8 be revised to an elective course as detailed in Appendix IV, page 11 of the agenda material.  

How many minor courses are required? Seven.

The Faculty of Education needs to include a statement in the rationale regarding how a minor is fulfilled.
3. Ryan – Patenaude

Moved that the changes to the five year BEd Visual Arts Major, as detailed in Appendix IV, pages 11 and 12 of the agenda material, be approved. CARRIED

4. Ryan – Jesse

Moved that the changes to the five year BEd Indian Art Major, as detailed in Appendix IV, pages 12 and 13 of the agenda material, be approved. CARRIED

5. Arts Education Visual Arts Minor (EVIS)

Ryan – Pearce

Moved that the changes to the Arts Education Visual Arts minor, as detailed in Appendix IV, page 13 of the agenda material, be approved. CARRIED

6. Ryan – Pearce

Moved that THEA 100 be replaced with THST 200 in all Arts Education program templates to comply with changes at the direction of the Theatre/Fine Arts department.

The following two corrections were noted, one in the motion and one in the rationale:

1. Correction to motion – remove “/Fine Arts”, because the department is just Theatre.
2. Correct the rationale to read: “Theatre 100 is being changed…as it is an introductory course and beyond the relevance, especially…but also trying to do everything else, as well. The Theatre Department is dividing the content of THEA 100 and THST 200. Recommend…THEA 100.”

The question was called on the Ryan-Pearce motion as corrected. CARRIED

7. Ryan – Mobed

Moved that the Secondary BEd Program in Mathematics Major (EMTH) be revised as detailed in Appendix IV, pages 13 and 14 of the agenda material. CARRIED

8. Ryan – Mobed

Moved that the 5-year Mathematics Major program resulting in two degrees: the BEd and BSc Mathematics (EMTI) (150 credit hours), as detailed in Appendix IV, pages 14 and 15 of the agenda material, be approved.

Is this coming from Science as well? Yes.

The question was called on the Ryan-Mobed motion. CARRIED

9. Ryan – Mobed

Moved that the Secondary BEd Program General Science Major (ESCI) and the Secondary BEd After Degree (BEAD) Program General Science Major (ESCI) be reinstated effective Fall 2010.
It was reported that this program had been deleted in error. There are students still in the program who are expecting to graduate this spring. It was further noted that AGPEA was consulted about whether they required a submission for consideration. They indicated they did not need to see this program again.

The question was called on the Ryan-Mobed motion. CARRIED

10. Ryan – Morin

Moved that the BAC programs be revised as detailed in Appendix IV, pages 16-23 of the agenda material.

It was noted that a word formatting error had occurred on page 19 of the agenda resulting in the appendix # and the blank line being numbered and the two subsequent points being renumbered. It appears there is text missing; however, there is not.

It was pointed out that many of these changes are grammatical.

The English and French translations don’t exactly match but has the same intent.

The question was called on the Ryan-Morin motion. CARRIED

11. Ryan – Patenaude

Moved that ECS 410 be added to semester 2 of the Two-Year BEd after degree program for the middle years round (gr. 6 to 9).

Although this was presented as an item for information, it requires approval because it is changing the requirements of a program.

The question was called on the Ryan-Patenaude motion. CARRIED

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

The items as detailed in Appendix IV, pages 23 and 24 of the agenda material were reviewed and received for information.

5.3 Report from the Faculty of Fine Arts

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

The new and revised courses as detailed in Appendix V, page 25 of the agenda material were received for information.

5.4 Item for Discussion – Awarding of Institution Honour, Mention Bilingue

It was reported that the reasons for request for discussion of this item are two-fold. Firstly, the Faculty of Arts, at a recent APDC meeting, discussed deleting this option because so few students were completing degrees with the designation. Because mention bilingue is an approved institutional honour, which can be completed in Arts, Fine Arts or Science, it cannot simply be deleted; however, the Faculty of Arts could choose to no longer offer it. Secondly, an Education student in the Bac program had recently appealed awarding of their degree, requesting it be conferred with mention bilingue because the requirements, according to the calendar, had been met even though the designation is not approved for offering in the Faculty of Education. It was decided there needed to be broader discussion about the designation to determine whether it was no longer a viable designation for offering, or whether it had simply not kept pace with changing times and should in fact be more broadly offered.
In discussion of the matter, the following points were raised:

- Might elimination of this designation be viewed negatively by the Francophone community?
- Since it only applies to Arts, Fine Arts and Science and has never been awarded outside of the Faculty of Arts, are the eligibility requirements too restrictive or limiting?
- It seems redundant for someone graduating from the Bac program to receive a degree with bilingual mention.
- Perhaps the Institut should be consulted.
- It is unrealistic for this designation to be offered in all faculties.
- The eligibility requirements are too restrictive.
- The U of R is not a bilingual institution.
- This designation does not necessarily ensure a competence in French and there was concern that inclusion of this on our diplomas and transcript suggests a competency that might not actually exist.
- Perhaps there should be a viability task force or commission created to investigate this matter.

It was agreed this matter should be deferred to the next CCUAS meeting at which the University Secretary is present.

5.5 Invigilation of Distance Learning Examinations

Metcalf – Patenaude

Moved that the regulation regarding on-line or televised exams, as detailed in Appendix I of these minutes, be approved.

A list of invigilator categories is available on the Distance Learning Division website.

The question was called on the Metcalfe-Patenaude motion.

6. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

6.1 Date of Next Meeting and Deadline for Submission of Agenda Material

This information was noted.

It was noted that, because there is no meeting of Executive of Council in February, these items will be submitted to the March meeting for approval.

7. CONCLUSION

The meeting concluded at 3:55 p.m.
APPENDIX I

University of Regina
Memorandum

From: John Metcalfe PhD, Registrar

To: CCUAS c/o B. Liski

Date: 29 July 2011

Re: Invigilation of Distance Learning examinations

On behalf of the Distance Learning Division, and after consultation with various stakeholders, I would ask CCUAS to consider the following motion. If passed, the regulation would be included in s. 5.6 of the Undergraduate Calendar. Numbering of surrounding regulations would be altered by the Editor.

MOVED THAT the following be included in the Undergraduate Calendar as a new regulation:

Final exams in courses that are online or televised or video-conferenced must be invigilated (proctored) by a University of Regina-authorized invigilator. The Distance Learning Division will arrange for exams at designated, pre-authorized sites within Saskatchewan (typically at the University of Regina or a Regional College). Students who wish to write at a different site within Saskatchewan or to write outside Saskatchewan must receive approval from the Distance Learning Division for the proposed site and proposed invigilator, and are responsible for any additional costs resulting from their proposed site and invigilator. The Distance Learning Division maintains a list of authorized sites and can help in finding an appropriate invigilator, but the student is ultimately responsible for making invigilation arrangements outside of the pre-authorized sites. Please see the Distance Learning Division website for full details on the appropriate procedures and deadlines. Students must provide photo identification to the invigilator prior to writing.

Rationale. This policy seeks to address two specific and pressing issues of academic misconduct in on-line courses. The first issue is misrepresentation, confirming the individual who writes an exam is indeed the student registered in the class. The second issue is cheating, requiring instructors to take all reasonable efforts to make certain a student writing an examination does not access unauthorized materials (e.g., textbooks, the web) and/or does not receive unauthorized help (e.g., fellow students). A solution to both misrepresentation and cheating is having exams proctored. A proctor can check student identification, thereby addressing misrepresentation, and a proctor can supervise the exam, thereby mitigating cheating. A review of policies at other Canadian universities relating to online exams reveals that these policies have at their core proctored exams.

(306) 585-5086 john.metcalfe@uregina.ca