

Minutes of the meeting of the APPC Sub-committee on New and Revised Courses and Programs (NRCP) held on **Thursday, April 17, 1997**, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 609 of the James Administration Building.

PRESENT: N. de Takacsy (Chair), W. Hendershot, R. Neufeld, S. Rytina, K. Woodman, Debbie Davies (Acting Secretary).

REGRETS: A. Currie, A. Hamoui, L. White.

GUESTS: John McGilvray (Philosophy); Anna Walsh, (Registrar's Office); Sarah Westphal (Arts)

10.01 The **Agenda** was approved as circulated.

10.02 The Minutes of the meeting of **March 20, 1997** had been approved.

10.03 Professor de Takacsy reported that the last NRCP Report to APPC was accepted.

10.04 Report from the Faculty of Arts (97-NRCP-04-36)

- a) *Honours in Italian*: Professor de Takacsy asked why there had been nothing written in the calendar requiring French language fluency as a prerequisite. Professor Rytina replied that historically nothing has ever been written, but fluency in French is required.

Professor de Takacsy will write to ask for the calendar entry to be changed.

- b) Professor de Takacsy asked Professor Westphal to speak about the School of Social Work's Certificate Program in Aboriginal Social Work Practice and to respond to any questions. Professor Westphal informed NRCP that the program meets a need for training Aboriginal social workers. It will be delivered by Continuing Education and financed by the Provincial Government. The Faculty of Arts and the School of Social Work agree that the courses offered in the context of this Certificate could also be credited towards that a regular Social Work Degree. The School of Social Work will exercise course and program control. The Faculty of Arts and the School of Social Work are willing to consider a designated Native advisor.

Professor Neufeld asked if all the courses already exist and whether there are two different versions. Professor Westphal explained that there are two versions of the courses are different but equivalent, and the same professor would normally supervise the content and delivery of both versions: evening at Continuing Education and daytime at Social Work. Professor de Takacsy referred to page 2 on admissions and inquired what the Continuing Education admission requirements were, and how the recommendation of the Native leaders and the School of Social Work would fit in, and whether other students could also take these courses. Professor Westphal assured Professor de Takacsy that there would be no problem in principle for daytime students to take evening courses. The Faculties will channel the students appropriately. **Professor de Takacsy will ask Social Work to rewrite the paragraph on admission requirements.** Professor Westphal suggested that the wording of the recommendation be written with the local community in mind.

Professor Hendershot inquired if there might be any complaints of segregation. Professor Rytina stated that was no difficulty in principle to targeting special programs to special communities and in fact this was goal of the funding by the Provincial Government. Professor Westphal reported that there is no discrimination at entry point. Professor Neufeld asked if the tuition fees are going to Continuing Education. Professor Westphal reported that Continuing Education was to administer the fees.

It was agreed that the program should be approved with the proviso that the admission requirements be clearly stated.

Professor Woodman asked that this proposal be cleared with SCCE before it is forwarded to APPC.

Professor de Takacsy will contact Dean Yalovsky. At the same time, he will also ask that the approval path for courses and programs involving the Centre for Continuing Education be cleared up.

- c) Professor Jim McGilvray was invited to speak on the *Multi-track B.A. Program*. Professor McGilvray explained that the Faculty of Arts was going through major restructuring of its undergraduate programs. The present proposal would be a replacement for the existing major programs. The new programs would be constructed from three classes of components: major concentrations of 36 credits in one discipline, minor concentrations of 18

credits in a discipline and a distribution requirement of 6 to 12 credits. Each student must take a minimum of one major and one minor concentration. Professor Woodman asked if this program was restricted to the Faculty of Arts. Professor McGilvray said yes, but that he would welcome other Faculties taking a similar approach. He added that a major selling point was the flexibility for the student and the ease in developing an understanding of more areas for a broader job market. He explained that Arts students do not get jobs in their disciplines but to better use resources they get locked into a major. Cutting majors to 36 credits and minors to 18 credits helps the 90 credit program become more attractive. Professor McGilvray agreed with Professor Neufeld that there is not a big change to minor programs but a big drop in credits in majors. Professor Hendershot asked if there would be any change to the Honours program. Professor McGilvray stated although there is a great deal of discussion the program will not change this year; though there might be an indirect impact on joint honours programs which presently involve 36 credits each from two different departments. Professor Neufeld asked why 36 credits and not another number. Professor McGilvray answered that the limiting factor at the upper end was the need to fit inside a 90 credit envelope, and at the lower end, the need to achieve a sufficient concentration in the discipline(s). Professor Westphal added that 36 credits was also practical in that it could be evenly distributed over three years.

Ms. Walsh asked how the programs would be entered on the transcript and whether the word "concentration" was essential. Professor Hendershot thought that this program might create havoc with the timetabling of courses. Professor Woodman asked for clarification of the term "distribution" credit. Professor McGilvray explained that these credits had to consist of courses so designated, which would be broad foundation courses open to all students without prerequisites and would be aimed in part at attracting students into that discipline by clearly explaining its intellectual foundations and methodology. Both Professors Hendershot and Woodman were concerned at this addition of a new term to the existing course nomenclature, but Professor Rytina explained that this was a new and different program element, and therefore needed a new designation, though a better alternative to "distribution" was perhaps desirable but if one could be found.

In response to a question from Professor de Takacsy, Professor McGilvray stated that the proposal had been revised to take into account the needs of those departments which claimed that their programs had a quasi-professional or job oriented character rather than a liberal arts character, with the possible exception of Computer Science.

Ms. Walsh was asked to address the student records limitations issue. She explained that at the present time there are no resources for changes to the old system and such changes might not be wise with the introduction of the New Student Information System. She explained that at present students can enter only one subject on MARS because there are problems with the structure of the program table. Second (or third) programs are handled by the creation of a new number to designate the combination and entered by a Student Affairs Office. She stated that ARO and ISR were presently looking at what it would take to modify the present system. She stated that this would be a massive restructuring of the old table. She reminded members that the New Student Information System had been approved by Senate though it would not be ready (even if budget approval was received) by March next year, which would be required to meet the proposed Arts deadline. NSIS and the Year 2000 Project were major projects in terms of time and resources. Priorities would have to be set for the many large projects. Ms. Walsh explained that the estimated cost would be \$75,000 to fix the old system, but this would remain more a guess than an estimate for another month while an assessment is carried out. Professor de Takacsy added that, in addition to MARS and the old student record system, there are other systems operated by Arts and Science that would have to be modified, for example degree audit, but the implications have not yet been assessed partly because there are no resources available to do the assessment. Professor Neufeld suggested that Engineering is currently evaluating turn-key degree audit system called DegreeNavigator which is very user friendly and which would cost under 100K\$ if adopted by all (or most) faculties, plus a yearly maintenance fee.

After a lengthy discussion, Professor Neufeld suggested that NRCP send along its concerns that the New Student Records System should take TOP priority and that NRCP does not want anyone to fiddle with the old system but press for the new system since the situation has now become critical. Professor de Takacsy pointed out that stated that the Multi-Track Program could not be implemented for the 1998-99 academic year if it had to rely on NSIS. Professor Rytina stated that from the Faculty of Arts standpoint, it is vital to have this Multi-track Program in place by August 1998. Professor Hendershot stated that for this to happen in practice, all the major and minor concentrations, perhaps 100 in total, must be come to NRCP by September 1997 since all approvals must be in place by December 1997 at the latest for the Calendar ... and one could expect somewhere between 60 and 100 such program proposals.

On the substance of the proposal, the committee was happy to give its approval.

It was therefore agreed:

that NRCP recommends the approval of the Multi-Track B.A. program;

that NRCP draws to the attention of APPC the resource implications of the multi-track BA program;
that NRCP recommends that NSIS should have priority over modifications to the old student record system;

that Professor de Takacsy will request from the Faculty of Arts their schedule for the development and approval of the major and minor concentrations with precise milestone dates.

10.05 The remainder of the agenda was deferred to the next meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.