

July 20, 1976 (Special Meeting)

rdc

The minutes of the Special Meeting of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council of Science held on Tuesday, July 20, 1976 at 1:30 p.m. in Room 250 Allen Building.

Members Present: Dean P. K. Isaac, Chairman; Drs. N. E. R. Campbell, K. Stewart, C. Platt, A. Olchowecki, D. Burton, H. W. Duckworth, G. Robinson, N. Davison and Mr. G. Richardson, Secretary.

Regrets: Mrs. K. Subrahmaniam.

Visitor: Dr. R. G. Stanton, Head, Department of Computer Science

The Chairman introduced Dr. Stanton to the members of the Committee and then gave a brief run down of the events leading to this second special meeting. He indicated that Dr. Stanton had dispelled many of the concerns of this Committee which resulted from the first special meeting on Friday, July 16, 1976 and in order to convince the Committee of this, Dr. Stanton had requested to meet with the Executive.

The Chairman stated that two of the main concerns of this Committee were the time module i.e. four months in, four months out, which appeared more expensive than certain alternatives and the fact that students were locked into this program with no chance of taking courses other than Computer Science ones. Because of these concerns the Executive Committee endorsed the Faculty Committee on Course Changes motions and were unable to recommend this program in its present form to Faculty Council.

The Chairman asked Dr. Stanton to speak to these concerns.

In his reply, Dr. Stanton referred to the two main concerns of the Executive Committee as well as the motions passed by the Faculty Committee on Course Changes. His discussion touched on many points some of which are as follows:

1. The Committee's feeling about the student being locked into the program was true, the student would be. This was intended to be a professional program for professionally minded students who wanted as much Computer Science material as possible. Students now in the regular Honours program could take as many as sixteen out of twenty courses in Computer Science and many do. The Co-op Program was intended for this type of student. If a student wishes electives, then he would take the regular

honours program which provides for this. If a student in the Co-op Program really wanted an elective course the department might allow him to take extra courses outside of his program and in addition to the program requirements.

2. Dr. Stanton stated that he first became involved in Co-op Program nineteen years ago at the University of Waterloo. The program at that time originated as four terms of three months, but for various reasons did not work well so it was changed to three terms of four months which worked much better. With this time module the Co-op program could overlap with the regular program thus cutting down on expenses and by overlapping feed back between the program was possible. In addition the periods proved to be long enough so that the instructors had adequate time in which to present all their material yet short enough that the student retained the information taught in class.
3. In commenting on the cost of the program, Dr. Stanton pointed out that the costs were essentially salaries for six new staff members. He went on to say that at this moment the department of Computer Science was six staff members short in terms of the staffing formula and by providing the six members requested for the program, the department would only be staffed to the level that it was supposed to be. Dr. Stanton claimed that the department was the most poverty-stricken of any department in the Faculty and even if they did go up by six members they would likely still be in a deficit position because the implementation of the program was certain to bring in more students to the Faculty. It was his feeling that under these circumstances the costs were not undue, unless of course it was intended that Computer Science was to operate as the poor department of the Faculty. Dr. Stanton concluded by saying that if it was felt that this program might adversely affect the Faculty, would this Committee give thought to recommending that the program be considered as separate and distinct from the rest of the Faculty? They might even consider the merits of the department separating from the rest of the Faculty.

4. In reply to a question on how students in the program would be evaluated, Dr. Stanton indicated that this would likely be done in a similar fashion to the department's current 324 course which gives academic credit for summer work. In this course, after approving the student's job, a questionnaire prepared by Dr. Stanton is sent to the employer. Upon return to the school in the fall the student is required to take 6 - 8 weeks of lectures on the basics of writing technical reports. There are four assignments involved and the student is graded on these and the returned questionnaire.
5. Students involved in this program would get paid for the time they spend at work. Industry would set the salary for the position and the student would be paid a pro-rated portion based on the time spent working, the year of the student in the program and his work experience.
6. Asked if he had approached industry for financial assistance for the program, Dr. Stanton replied that he had not and did not feel that it was right to ask industry for help. He said that industry now contributes substantially to the running of the University and should not be asked for more. He again pointed out that they were just requesting the six staff members that they were short!
7. Returning again to the Committee's concern of electives in the program, Dr. Stanton reiterated the department's stand that they were not opposed to electives in the program. At the request of Dr. Burton he agreed that a list of elective courses from which students could choose courses to replace Computer Science courses would be included in the program. The list would also indicate those courses which were considered to be compulsory to the program and those that were not and could be substituted by an elective.

In summing up it was noted that there were many problems associated with the implementation of the program. However, rather than get into a detailed discussion at this time, the Committee agreed to acknowledge that these existed and would in the future have to be solved should the Co-op program be approved and funds found.

Dr. Stanton reaffirmed the department's position that they could not proceed with the program unless all funds required were received. It was either "all go" or "no go" he said; they could not start on a part-time basis. He concluded by saying that if the Committee felt the program had virtue but that there are too many problems to be solved i.e. administrative, financial, etc., would it give consideration and perhaps recommendation to accommodating the program outside the Faculty.

The Chairman thanked Dr. Stanton for his time and he left the meeting.

The Committee decided that a special Faculty Council meeting should be called. The notice to the individual members would flag the matter as being of significant importance, and each department would be sent the detailed information of the program and be asked to make the material available to the staff members. Because the meeting would be a special meeting only one item of business could be discussed. However, the Chairman would ask Council at the beginning of the meeting if an announcement regarding Dr. Aitchison's memo (which requested information on the status of the Department Heads without term review) would be acceptable.

The meeting adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

/fk