PRESENT: Katherine Arbuthnott, Bonnie Dobson (for Robin Evans), Bev Liski (Recording Secretary), Cameron Louis, John Metcalfe, Nader Mobed, Gary Morin, Allan Patenaude (Chair), Wes Pearce, Yvonne Petry, Annette Revet, Harold Riemer, Nick Ruddick, Heather Ryan, David Senkow, Satish Sharma, Judy White

GUESTS: None

REGRETS: Ang Saweczko, John Smith

Judy White joined the meeting by conference call.

The Chair welcomed new and returning members to the committee and invited members to introduce themselves.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ryan - Riemer

Moved approval of the agenda as distributed. CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF LAST MEETING, June 14, 2012

Morin - Mobed

Moved approval of the minutes of the meeting of June 14, 2012 as distributed. CARRIED

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There was no business arising from the minutes.

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Reports from Task Forces, Commissions or Sub-committees

4.1.1 Commission to Review Fresh Start Program

Meetings are proceeding and a report is expected soon.

4.1.2 Sub-committee to Review Work Load around Examination Period

The committee is currently without a chair. The regulation regarding term work is being considered by the Faculty of Arts.

4.1.3 University Regulations Sub-committee

No report.

4.2 Awarding of Institutional Honours, Mention Bilingue

No report.
5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Report from the Faculty of Business Administration

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

The course changes, as detailed in Appendix I, pages 2-8 of the agenda material, were received for information.

With regard to BUS 100 being the prerequisite for all 200-level BUS courses, when does the BUS prerequisite get overridden? Faculties that BUS 200 and above courses in their programs are not included. The Faculty of Business Administration will meet with the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science to discuss their options. There will be a transition period with suitable arrangements being worked out for faculties affected by this change.

5.2 Report from the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

1. Revisions to Software Systems Engineering (SSE) Electives

Sharma – Pearce

Moved to revise SSE electives as detailed in Appendix II, page 9 of the agenda material.

What is the current change to Humanities? Who makes the approval? Engineering will consult with Arts regarding what is considered to be an appropriate Humanities course.

How broad might this be? Students want other choices.

There is no official definition of Humanities, even within the Faculty of Arts. If we say “approved” we need criteria to define what this is.

Engineering will determine what is a Humanities course, based in consultation with Arts but the course may not just be from Arts or from the U of R. Accreditation requires Humanities courses.

The Faculty of Engineering expects be very few of these requests.

Can how approval is determined be included? Procedure does not need to be included here.

Use of the term “Humanities” is at issue. Arts doesn’t use this term any longer and Fine Arts has never used it.

Engineering can make some of the decisions about what is considered to be an Humanities course but, when they can’t, they will consult with the Faculty of Arts.

Does the accreditation body define “Humanities” a certain way? It is defined as “central thought process”.

The question was called on the Sharma-Pearce motion.

CARRIED

1 abstention

2. Revisions to ESE, EVSE, ISE and PSE Humanities Elective

Sharma – Arbuthnott
Moved to revise the ESE, EVESE, ISE and PSE humanities elective, as detailed in Appendix II, pages 9 and 10 of the agenda material, effective 2013 Spring/Summer.

CARRIED
1 abstention

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION
The new and revised courses, as detailed in Appendix II, page 11 of the agenda material, were received for information.

5.3 Report from the Faculty of Nursing

ITEM FOR INFORMATION
The new course, as detailed in Appendix III, page 12 of the agenda material, was received for information.

5.4 Report from the Faculty of Science

ITEM FOR INFORMATION
The revised courses, as detailed in Appendix IV, page 13 of the agenda material, were received for information.

5.4 Report from the University Secretary re Academic Holds

ITEMS FOR APPROVAL

1. Addition of §5.13.2.4 Academic Holds to the Undergraduate Calendar and Course Catalogue, and
2. Addition of §5.13.2.4.1 Removing an Academic Hold to the Undergraduate Calendar and Course Catalogue

Revet – Arbuthnott
Moved approval of motions 1 and 2 as follows:

That §5.13.2.4 Academic Holds be added to the Undergraduate Calendar and Course Catalogue as detailed in Motion 1 of Appendix V, page 14 of the agenda material.

And

That §5.13.2.4.1 Removing an Academic Hold be added to the Undergraduate Calendar and Course Catalogue as detailed in Motion 2 of Appendix V, page 14 of the agenda material.

What’s the difference between this kind of hold and a hold for financial reasons? They just have different codes.

The catalog entry in the first motion should be amended to read as follows:

§5.13.2.4 Academic Holds
A student who has committed, or is under investigation for, an act of Academic Misconduct will have a hold placed on their his/her student account. The hold remains on the student's account for 30 days following the decision letter by the Faculty. If the student does not indicate that they wish submit a formal request to appeal the decision of the Faculty within the 30 days, the hold is automatically lifted from their his/her account after 30 days. If the student wishes to appeal the decision, the hold remains on their his/her account until a decision is reached following their his/her appeal hearing.

During the hold period, a student is not able to register for classes on their his/her own, verify grades or see obtain transcripts. Should a student need to perform any of these actions, a student can perform these actions with the help of their his/her Faculty advisor.

Faculty Advisors should be told about these changes.
The question was called on the Revet-Arbuthnott motion as amended.  

CARRIED

5.6 Report from the Faculty of Arts

5.6.1 Do we need a regulation forbidding students from registering in more than one class taught at the same time?

This concern/question has to do with non-attending students. An instructor told a student that s/he would get a 5% deduction for non-attendance, because they had registered in two courses that were being offered at the same time and intended on not attending one of the classes. Under the current regulations, can they do this? There already is an attendance clause in the UG Calendar (§5.3) but do we need to put something more in the calendar with regard to possible punishments for non-attendance, where students clearly intend on not attending a course.

UR Self-Service would not let a student register in 2 courses offered at the same time, so this it is implied by the restriction that this is not permissible. Putting something more in the calendar may give students the idea that this is allowed.

An override would be required in these cases.

The Faculty of Engineering is very strict and has a form and process for cases like this.

This is not allowed in the Faculty of Education.

The University-level regulation is less strict but seems obvious. Plus students should not do this.

Can the Faculty of Arts develop its own policy? Yes.

Having a form that allows students to register in two courses offered at the same time would open the door to more students attempting to do this. It’s not a good idea.

The Associate Dean will discuss this with the Faculty of Arts. The Faculties of Education and Engineering will provide their regulations and process to the Faculty of Arts for reference purposes.

5.6.2 Dropping Students from Classes for Non-Attendance

Members were referred to §5.3 of the UG Calendar. This seems like an impractical regulation.

Barring students from the final examination may be effective.

This regulation needs to be reworked.

What is the problem? Why not just let students fail? Some people deserve the right to fail.

There is a financial implication if the university drops students from a course.
Nursing has an attendance policy because of the applied learning aspect of their program.

Since there seems to be varying application of this, perhaps there needs to be a university rule for addressing the problems.

Non-attendance impedes growth of a student as well as possibly other students in the class.

Arbuthnott – Ruddick

Moved that this matter be referred to the University Regulations Sub-committee for review of the non-attendance policy, consideration of what constitutes ‘non-attendance’, and report back to the CCUAS.

CARRIED

6. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

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

This item was noted for information.

7. CONCLUSION

The meeting concluded at 2:35 p.m.