Introductions were made for the benefit of the new members.

1. Approval of the Agenda

The Agenda was approved as presented.

2. Approval of the Minutes of September 14, 2017

The attendees list should show S. Rhodes as being absent.
The minutes were approved as amended.

The Chair announced that Daniel Leznoff was appointed as Chair of SCUS until further notice.

3. New Business

COURSE CHANGES (SCUS 17-42)

Motion 1
It was moved by S. Spector and seconded by A. Clapp

“that SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the following course changes effective Summer 2018.”

CARRIED
a. Beedie School of Business (SCUS 17-42a)

(i) Prerequisite change for all 300-level Business courses:

b. Faculty of Environment (SCUS 17-42b)

1. Department of Archaeology

   (i) Prerequisite change for ARCH/HS 312 and 313

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

a. Faculty of Environment [SCUS 17-43]

1. Department of Geography

   Motion 2
   It was moved by A. Clapp and seconded by S. Spector

   “that SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the New Course Proposal for GEOG 150-3, Digital Earth with B-Soc/Sci designation effective Fall 2018.”

   CARRIED

   The Chair reminded the group to ensure that the Library is notified of all new courses offered so appropriate resources are in place.

PROGRAM CHANGES

a. Beedie School of Business [SCUS 17-44]

   Motion 3
   It was moved by S. Spector and seconded by S. Poyntz

   “that SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the upper division requirement changes to the:
   - Business Minor
   - Business Major
   - Business Honours programs effective Summer 2018.”

   CARRIED
b. Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (SCUS 17-45)

1. School of Interactive Arts and Technology

Motion 4
It was moved by S. Poyntz and seconded by N. Gajdamaschko

“That SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the
• Requirement changes to the IAT BA and IAT BSc second degree programs
• Requirement changes to the IAT BA, BSc, BA Honours, BSc Honours, BA second
degree and BSc second degree effective Summer 2018.”

CARRIED

2. Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology

Motion 5
It was moved by S. Poyntz and seconded by M. Lechner

“That SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the
requirement changes to the Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology Bachelor of
Arts double minor program effective Summer 2018.”

CARRIED

3. School of Communication

Motion 6
It was moved by S. Poyntz and seconded by N. Gajdamaschko

“That SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the
Upper division requirement changes to the CMNS Honours (Option A and Option B)
program effective Summer 2018.”

CARRIED

c. Faculty of Science (SCUS 17-46)

1. Department of Mathematics

Motion 7
It was moved by C. Lowenberger and seconded by A. Clapp

“That SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the
changes to the:
• Upper and Lower division requirement changes to the Mathematics Major program
• Lower division requirement changes to the Mathematics Honours program
• Lower division requirement changes to the Applied Mathematics Major program and Applied Mathematics Honours program
• Upper and lower division requirement changes to the Operations Research Major program and the Operations Research Honours program effective Summer 2018.”

CARRIED

4. Other Business

a. Proposed Changes to BC High School Admission Requirement (For Information Only)

R. Khan Hemani spoke to this agenda item and documents were distributed to the SCUS members. Rummana gave some background of this item and answered questions posed by the committee members. Discussion ensued.

R. Khan Hemani explained the importance of this timeline; that is if the university would like to make any changes to the admission requirements, they would have to be announced and in place by January as Grade 10 students will be selecting their Grade 11 courses and the Grade 11 students will be thinking about their Grade 12 course selection. These high school students need accurate information to proceed with their curriculum in a timely manner. Rummana did explain there is a little wiggle room and February could be the latest to make these admission requirement announcements and to also be mindful that these changes can only be done once a year.

There was much discussion with a general consensus that the university does need to review and change their admissions decision-making model for BC high school applicants and agreed with the proposed changes but still had several questions for Rummana.
As requested by the province, R. Khan Hemani added that SFU and UBC have been sharing information in order to drive student enrollment and retention as it appears the decisions SFU and UBC make will significantly change student admission, enrollment and retention.

R. Khan Hemani asked the group a few questions in order to assist them in beginning to think about what they would like to see as incoming future high school students.

• Do we want to go from 4 Grade 12 required courses to more?
• Do you think 60% for English 12 is too low for admission?
• Do we want to be explicit as to what Grade 12 courses we want in order to succeed in university?

We need to make important decisions to better serve as predictors of high school students coming in who will be more prepared to attend university and succeed.
Questions posed by members to Rummana:

- Academic difficulty – how will this play into this new model?
  You would really have to look at other ways to offset this – some students had better performance in grade 11 but in grade 12 something happened – and so they were out of luck but with this new model – the student has more opportunity to demonstrate their potential instead of being penalized somewhat by the old model.
- How will this be weighted?
- How will this look in comparison to International Students? i.e. a room full of highly qualified domestic students and international students who will have a set of different admission requirements
- How does this look like across high schools? Not all high schools offer the same courses
  We face that now; not an issue
- How do students know what to work towards?
  This has actually become a problem as students start doubting their ability and don’t enroll due to lacking confidence in achieving certain gpas
  - Did you run this new model through a current admissions scenario? if so, what did it look like?
  Yes, to see what the weighted average looked like and it served as a better chance of selecting highly qualified students for success such as broadening course selection helped students to better select their courses which allowed them to be admitted appropriately and succeed
  - S. Poyntz thanked R. Khan Hemani and C. Geisler for their meeting with FCAT where they clarified what prepares our students for success – his question was, when we increase the number of required Grade 12 courses – we somehow narrow the pool, the drawback is high school is a strange indicator of success and sometimes not but focusing in this matter may limit us
  There is no minimum in Grade 11 courses but Grade 12 there is a limit, reason being is there’s a lot less Grade 11 predictor course due to less data.

R. Khan Hemani thanked the group for inviting her to SCUS and for the discussion and offered to be available to attend faculty meetings if needed to answer any more questions. She will forward documents to the members to bring to their UCC meetings for discussion. The next three weeks will be dedicated to discussions around this proposal and the goal is to bring the proposal back to SCUS for approval at either the November or December meeting and to be forwarded to the January Senate meeting.

b. Certificates (For Information Only)

The Chair gave a brief review of previous discussion in SCUS regarding Certificates. He added that J. Hinchliffe is in the process of finalizing terminology so we all know what we’re referring
to when speaking about certificates, concentrations or streams. He asked the committee to give feedback on their thoughts about Certificates. Discussion ensued.

Members agreed:
- it’s easier to create a certificate than a degree and that a certificate is a useful tool although it may lengthen a student’s time spent on a degree
- complements a major and may help in student retention
- need to do some housekeeping in terms of which certificates are well subscribed and those that are not

Suggestions:
- Let’s be consistent across campus with terminology; for example, concentrations and certificates – we should all know what we are referring to
- Admission is an issue – you have to be in a degree program in order to get a certificate
- Other institutions don’t have certificates because of the negative connotation; should we develop a certificate as an option?

The meeting was adjourned at 4:26pm
Minutes prepared by R. Balletta