

20 December 1979

Bundled

CB

The Minutes of the 59th Meeting of the Executive Committee of Science Faculty Council held on Thursday, December 20, 1979 at 3:30 p.m. in Room 250 Allen Building.

Present: C.C. Bigelow, Chairman; Profs. P.K. Isaac, B.D. Macpherson, N. Losey, J. Stewart, P. Loewen, K. Stewart, J. Charlton, G. Woods, K. Mount; Mr. H. Christianson; S. Catt, Secretary.

Visitors: Profs. J. Jamieson, M. Doyle; Mr. V. Taylor.

1. The Minutes of the 58th meeting of October 10, 1979 were approved on a motion by Charlton/J. Stewart.

2. Computer Science Department's Brief on School Status

Prof. J. Jamieson attended this meeting as a representative of the Senate Executive Committee to explain how they had dealt with the brief. Prof. M. Doyle attended as an observer from the Department of Computer Science.

The brief had been forwarded to Senate by the Dean with no comment except a wish that we would have an opportunity to comment.

Prof. Jamieson explained that Senate Executive had considered it to be a report requesting establishment of a new School. Senate Executive believes that no existing channels are applicable to this particular situation, and had decided as a first step to ask the Faculty for comments. Most members of Senate Executive felt there would be additional resources required and therefore the report would be forwarded to SPPC to determine the nature of these. The proposed starting date of July 1980 was thought to be unrealistic as the proposal would also have to be considered by Senate, the Board of Governors, and the Universities Grants Commission. The question was raised as to the type of school which was being proposed, i.e. a school within the Faculty or one separate from the Faculty. Senate Executive felt the proposal was to become a school within the Faculty initially and move to separate status in a year or two.

In reply to a question as to what was the driving force behind the proposal, Prof. Doyle responded that Computer Science sees itself as a rapidly growing area and would have a better chance in competing for

resources as a school. He was unable to respond to a question whether Computer Science would remain in the Science budget for the first year or two; the proposal was to "report to the Dean of Science" during the initial stage.

In reply to a question, Prof. Jamieson said the Senate Executive had restricted itself to considering how the proposal should be handled; without discussing substantive details.

Profs. Jamieson and Doyle left the meeting.

The Chairman put forward a proposal to present the brief to Faculty Council; by reason of the Council by-law requiring that matters of substantive importance must be discussed at two meetings, he suggested he write each Department Head asking for a short comment, these comments to be circulated to members of Council; have a Faculty Council meeting as soon as possible at which Council would be asked to refer the matter back to the Executive Committee to compile a Faculty comment to be considered by a second Council meeting and transmitted to Senate Executive.

There was discussion of what aspects the Departmental comments should deal with, and the Chairman suggested the comments could be as general as the respondents desired: the anticipated effect on the department, the faculty, the university, etc.

It was moved, Losey/Loewen that

"the Executive ask the Dean's Office, the Departments and individual members of Council to examine the 'Proposal for the Formation of a School of Computer Science' and prepare an opinion on the effect separation would have on departments, the faculty and the university for referral to Council."

CARRIED

Unanimous

Comments will be circulated, discussed at the first Council meeting, and an ad hoc committee of the Executive to be named by the Dean asked to compile a comment for discussion at the second meeting. The Executive agreed to the Dean's nomination of P.K. Isaac, J.P. Svenne and G.O. Losey as the ad hoc committee.

3. Restrictiveness of Computer Science Honours Program

At the last Executive Committee the secretary had been directed to write to the Head of Computer Science regarding the restrictiveness of the Honours Program and to request a reply by November 15th. A reply has been received indicating the Department has formed a committee to look into the matter. This committee has not yet reported.

4. Regulations regarding misreading of the Examination Timetable (referred back by Faculty Council)

Prof. Macpherson outlined the present procedure and the proposed new one which had been formulated by the Student Standing Committee, approved by the Executive and sent forward to Faculty Council, which returned it for further consideration. After some discussion it was moved Woods/K. Stewart that

"the Faculty Executive after due consideration endorses the recommendations from the Committee on Student Standing and resubmits it to Faculty Council for its consideration."

CARRIED

1 opposed

5. First Year Programs

A paper submitted by Prof. Losey was circulated and she asked that the Executive look at first year packaging to see if it is possible to devise prescribed first year programs in Science as is done in Agriculture and Engineering. She moved/Mount that

"the three packages outlined in the paper be included in the Calendar."

In discussion it was noted that the feasibility of common first year program or programs had been investigated during last summer; the result was essentially that the Departments felt it was not possible given the large number (63) of programs available beginning in second year.

Prof. K. Stewart wondered if Departments or Divisions of the Faculty could devise arbitrary first year programs which would constitute entry to various streams. Mr. Christianson felt this would limit students'

choices especially in large faculties. It was also noted that some programs in the faculty are already quite restrictive due to pre- and co-requisites and required courses. Possibilities of counselling and orientation sessions were discussed but it appeared individual counseling during September In-Person registration would not be possible because of the numbers of students.

The motion was called and was

DEFEATED

1 for

8 opposed.

A questionnaire directed to some first year students is to be formulated in consultation with the Executive Committee at a meeting which V. Taylor will be invited to attend.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

# Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE December 17, 1979.TO Executive, Faculty of ScienceFROM C.C. Bigelow

SUBJECT:

There will be a meeting at 3:30 on December 20 in 250 Allen Building.

We need to discuss a couple of matters.

1. Regulations regarding misreading of examination timetable (referred back by Council).
2. Computer Science Department's brief on School Status. I will have a proposal for referring this to Council.
3. Dr. Losey wishes to initiate a discussion on the treatment of first year students.

CCB/MD

(CWB)

M

PK

JMB