

APPROVED MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS AND STUDIES (CCUAS)

June 16, 2021

9:00 a.m.

Location: Zoom meeting

Members Present: Darlene Chambers, Stephen Cheng, Doug Cripps, James D’Arcy, Naomi Deren, David deMontigny, Fidji Gendron, Dorothy Lane, Karen Lehmann, A. Magnan, Robin Markel, David Meban, Nader Mobed, Pamela Osmond Johnson, Wes Pearce, Morina Rennie, Yaya Siggins, Toby Sperlich, Glenys Sylvestre, Sean Whalley, Scott Wilson (Chair)

Regrets: Alfred Adenuga, Katlyn Richardson

Guests: Nilgün Önder and Christie Schultz

Observers: Heather Antonini, Barb Elich, Sarah Stewart, Jessie Chen, Jordan Courtney

Recorder: Coby Stephenson

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. by S. Wilson, Chair.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

G. Sylvestre – A. Magnan

CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

D. Lane – S. Whalley

D. Chambers suggested that 4.4.3’s effective date was incorrect and asked what effective date was approved at E of C and Senate? It was 202130.

MOVED that the minutes of the May 5, 2021, meeting be approved as distributed.

CARRIED

3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

3.1. Social Work Admission Revisions

G. Sylvestre reported that at the Senate Meeting on June 2, 2021, it was questioned why there was not a Math or Science requirement for High School Applicants (see Motion 4.4.1 of the May CCUAS agenda). Senate asked that the motion be returned to the Faculty of Social Work for clarification.

G, Sylvestre also reported that Motion 4.4.2 change the calculation of the Certificate in Indigenous Social Work / Bachelor of Indigenous Social Work Admission GPA from a program average to the most recent 30 credit hours was passed at Executive of Council and Senate with an effective date of 202130; however, during the May CCUAS meeting D. Chambers had asked that the effective date be revised to 202210. This amendment was not updated in the Report to E of C. Social Work will find out if the approved incorrect effective date is an issue.

S. Wilson reported that he was asked at Executive of Council if French Immersion students in the Province will be negatively affected by the new admission requirements. N. Deren explained that courses taught in French are accepted in the same manner as courses taught in English. P. Osmond Johnson indicated that there is a statement about this in the Admission section of the undergraduate calendar and in the promotional publications.

4. REPORTS FROM FACULTIES AND ACADEMIC UNITS

4.1. REPORT FROM THE REGISTRAR'S OFFICE

The Microcredential Framework discussion was moved before the other motions in order to accommodate the guest speakers, N. Önder and C. Schulz. The discussion notes are as follows:

Microcredentials at the undergraduate level is new ground and is evolving. Faculty of Education fully supports Microcredentials because these will provide more opportunity for Faculty of Education students and graduates. By stacking the Microcredentials it may lead to an increase in salary and professional training. We need to be careful with how the classes are packaged and the timeline to complete because of the schedule of working teachers. Centre for Continuing Education allows students 52 weeks to two years to complete a microcredential package.

These can also be offered to people in the community such as individuals who work at the Science Centre and they want to learn about teaching without taking a full degree.

G.Sylvestre suggested there could be too much governance for Microcredentials with less than 15 credit hours. We may not want approvals to go to Senate because it slows the approval process.

Could a microcredential be a single course only? Could the international designation be replaced by a badge? Are there real credentials that are only one class? Think about what the learner needs and what their goals are. Will the package benefit the learner and how?

The definition is important. Learning outcomes are crucial for specialized knowledge. Microcredentials give greater potential and flexibility for professional development at the undergrad level. It will also allow mature students to commit to credentials that fit within their timeline. Lastly, within larger frameworks, students may ladder to a BA, for example, with a series of microcredentials.

A concern regarding the nomenclature was asserted: the idea of badges might not be appealing because people may think about Boy Scout badges so can the name be reconsidered? Learners in the continuing education space want recognition that they can publish/share easily such as on LinkedIn. The historical context of CCE/Extension was to give access to credit courses for people who were not in a full degree program. Badges are appealing for the job market and contemporary learning. The definition and use of *professional* was brought forward. Is there a way to differentiate such as naming those skills development certificates instead of professional certificates since *professional* has a connotation with *profession*?

Could we use: *Non-credit professional development* in order to differentiate between credit and non-credit. We are using terms that align with the current language the U of R uses and so CCE is committed to using *Professional certificate* and *microcredential*.

Alumni status is a bigger discussion for outside of this body. Microcredentials have potential to build the alumni base, community and development.

A microcredential is a credential for professionals, but it's not a professional credential.

In the experience of CCE, learners are not assuming they are receiving a credential from a professional body. In this context, the word professional is not being used in the way a professional engineer would use it.

There are concerns that the term *professional* is being appropriated for marketing purposes. There is a desire for another term to be found. It's not an accurate depiction of what a professional micorcredential is. In this context, professional development is different than professional accountant. Our learners have been earning professional certificates from our institution for a decade.

4.1.1. RESIDENCY DEFINITION

J. D'Arcy – A. Magnan

MOVED that the definition of Residency on page 2 of the Agenda be added to the Glossary and Abbreviations section of the Academic Calendar, *effective immediately*.

No discussion.

CARRIED

4.1.2. RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS

J. D'Arcy – D. Cripps

MOVED that the Residency Regulations outlined of page 2 of the Agenda be added to the Graduation section of the Academic Calendar between the Governing Academic Program regulation and the Awarding of Concurrent and Additional Degrees regulation, **effective 202220**.

Discussion Notes

Proposed residency requirements are a concern for the 15-18 credit hour certificates. Residency Requirements for diploma or certificate programs needs to be revised to: Students must fulfill their program completion requirements with a minimum of 50% of their credit hours, or at least 9 credit hours for those certificates with 18 credit hours or less, with University of Regina coursework.

It was noted that the Faculty of Science is not listed in the Residency Requirements at the U of R and Other Universities table (page 4 of agenda).

There are concerns about the low residency requirement at 25% as the U of R won't have academic oversight of 75% of the student's education, yet, the U of R will be approving the full credential.

Although this is an opportunity for the U of R, none of the reasons stated for reducing the residency requirement are for academic reasons. Further concerns were expressed about a University-wide residency requirement.

Subject matter experts will review the transfer courses. If all of the transfer credits are being approved anyways then why don't we say 0%? A low threshold erodes the meaning of what a U of R degree is and may take away from the design or cohesion of the program.

Faculties are not being forced to go below 50%. It's not completely about marketing. It's about student mobility. The provincial/federal governments across Canada have concerns that students are being forced to complete course work at double the cost of their credential. Does it make sense for students to repeat course work they've already completed? In the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science,

accreditation rules dictate the residency requirements. Each Faculty is unique. KHS would like the flexibility to allow a lower residency %. PLAR credits are all evaluated and if the program decides if the student needs more courses as part of the admission process.

The Registrar encouraged the members to have a discussion with their respective Dean if they have any concerns about the residency requirements as this proposal came out of Deans Council.

ABSTENTION: 1
AGAINST: 3
CARRIED

5. Adjournment – S. Whalley moved to adjourn at 10:31 a.m.