

January 28, 1972

Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE January 24, 1972

TO ALL SCIENCE EXECUTIVE MEMBERS

FROM G. Richardson, Secretary - Executive Committee

SUBJECT:

GR

A special meeting of the Science Executive Committee has been called for Friday, January 28, 1972 at 2:40 p.m. in the Conference Room, 250 Allen Building.

The item for discussion will be the remainder of the B.Sc. (Gen.) Report not completed at the last special Faculty Council meeting. This includes items 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Additional copies of the report can be obtained from the Secretary.

GR:wac

February 4, 1972

Minutes of the special Executive Committee meeting held on Friday, January 25, 1972 at 2:40 p.m. in the Faculty Conference Room, 250 Allen Building.

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

Regrets: Dr. M. Kettner

The Chairman explained that it was his hope that by having the Executive Committee comment on the remaining items of the B.Sc. (Gen.) Report, (viz. Items VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, and XI) and forward their comments to the next Faculty Council meeting, that this would speed up Council's final decision on the report.

He noted that at the two special meetings of Faculty Council, discussion of this report had resulted in decisions on only the first five items. In addition to this, the Chairman stated that the remainder of the report was somewhat more 'operational' in content and did lend itself to Council's acceptance of this Committee's recommendations.

The Chairman asked Dean Cooke to speak to the report.

Item VI Science Requirement

Dean Cooke began by listing the courses that satisfy the current Science requirement. He indicated that his committee was not unanimous in its proposal that the requirement be removed. He himself, as Chairman of the Committee, had had his own opinions as to what the requirements should be. With the Committee's concurrence he outlined his own proposal:

Science requirement would be increased to:
one course from Mathematics, Statistics, Computer Science or Applied Mathematics,
one course from Physics or Chemistry,
one course from the Biological Sciences or Earth Science.

Professor Wood's opinion was that the requirement to take experimentally based courses as a good one and he would favour students majoring in Mathematics to do this. Dr. Svenne pointed out that in the past when we had an Arts requirement, it ensured a good cross section of courses for the general student, but now with this requirement gone he would favour retention of the Science Requirement. Dr. Vail maintained that the retention of this requirement was contrary to the objective of the report, which was to allow for maximum flexibility in the general program. The Chairman agreed that the objective of the report was to provide maximum flexibility, but, he stated, that in addition to ensuring breadth, certain minimum requirements were necessary, the degree, was, after all, a "General Degree".

Dr. Svenne proposed that this item be referred to Faculty Council with a list of all possible alternatives. Dean Cooke agreed and added that the final decision would be made by Council in any case, regardless of the Executive Committee's recommendation.

It was moved by Reid (Losey):

"that Item VI be presented to Faculty Council
with a list of alternatives."

Carried

Unanimous

The list of alternatives to be presented to Council would be the following:

1. Acceptance of Item VI viz. that the requirement be removed.
2. Retention of the present Science requirement.
3. Modify the present requirement to require one experimentally based course.
4. Modify the present requirement to one experimentally based course plus one Mathematics course.
5. Modify the present requirement to require one course from the Biological Sciences or Earth Science; one course from Mathematics, Statistics, Computer Science or Applied Mathematics; and one course from Physics or Chemistry.

Some discussion followed to consider the suggestion that a mail ballot be called for Item VI. The reason behind this was that it would give every Faculty member a chance to vote on what was considered a very basic and important issue. It was also suggested that because of the importance of this report, cancellation of classes in Science would be appropriate in order that all Faculty members might attend and vote. A third proposal was also suggested, viz. that the report be rewritten with all the changes and modifications, sent to each Faculty member and voted on as a package by mail ballot.

After much discussion it was pointed out by Dean Isaac that should Faculty Council get into the habit of requesting mail ballots on important issues, the regular Council meetings would become meetings for "unimportant" matters. It was moved by Reid (Wood):

"that the Executive Committee recommend to Faculty Council that Item VI be put to a mail ballot for approval."

Defeated

2 in Favour

Item VII Minimum Science Content

No discussion of this item ensued and it was passed on to Faculty Council without comment.

Item VIII Limit to Concentration

Further explanation of this recommendation was requested. Dean Cooke explained that the five courses must be outside the major department(s) and must not be any of the specific ancillary courses. They could, however, be other courses in the department from which the ancillary courses were chosen.

With this explanation the item was passed onto Faculty Council without comment.

Item IX General Performance Level

Dr. Cooke explained that the committee had attempted to revise three aspects of the existing regulations, these aspects being: to formulate a mechanism to place a student on academic suspension prior to his completing two years of study, as is now the case; to change the number of attempts from 23 to 20; and finally to simplify the overall regulations. He felt that these had been accomplished by Item IX.

After a short discussion, it was moved by Vail (Losey):

"that Item IX of the report be recommended for acceptance."

Unanimous

Item X Half Courses

Dean Cooke explained that Item X was essentially a recommendation in the hopes of "encouraging" legislation. If implemented, this proposal would give first year students more flexibility in choosing their eventual major programmes. As was the case now, certain programmes tend to become very restrictive after first year.

There was some discussion about whether or not this item should be included in the report, even if it was as, as was pointed out, part of a general liberalization of the B.Sc. program.

It was eventually moved Isaac (Vail) that:

"this section be deleted subject to further consideration in the Executive Committee."

Unanimous

Item XI Performance Level in Major

There was no discussion of this item and it was forwarded to Faculty Council without comment.

The meeting adjourned at 5:24 p.m.