

January 7th, 1972

January 18, 1972

Minutes of the tenth meeting of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council held in the Faculty Conference Room, 250 Allen Building, on Wednesday, January 7, 1972 at 2:40 p.m.

Members Present: R. D. Connor, Chairman; Drs. M. Kettner, G. Woods, J. Reid, I. Cooke, J. Vail, G. Dunn, P. K. Isaac, J. Svenne, G. Losey, Mr. D. Sutherland. (11) G. Richardson, Secretary

This meeting being a continuation of the ninth meeting, the agenda continued from the point at which discussion had terminated.

XI. Letter From Dr. Gratzer (cont.).

In determining whether or not copies of the information form, that is the one giving the background and pertinent information about the nominee, should be sent to all Faculty members or just several sent to the departmental office for staff to read if they so wished, the following motion was made by Dr. Vail (Svenne):

"that the background information on nominees be sent to all members of Faculty Council."

An amendment to this motion was proposed by Dr. Cooke (Reid) namely:

"that copies of the background information be sent only to departmental offices (two per office) and not to each member."

Defeated

4 in favour

5 opposed

A vote taken on the original motion resulted in it being

Carried

6 in favour

2 opposed

In speaking with Dr. Gratzter subsequently, the Chairman stated that Dr. Gratzter had another recommendation that he wished considered by the Executive; this involved the distribution of Faculty Council minutes. Dr. Gratzter felt that it was not necessary to send copies of the minutes to each individual, but, that several copies sent to each of the departmental offices would be sufficient. Agendas would still be sent to each member.

Dr. Reid suggested that only the important material, such as motions, was all that needed to be sent to individual members. The Chairman replied that the Faculty of Arts had tried this without success and had returned to sending copies of the complete minutes.

The discussion was concluded with the Committee agreeing that the current distribution of Faculty Council minutes should continue.

Before moving on to the next item of business, Dr. Reid wished clarification of the capacity in which Executive Committee recommendations reached Faculty Council. The Chairman stated that these were forwarded to Faculty Council as recommendations only and could be overruled by Council.

Dr. Vail suggested that they should be presented to Council in the form of motions which were subsequently moved by the Executive reporter. This he felt would initiate action on behalf of the Council. The Committee agreed and the Chairman asked Dr. Dunn, as Executive reporter to Council, if he would be willing to do this; he replied in the affirmative.

VII. Terms of Reference - Student Standing Committee.

The Chairman asked Dean Cooke to speak to this item.

At the conclusion of Dr. Cooke's review of the terms, Dr. Reid asked whether or not an appellant could appear before the committee in support of his appeal. Dr. Cooke replied only if the appellant was invited by the committee; this would happen only if the committee was not unanimous in its decision and wanted more information from the appellant.

It was Dr. Kettner's impression that when the Executive Committee had set-up the Student Standing Committee it had wanted the appellant to have the right to appear. Dr. Cooke stated that

the Student Standing Committee had not been given any such intruc-tion. He stated that the members of the Student Standing Committee had discussed this matter thoroughly and had rejected it. He went on to say that the circumstances here were different from that in a court of law where an appeal was made against a conviction. In law the man is "an appellant from a judicial decision", in this case the appeal was a petition that an existing regulation applicable to all not be applied to him. Here the appellant wanted special con-sideration due to some extenuating circumstances. These circum-stances were to be written down in a letter of appeal and sent to the committee; all members had knowledge of these. Prior to his appeal to the Student Standing Committee it was not unusual for the appellant to have had an interview with a student advisor and a meeting with one of the Deans to discuss his case.

It was Dr. Cooke's opinion that the appellant had adequate opportunity in which to voice his appeal and his presence before the committee was not necessary. No question and answer examina-tion was needed to reveal the facts of the case. The rules were known. The student knew the circumstances which would cause him hardship were the rules to be applied blindly, so with these written down, the committee could weigh them.

Dean Isaac was of the opinion that inviting a student to appear before the committee could be more disadvantageous to him than helpful. Further to this, Dr. Svenne felt that if a student was invited to appear he would have a natural feeling of obligation to do so and would probably feel that if he declined, it would lessen his chances of a successful decision.

The Chairman pointed that if the right to appear before the committee was given to every appellant, the work load of the com-mittee would increase very significantly. He also noted that con-sideration would have to be given to those appellants from out of town who would not always be available to come before the committee at their call. Further, to invite a student to attend might imply to some that he was on trial. Some, therefore, with quite legiti-mate petitions might not even apply for consideration. The Dean concluded by saying that every appellant who lost an appeal was sent a letter from himself stating that he could, if he so wished, take his appeal to the Senate Appeals Committee.

Mr. Sutherland suggested that when an unsuccessful appellant received a letter from the committee giving their decision, that it might be of value to say in the letter, the committee had reached its decision by unanimous vote.

At this point, Dr. Kettner proposed the following motion (Vail) to appear after "Appeals" 3.C. pg.2 of the terms of reference:

"that the appellant and/or his proxy, be invited to be present at the time and place where the Committee on Student Standing is considering his appeal and that he further be instructed that the invitation is not compulsory."

Defeated
4 in favour
6 opposed

Dr. Cooke (Vail) moved:

"that this Executive Committee endorses these terms of reference."

Carried
nem. con.

The following motion was made with regard to the disposition of the terms. Svenne (Cooke):

"that the Executive Committee report to Faculty Council that these terms of reference have been accepted by them and that the Committee seeks the concurrence of Council."

Unanimous

Dr. Kettner gave notice that he planned to raise the matter of the appellant appearing before the Student Standing Committee at the next regular Faculty Council meeting.

VIII. Disciplinary Unit.

In light of the new discussions in the University Disciplinary Committee, this Committee agreed to defer this item until a later meeting.

XII. Member of Science Faculty on the Manitoba Research Council.

Because the function of the Manitoba Research Council was not known to any of the Committee members, it was agreed that the Chairman would write the Council requesting more information on their activities, etc. and report back to the Executive Committee at a later date.

IX. Festival of Life and Learning.

The Chairman read the letter from the Science Vice-Stick requesting ideas from the Faculty Council members as to possible topics and speakers they might contact regarding the Festival of Life and Learning and Faculty Council's subsequent motion directing the Executive Committee to handle this matter.

After a brief discussion, the Chairman suggested that two volunteers from this Committee collect speakers names and topics from Faculty Council members and forward these on to the students. Agreement to do this was received from Drs. Kettner and Svenne.

V. Davis Report - Committee on Selection.

The Chairman asked Dean Cooke to speak to this item.

Having completed this, Dr. Cooke moved:

"that the report be accepted by this Committee."

Carried

With regard to the disposition of the recommendations, the following action was taken:

Recommendation I Dr. Cooke requested that he discuss this recommendation with Dr. Davis, the Chairman of the Selection Committee, before any action was taken and he would report back to the Executive at a later date.

Recommendation II The Committee agreed that a Faculty member of the Department of Statistics should be asked to assist the Faculty in implementing Recommendations II (a), (b), and (c). The Chairman would report back to this Committee at a later date.

Recommendation III Because the purpose of Recommendation III (a) could not be seen it was moved by Dr. Isaac (Reid):

"that item III (a) be deleted."

Carried
Unanimous

With this amendment the Committee agreed to forward this recommendation on to the Registrar and the Senate Committee on Admission.
Recommendation IV The Committee agreed to pass this recommendation on to the Registrar with the request that he implement it.

VI. Class Representatives.

This matter having apparently been attended to earlier, was dismissed.

XIII. Other Business.

Dr. Svenne enquired whether or not it was possible to have the Faculty Council meetings on a time other than Friday afternoons. He explained that it was always the same members who had to miss these meetings because of classes or laboratories scheduled during that time. The Chairman explained that this was one of the very few times that a location suitable for Council meetings was available for a time long enough to hold a meeting. However, he agreed to ask Faculty Council at the next meeting for their opinions about holding future meetings in other areas such as the Senate Chambers.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

GR:wac

January 18, 1972