1. Approval of the Agenda

Introductions were made for the benefit of the new committee member, Stuart Poyntz

There were two additional items added under `Other Business`:
- For discussion, items that will be brought back to SCUS from the SCUS sub-committee
- For discussion, possible revisions to the SCUS terms of reference

**Motion 1**
It was moved by S. Spector and seconded by L. Legris

“that SCUS approve the agenda of September 15, 2016 as amended.”

CARRIED

2. Approval of the Minutes of August 4, 2016

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

“that SCUS approve the minutes of August 4, 2016 as presented.”

CARRIED

W. Parkhouse notified the committee that Senate approved all items brought forward to Monday’s Senate meeting including the revisions to the Priority Enrollment policy. Changes were made that clarified what “consecutive” meant for students.
3. New Business

a. Faculty of Education (SCUS 16-31)

Motion 3
It was moved by A. Chinnery and seconded by L. Legris

“that SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the prerequisite change for EDUC 422 effective Summer 2017.”

CARRIED

b. Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology (SCUS 16-32)

1. School of Interactive Art and Technology

(i) Requirement changes to the Interactive Arts and Technology Major,
- Bachelor of Arts
- Bachelor of Science
- Bachelor of Arts, Second Degree
- Bachelor of Science, Second Degree programs

(iii) Admission requirement changes to the SIAT Majors, Minor, and Joint Majors programs

S. Poyntz withdrew items 1. (i) and (iii) as further discussion and revisions are required before the items may be presented for approval.
L. Legris will work with C. Gibson to prepare documents prior to the next SCUS meeting.

Motion 4
It was moved by S. Poyntz and seconded by C. Murray

“that SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the description change for IAT 244 effective Summer 2017.”

CARRIED

c. Faculty of Applied Sciences (SCUS 16-30)

1. School of Computing Science (SCUS 16-30a)

Motion 5
It was moved by E. Park and seconded by M. Lechner

“that SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the Upper Division requirement changes to the Computing Science Second Degree Program effective Summer 2017.”

CARRIED
2. School of Mechatronic Systems Engineering [SCUS 16-30b]

Motion 6
It was moved by E. Park and seconded by L. Legris

“That SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the requirement changes to the MSE Major, MSE/BUS Double Degree and MSE Honours programs effective Summer 2017.”

CARRIED

E. Park gave a brief overview of the intent of this requirement change.

Motion 7
It was moved by E. Park and seconded by L. Legris

“That SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the:

- Prerequisite change for MSE 250 and 481
- Deletion of MSE 350 and 351 effective Summer 2017.”

CARRIED

4. Other Business

a. Withdrawal Under Extenuating Circumstances [SCUS 16-33]

Motion 8
It was moved by S. Poyntz and seconded by L. Legris

“That SCUS approve the changes to the guidelines and procedures as circulated effective immediately to read:

IV. GUIDELINES

4. Personal Letter

Undergraduate WE applicants must write a clear and concise letter (no longer than two pages double-spaced or one page single-spaces and typed) stating the reason for why they are applying to withdraw. There should be a direct link between information presented in the cover letter and the supporting documents. A chronological list of relevant events is helpful when reviewing all requests. A vague cover letter accompanied by weak supporting documents or none at all will delay the outcome or result in a denied decision.

In cases where a student has experienced a sexual assault, the requirement to provide a personal letter can be an additional emotional hardship. In these cases, the following authorized staff members (or designates) can provide a written letter of support in lieu of the personal letter outlines above:
V. PROCEDURES

a. Students who are considering an Undergraduate WE application, or require clarification about any of the rules, regulations and deadline dates in the academic calendar regarding withdrawals should consult with an academic advisor in Student Services, located in the Maggie Benston Centre, or speak to a department advisor from the faculty in which they are enrolled. Since these rules, regulations and deadline dates are an important component of a university program, students should know them.

b. Once a decision is made to pursue an Undergraduate WE application, the package of information should be submitted to the Manager of Student Academic Appeals in Student Services. Each Undergraduate WE package includes: the WE Application Form, a personal letter outlining the extenuating circumstances and how it is affecting their academic studies and all supporting documents to back up the information in the personal letter.

When a student has experienced a sexual assault that impacts their ability to complete their academic studies the following authorized (or designates) may act on behalf of the student and initiate the necessary process for withdrawal; collating components of the WE package to be submitted for consideration.

J. Hinchliffe gave an overview of the changes to the WE guidelines and procedures which includes wording for incidents of sexual assault. Although this revision is already in practice, the intent is to officially state this procedure in the policy and to make the WE process easier for students finding themselves in these circumstances. All agreed to this change and much discussion did ensue with suggestions of possibly adding other categories of extenuating circumstances to the guidelines where third party intervention may be necessary. For example, motor vehicle accidents or medical disability. J. Hinchliffe explained the policy does include wording for incidents of MVA and/or medical disability whereas a Health Care Provider serves as the third party. She added that a sexual assault case is different where it requires an explicit pathway due to the nature of the incident. C. Murray posed the question, ‘are not all categories explicit?’ J. Hinchliffe suggested that if the members wish to review the policy as a whole, this item could be brought back to a future SCUS meeting for discussion but recommended that the committee vote on the revision today. All agreed. She also pointed out to new committee members that these guidelines had been reviewed and updated in 2013.
b. Course Equivalency (For Information Only)

J. Hinchliffe spoke to this agenda item to explain the differences between the types of course equivalencies as many faculties had problems defining what their course equivalencies were, which confused students and put them at a disadvantage. There appear to be three categories; a. direct course to course equivalency b. sequential course equivalency and c. one-way course equivalency. She added that the course change forms will be revised so the type of course equivalency may be selected. J. Hinchliffe suggested the members review their courses with their departments and forward any feedback to her.

c. Well Being through SFU Policy (For Information)

J. Hinchliffe gave a brief overview of this agenda item; an initiative through Health and Counselling whereas the intent is to create a healthy campus by revising how we conduct business and present information which directly impacts our students. A template was distributed to the members that outlined language, intent and presentation tips for developing or revising policies, practices and guidelines.

d. Report of the Working Group

J. Hinchliffe spoke to this item and informed the members on the four main items that the SCUS subcommittee have decided to bring forward for discussion and approval to future SCUS meetings.

- Course Repeat policy
- Exam policy
- Academic forgiveness policy
- Certificate analysis proposal

e. SCUS Procedure Changes

W. Parkhouse spoke to this item whereas he made a recommendation to slightly change SCUS procedure with regard to curriculum approvals. He suggested that only substantive curriculum changes be brought forward for discussion and approval and all other minor changes be approved by a delegated authority group and brought forward for information only. Using SGSC as an example in which that committee has the authority to delegate to the Chair. In addition, SGSC has the authority to set up subcommittees. There was much discussion with an overall consensus of interest to changing the process through which approval of minor changes is delegated to a subcommittee but there was agreement that central oversight is strongly needed.

Meeting adjourned at 3:36 pm
Minutes prepared by R. Balletta