

May 7, 1980

The Minutes of the 61st Meeting of the Executive Committee of Science Faculty Council held at 2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 7, 1980.

Members Present: C.C. Bigelow, Chairman; Profs. B.D. Macpherson, P.K. Isaac, K.W. Stewart, J.M. Stewart, R.G. Woods, K. Mount; S. Catt, Secretary.

Regrets: Profs. N. Losey, J. Charlton, P. Loewen.

Visitors: D. Derenchuk, V. Taylor, G. Paulley.

1. The minutes of the 59th meeting of December 20, 1979 were approved on a motion by J.M. Stewart/Mount. The minutes of the 60th meeting of January 28, 1980 were approved on a motion by R.G. Woods/Mount.
2. Worksheets (attached) containing the names and records of the top students in the General and Honours programs were distributed to the members by Donna Derenchuk, a Student Advisor. Dean Macpherson explained the criteria on which each Gold Medal is awarded. These criteria had been changed last year to include the last two years in the Honours, and the last 60 credit hours of the General programs. After some discussion the Gold Medal in the General program was awarded to Helen Constance Labies (Macpherson/K. Stewart, unanimous); and the Gold Medal in the Honours program was awarded to Terrence Patrick Legg (Macpherson/Woods, unanimous).

Dean Macpherson advised the Committee that the Faculty now has a third Gold Medal for the 4-Year Major program but that this medal would not be awarded until 1982 when the first regular students graduate.

3. Report from the Student Standing Committee on Regulations Regarding Misreading of the Examination Timetable.

Dean Macpherson outlined recent events in this connection, that is that a revised set of regulations had been approved by the Executive and sent forward to Faculty Council, which had referred it back for further consideration. The Executive had reaffirmed its approval at its meeting of December 20, 1979, but there had not been a regular Faculty Council meeting since then. In the meantime a new exam series had occurred and a number of

students had missed examinations. They were interviewed by Vic Taylor, the Administrative Assistant in the Faculty Office, and in the course of the interviews he had come to believe that all of them were legitimate cases of students who had misread the timetable, had car breakdowns or other reasons for having missed exams. Mr. Taylor had drafted a new proposal which would do away with the "F" associated with misreads; this had been considered by the Student Standing Committee; that Committee had decided it would be appropriate to simply grant a deferred exam in the course missed. On that basis Dean Macpherson had drafted a new set of regulations which was now being put before the Executive (copy attached).

In the discussion which followed, concern was expressed about the possible abuse of the new regulation, the lack of deterrent effect it would have, and lowering of the Faculty's standards. Some members expressed the view that even under the old, tight regulations, students who wanted to evade the regulations found ways to do so; that in many cases students bypassed the regulations by going to their instructors who agreed to administer special examinations, thereby allowing such students to escape the consequences of misreading. The proposed new regulation was similar to the one in effect in the Faculty of Arts.

Prof. Woods suggested that the new proposal be approved with the proviso that the Dean's Office monitor it for two spring exam series and if there is an increase in the number of requests for deferrals the Executive then reconsider the matter.

It was moved (Macpherson/Isaac) that

"The Executive pass the proposal to the Faculty Council
with the recommendation that it be accepted."

CARRIED.

1 opposed

4. First Year Programs

A questionnaire (attached) had been sent to a random selection of first year students, the replies are being analysed by the Dean's Office and some preliminary data are available.

The questionnaire was prepared following a request by Prof. N. Losey that common first-year programs be considered. Prof. Macpherson pointed out that analysis of responses was not complete but felt some of the preliminary data gave a base to build on; when the analysis was complete it could be looked at again. Prof. Woods was concerned about the matter of departmental affiliation for first year students which had not been resolved in spite of lengthy debate in Faculty Council of a report of an ad hoc committee examining it. Prof. Isaac, who had chaired the ad hoc committee, said it felt this was a separate question. He asked if it would be possible to have a follow-up in second year from those students who responded to the questionnaire. Prof. Macpherson said the Dean's Office planned a survey of students who don't intend to return to Science.

It was decided to leave further discussion until data were more complete.

5. Proposed B.C.Sc. degree and other matters affecting Computer Science

The Chairman referred to correspondence with the Head of Computer Science (copies attached to Agenda) and to discussions he and Dean Macpherson had with Dr. Stanton, and suggested that he be authorized to set up two Committees, (1) to deal with the question of the proposal for a B.C.Sc. degree, different admissions requirements for Computer Science students, narrowness of the Honours program, different time period for completion of the degree, a separate Student Standing Committee; and (2) to pursue the matter of a Co-operative Program. Prof. Stanton had made a new proposal in that regard which was that the present Computer Science program be converted to a Co-op Program.

The Chairman felt there are many complexities involved about which the faculty would have to be absolutely clear before getting into it. He would like to know whether there is likely to be much interest in other departments in co-operative approaches.

Both proposed committees would be chaired by Dean Macpherson in the first instance, the chair to be taken over by Prof. N. Losey when he goes on leave on July 1. The membership would consist of a representative from Computer Science and one from another area of the faculty.

On a question of time frame for the committees to complete their work, Dean Macpherson felt the first committee should be able to report by September; the question of Co-op Programs would likely require more time. The Chairman noted that Mr. Axworthy had expressed an interest in it.

On a question of overlap in course content the Chairman agreed Committee #1 would be looking into this. The matter of the technical training aspect as opposed to the educational philosophy of a Department of Computer Science was discussed but no conclusion was reached as to the Committee's role in this. A member felt it was not usual when a department is established to conceive a set of goals for it and this had not been done in the case of Computer Science which had been set up originally as an operator of a computer facility and only later began to offer courses.

The Chairman intended to draft terms of reference for the two Committees, which would be circulated and discussed at another Executive meeting in the near future. Membership of the Committees would also be discussed. The proposed Committees were intended to be advisory to the Dean and he had brought it to the Executive for their information and for guidance.

At this point a Student Senator attending as an observer asked permission to speak, the Committee agreed to hear him, and he proceeded to outline his views on several of the matters discussed.

6. Other Business

i. Election to Membership on the Student Standing Committee

It was necessary to replace one retiring member (Dr. Duckworth) and Dean Macpherson nominated two people who had agreed to let their names stand. These were Dr. W.C. Brisbin and Dr. N.R. Hunter. The ballot was secret and the result was:

Elected - Dr. W.C. Brisbin.

ii. Course Changes

At its meeting of Oct. 10, 1979 the Executive had approved four courses from Administrative Studies for inclusion in the list approved for credit in Science. However, Administrative Studies said they could not allow our students to register in 9.110, 9.111 and 27.111 due to space limitations.

Not considered at the time was the question whether students transferring to Science from Administrative Studies could be granted transfer credit for these courses; in view of our acceptance of the courses as appropriate for Science credit, the Executive was now asked to approve their transfer credit. It was moved Macpherson/Mount that:

"Students who transfer into the Faculty of Science having taken courses 9.110, 9.111, 27.111, 10.341 be allowed credit for these courses in their science program."

CARRIED.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

file

Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE April 22, 1980

TO Members of the Executive Committee of Science Faculty Council

FROM C. C. Bigelow, Chairman

SUBJECT:

The sixty-first meeting of the Science Executive Committee is scheduled for 2.30 p.m. Wednesday, May 7th, 1980 in room 250 Allen building.

A G E N D A

1. Approval of the Minutes of the 59th meeting held on December 20, 1979 and the 60th meeting held on January 28, 1980.
2. Selection of the Faculty's Gold Medal winners in the General and Honours programs (material will be distributed at the meeting).
3. Report from the Student Standing Committee on Regulations Regarding Misreading of the Examination Timetable.
4. First Year Programs (The results of the questionnaire we sent out are now being analyzed; preliminary data should be available at the meeting.).
5. Proposed B.C.Sc. degree, and other matters affecting Computer Science (see attached correspondence).
6. Other Business.

encls.

74
CB

n
ADM

Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE April 14, 1980

TO Dr. C. V. Bigelow, Science

FROM Dr. R. G. Stanton, Computer Science

SUBJECT: Your memo on various topics, and our subsequent conversation

1. Introduction. This is a very informal memo with the idea of getting on paper some remarks about the general philosophy and objectives that we were talking about. At the end, I shall make a suggestion as to how we might proceed to find the best way of implementing these.

2. Obviously, these remarks have not been to our departmental council, since we shan't have a meeting till fall. However, I believe that they translate general matters that we have discussed. In any case, I believe that your suggestion of setting up a joint committee to come up with something concrete is the best way of ending up with a definite proposal.

3. As we discussed, Computer Science would like to see a B.C.Sc. degree. The Science Faculty has already gone on record, in its memo to Senate, that it would be quite possible to have a separate degree within the faculty. So it would appear that such an arrangement could be worked out.

4. In line with having a separate degree, we would like to see an arrangement worked out whereby students could enter Computer Science in first year, being admitted to the Computer Science programme within the faculty of Science. This would permit entrance with what we wish for our students, namely, "general university entrance requirements with standing in Mathematics 300". Obviously, a student in this programme would have the same transfer rights to another programme as if he had entered anywhere else; similarly, we would be happy to allow any student with qualifications to transfer into the programme.

5. The programme would be neither a general nor an honours programme. It would be a specialized 20-course programme. It would resemble an honours programme in its concentration in one area; it would resemble a major programme in permitting part-time students, and longer than 4 years.

6. With regard to point 5, let me refer to the allegation of "narrowness" made about our programme. On checking the calendar, it seems to me that we do not prescribe more courses in our area than are prescribed by several other areas of science. However, in order to show that we are quite interested in diversity, let me suggest that CS change its regulations so as to require that a student in CS, before graduation, should have completed a minimum of six full courses (36 credit hours) outside CS. Might we also suggest that a similar requirement be made by all other departments, since we do not think that the problem, if problem there be, is unique to CS.

With regard to point 5 again, there would probably be quite a few CS students.

STANTON
4/14/80
CS/CS

our discussions indicated, the current "Honours" regulations have a procrustean nature that is foreign to our concept of the CS degree. With a CS degree, there would be 3 programmes in the faculty, the major and general programmes (I have lumped them), the honours programmes, the CS programme. I can see advantages to having 3 Student standing committees to deal with these. If only 2 were desired, then a fair division of labour might be to have a CS committee and one for the others. In any case, some discussion of getting a major input from us with regard to CS students would be helpful.

8. The other point in your memo deals with our co-op programme. This has been discussed for a long time. Everyone is in favour of it, but there is not enough money. I see no hope under present circumstances. Therefore, after discussions with a number of colleagues, I present a bold new concept.

9. Let us re-activate the committee that met last year (Lawless, Bigelow, McPherson, Stanton, Doyle: for Bigelow, read Connor at that time). Let us replace the current "regular" CS programme with a "co-operative" programme. By not trying to run both regular and co-op programmes, we avoid the heavy increase in funds needed. A co-op programme costs only a little more than a regular programme if you only run one of them. So it would be feasible, and if we went all-out in planning we might be able to start it from the fall of 1981.

10. There are a number of ramifications of point 9 that we have discussed, but we can see no major difficulties. Indeed, in view of the fact that Science and the Senate have already approved the co-op programme in principle, implementation should be quite fast and easy.

11. Excuse the typing; I shall be making an appointment to discuss point 9, which I think holds prospects of great benefit for the university, for the students, and for our employers.

12. In line with points 1 and 2, perhaps a committee could work out a reasonable proposal for implementing the above points, namely, (A) a BCSc degree (B) entrance into first year with the requirements mentioned in 4 (C) a co-op programme replacing the regular programme (D) a standing committee to handle the CS programme - or perhaps we should call it the co-op programme, since we would not have enough resources to give other than the co-op programme.

13. It should be stressed that going 100% co-op would in no way interfere with our service duties. We would simply give our current regular programme on a co-op basis; all courses taken by non-CS students would remain as they are (almost all are already half-courses).

14. Re the committee in 12, might I suggest 3 people from Science and 3 from CS chaired by yourself or your representative. Two people that come to mind as having expressed interest in the past - judging by the Science briefs - are Dr. Hall and Dr. Samioloff. On the other hand, you might feel that the committee re the co-op programme mentioned in 9 should do the ground work.

15. This memo is not meant as a model of organization!