

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting of April 27, 1979

PRESENT: Dr. J.W. O'Brien (Chairman) Prof. J. Bordan; Dr. M. Despland; Dr. R. Breen; Dr. P.E. Filion; Dean J. Chaikelson; Dr. R.E. Wall; Prof. D. O'Connor; Prof. M. Verthuy; Dean S. French; Prof. C. Bertrand; Prof. R. Tittler; Prof. K. Waters; Dean W.E. Akin; Prof. J. C. Tresierra; Prof. H. Proppe; Mr. P. Saskin; Ms. L. MacDonad; Mr. W. Kan; Mr. G. Fyffe; Prof. J. Stewart; Prof. R. Lambert; Mr. N. Finestone; Prof. H.B. Ripstein; Dean M. Flynn; Prof. J.H. Whitelaw; Prof. A. Deland; Prof. R. Curnew; Prof. J.D. McLaughlin; Mr. K.D. Adam Dean M. Cohen; Prof. T. Nogrady; Prof. T. Fancott; Dean M.N.S. Swamy; Prof. J.C. Giguere; Dean A. Pinsky; Prof. J. Locke; Dean P. Simon; Prof. J.R. Goodwin; Prof. G.D. Xistris; Prof. J. Bhatnagar; Prof. R. Smith; Prof. S. Morris

ABSENT WITH REGRETS: Prof. M. Farrell; Prof. A. Crossman; Prof. A. Jordan

Call to order

79-3-1 The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m.

Dr. O'Brien advised that the first item on the Agenda would be dealt with in "Closed Session" and he asked those present who were not members of Senate to leave the meeting.

OPEN SESSION

Approval of Minutes

79-3-3 IT WAS MOVED BY DR. WALL, SECONDED BY DEAN SWAMY, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE SENATE MEETING OF MARCH 23, 1979, BE APPROVED.

- MOTION CARRIED

Question Period

79-3-4 With respect to the matter of conditions in the Vanier Library which had been raised at an earlier Senate meeting, Dr. O'Brien invited Mr. Graham Martin, Vice-Rector, Administration and Finance, to present his report on the current state of that situation. Mr. Martin explained that this was intended to be a progress report as a follow-up to the earlier report which he had made to Senate last December. The project was as yet far from ended and consequently, this would be another interim report.

He advised that since the December meeting he had received the initial engineering study on the Vanier Library air-conditioning problem, some of

the details of which he had mentioned in his report to Senate at that time. As he had previously indicated, the University was not satisfied with that first report and it was subsequently decided to deal with another firm which has done and is doing further work in the air-conditioning area. He stated that the University was now more confident that the problem was being grasped. The second study was more thorough, and included such things as computer simulation of the operation of the air-conditioning system against the actual day by day temperature cycles over the last few years. As a result of these studies, a detailed plan of experimentation and modification has been drawn up and will begin next week. He advised that some of the major tests and modifications to begin next week would include rewiring and adjusting of controls to correct some of the wierd aberrations which occur; installing various time delays to properly handle the on-off cycles which the air-conditioning would be going through; altering various ducts in order to bring cooled air to areas which it previously had not been reaching; separating by walls, areas in the Library where there was no heating problem from areas where there was a very serious problem; modifying the diffusers which, as he had indicated in December, directed cool air onto the lights resulting in the air being heated even before it got into the body of the Library, by taking them through a ninety degree bend and placing new diffusers on the ends; reviewing the cooling system of the skylight in the centre of the Library; studying possible coatings that could be put on the skylight to reduce the incoming heat loads; varying the operating cycles of the central plant, i.e. the hours of operation, etc., to correlate the cooling effects with the operation in the Library itself.

Mr. Martin advised that all of the above were in addition to the extra maintenance contract which has been signed and the general cleaning of the system, including the ducts, which has gone on, and would be going on again over the next few weeks.

He stated that hopefully the results over the next two weeks should give a clear indication as to whether or not these modifications would solve the problem without the installation of a very expensive extra plant. If the experiments prove successful, arrangements have already been made with a contractor to carry on and spread the installation of diffuser elbows, etc., throughout the Library over the next month, so that with these changes, if they prove workable, everything should be fully operational by June 1, 1979.

Mr. Martin also alerted Senate to the major problem of the power plant on the Loyola campus which has to be shut down during the last two weeks in May for the annual boiler maintenance and inspection. During this period, no cooling or heating would be available on the campus and the only operation that would be available during those two weeks would be straight ventilation of outside air. Consequently, if a heat wave occurs during that period, there would be nothing that could be done about it.

In summarizing, Mr. Martin stated that over the next few weeks, experiments would be undertaken to modify the system and the results of the changes he has mentioned, which would cost approximately twelve

thousand dollars, should provide a reasonable chance to solve the problem with the existing installations for this summer. If not, the University would probably have to invest in a major installation, with a cost of between one hundred and one hundred and fifty thousand dollars. However, he advised that he was frankly more optimistic now than in December, that the problem could be handled with the proposed changes to the existing system.

79-3-5

Responding to a question which had been raised at the last Senate meeting concerning the amount of time required to move Library books from one campus to the other, Dr. Filion, Assistant Vice-Rector and Director of Libraries, advised that Library personnel had completed a statistical study and information on the current situation with respect to Inter-campus Delivery (I.C.D.), was now available. He explained that Library personnel were very much concerned with the problems and the unanimous feeling was that there was no use in having so many books, nor especially rationalizing the selection of books on the two campuses, if the books could not be rapidly moved from one site to the other. The feeling was that perhaps there should be some re-allocation of the budget and more money directed towards the I.C.D. system in order to hasten delivery of books from one campus to the other.

Statistical studies indicated that on the average, it takes three days to deliver material from the S.G.W. campus to the Loyola campus, and two days from the Loyola campus to the S.G.W. campus. The reason for this difference was that material from the Loyola campus is delivered directly to either the Science or the Norris Libraries, whereas material coming from the S.G.W. campus is delivered to a central depot on the Loyola campus and then to either the Vanier or Drummond Libraries. This amount of time applies to 59 percent of the requests, provided the books are in the Library. Dr. Filion explained that 11 percent of the requests involved items which were in use in the Library or books which have just been returned, and in which case the time required for collecting, sorting and delivering, was increased to four days.

The remaining 30 percent of the requests involved items which were on loan and for which, even though they are recalled, the Library must wait until they are returned. Also, as often happens, there is a waiting list for a particular item that has been requested. In such cases, where people are already waiting, it might take a few weeks to fill the request.

Concerning steps to be taken in an attempt to improve the system, Dr. Filion advised that beginning on April 30, 1979, books requested from the S.G.W. campus would be delivered, not to the central receiving area, but rather, directly to the Vanier Library on the Loyola campus; that over the next few months attempts would be made to hasten transmissions of requests, and to report on the status of a particular request, whether the book was on loan, whether there was a waiting list, etc.; and that through discussions with those involved improvements in the transportation system would be sought.

Dr. Filion advised that the aim of the Library, over the next few weeks or months, was to provide one-day service. He emphasized however, that this would only be possible where items requested were in the Library and were not already on loan.

79-3-6 Prof. Tittler expressed his appreciation, on behalf of all Library users, for the comments Just made by both Mr. Martin and Dr. Filion. He stated that he was particularly encouraged by Dr. Filion's comments concerning the speeding up of inter-campus delivery of Library material and also with the idea that people requesting material would be notified in those instances where items were already on loan. Prof. Tittler felt this was essential to the kind of borrowing policy which Senate decided on last Spring.

79-4-6 Responding to a question concerning interim arrangements for classroom space over the next two years, and particularly with respect to slimmer courses which were scheduled to start next Tuesday, Mr. Martin advised that the plan for modifications to the physical plant of both campuses was intended, in general, to provide transition space. He stated that he had learned of the specifics of the classroom space situation only one hour ago, but his understanding was that the Registrar was meeting with Prof. J.P. Petolas, Assistant Vice-Rector, on the matter. Insofar as he was aware, there was not to be any interruption in the number of classrooms, although classrooms would move in the course of the summer. Certain classrooms would be taken out of use and others would be added. He emphasized that the intention was certainly to provide transition space. Responding to another question, Mr. Martin confirmed that the current plans for major modifications included provisions for accessibility on behalf of handicapped students and faculty and also that such plans would be forwarded to the Committee on Provision of Services and Facilities for Handicapped Students.

79-3-8 Referring to the rather lengthy discussion that occurred at the beginning of the Question Period at the last Senate meeting as a result of a question which he had raised concerning mechanisms in the Faculty of Engineering for ensuring formal student input to faculty contractual decisions, Prof. O'Connor stated that he wished to quote from a memorandum addressed to him from Prof. Bordan, Vice-Rector, Academic 1978. The memorandum advised Prof. O'Connor that the dated August 18, the document concerning "Contract Board of Governors had adopted Increments: Full-time Faculty " and Renewals, Promotion and Merit also that . the Board "had instructed the Deans to ensure, in their implementation of section 1. of the new regulations, formalized arrangements for student input be made in the not-too-distant future". He requested that this be recorded, if possible, as a further clarification of the state of affairs.

Reports from Councils, etc.

79- 3-9 Dean Swamy advised that three grants had been awarded by the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada, from among applicants from all of the Universities in Canada, two of which had been awarded to the Faculty of Engineering of Concordia University. The value

of one grant was eighty-four thousand dollars and the other, seventy-six thousand dollars.

79-3-10 Dr. Breen reported that Dr. H.E. Enesco has received a thirty-eight thousand dollar grant from Health and Welfare Canada - NHRDP, to do a study on nutrition and longevity.

79-3-11 Concerning the Research Green Paper (agenda item VI, o),), Dr. O'Brien advised that the Steering Committee, in deciding how to deal with this item, proposed that it be placed in the Section of "Reports from Councils, etc.", because the intent was not to begin a major and far ranging debate on what was obviously a large subject of considerable importance to the University, at this meeting. Rather, Steering Committee proposed that Senate should be made aware of what was going on in the University, as a reaction to the Green Paper on Research and that Senate have an opportunity to consider in what way and at what time it might wish to deal more thoroughly with the question. He also emphasized that there was a very particular and very tight timetable involved in making some kind of response to this matter. Dr. M. Despland, Associate Vice-Rector . Academic, Research, explained that in late March or early April, 1979., Dr. Camille Laurin, as Minister of State for Cultural Development in Quebec, published and widely disseminated a Green Paper entitled "Towards a Scientific Research Policy for Quebec". The deadline for submission of any response to the Green Paper was June 30, 1979. Dr. Despland explained that the "Green" Paper, in the mind of the Minister, was the beginning of a consultative process and was not a proclamation of broad Governmental intentions. In the Fall, the Minister for Cultural Development, armed with better knowledge as a result of having read the responses to the Green Paper, , would visit the Universities and other research-minded institutions for reaction to the Green Paper. At that point, some further process of digestion and reflection was supposed to take place at the Governmental level, which might well lead to a "White" Paper or a declaration of intention with respect to research policy. This in turn, in all probability, would lead to legislation.

He advised that the Rector has established a Task Force consisting of himself; Dr. J. Stewart; Deans Cohen, French, Simon and Swamy; and the two Vice-Rectors, Academic, to prepare a response to the Research Green Paper. The first meeting of the Task Force was devoted to setting up a process of information gathering and consultation to ensure input to the University response from researchers and other people in the University. Specifically, a memorandum was circulated to all departments inviting them to submit responses if they wished to do so early in the internal process; the Steering Committee was contacted concerning consultation with Senate; and arrangements have been made for an open meeting to be held on May 9, 1979, in room H-435, Hall Building, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., to exchange ideas on the issues raised in the Green Paper. He further advised that the first draft of the University's response would presumably be completed around the end of May.

He explained that up to now research policy has been largely a Federal enterprise, but we were now witnessing the inevitable appearance of

Provincial concerns on research policy and development. It has become clear over the past few years that the Provincial Departments of Education, by having policies on the development of Graduate Studies, were affecting the direction of research and were investing education money in research-related areas. Since such large amounts of University money were devoted to the training of researchers and to research itself, it was quite appropriate for any Provincial government to ask questions about research.

The situation in Quebec was special in the sense that the Provincial development of interest in research was being undertaken by a Government which, apart from good government, has also a certain commitment to some type of referendum on sovereignty-association - This general political context was very much present as background to the Research Green Paper. The first citation of various extracts from the Green Paper, which the Task Force has distributed for the Senate meeting (document US-79-3-D13), made this abundantly clear.

Dr. Despland explained that there was another twist which was peculiar to Quebec, which he felt should be emphasized. This was that research development was being understood by the Department responsible for the Green Paper as being a part of an effort of cultural development, so that University research was not there as a topic for consideration in and for itself, but rather as a topic for consideration in the framework of a broad policy for research, which encompasses governmental and industrial research. The general strategy behind the Green Paper was not to evaluate and improve University research, but rather, the general policy was to have some sort of take-off in scientific, industrial, and research developments in general in Quebec and for us to question the role of University education within that broad cultural and somewhat political context.

Concerning the University's response, the intention of the Task Force was to begin by presenting as clear a picture as possible of our own achievements and experiences in the area of research development. As we tell our own story, we can identify aspects of our experience in which it is clear that the type of thinking embodied in certain points in the Green Paper, would handicap the successes that we have had.

For purposes of today's meeting and particularly for the open meeting scheduled for May 9, 1979, which would allow for lengthier discussion, Dr. Despland advised that the Task Force has selected certain major issues from the Green Paper, which were outlined in document US-79-3-D13.

Responding to a question concerning the possibility of presenting a draft of the University's response to Senate, if it so wished, Dr. O'Brien explained that it would be possible to do so, but the problem, if there was one, would be one of timing. He suspected that there would be a very narrow period of time between the date on which a draft of a working paper in sufficient detail to allow for effective discussion would be available, and the date beyond which the task of incorporating any changes to the document, having it translated into French and delivered to Quebec City, takes over. It may well be that that particular period would not coincide with the one

remaining regular Senate meeting. If Senate wished to discuss the University's response to the Research Green Paper, it might be necessary to call a special meeting at whatever date appeared to be most effective for that purpose.

Dr. Despland advised that it was clear from the timetable that the definitive English version of Concordia's response should be ready no later than June 15, 1979. He emphasized again that major input to the response should be made by May 9, 1979, particularly insofar as contributions to the major issues were concerned.

A straw vote indicated that Senate did not wish a special meeting to be called at the end of May or the first week in June, to deal specifically with the University's response to the Research Green Paper.

Dr. O'Brien emphasized that the meeting of May 9, 1979, was the major point at which there would be an opportunity for discussion and influence on the direction that the University's brief would take. He urged all Senators who had an interest in the matter to attend that meeting, if at all possible.

Dr. Despland explained that while the document speaks of Scientific Research Policy, which has a mathematical and natural science image, nonetheless, the word "science" in the document refers to all research activities in all fields, from Fine Arts design to Engineering, including Sociology, Philosophy, Medicine, etc. It must be made clear that what was going to be decided may affect all University departments, including those in the Faculty of Arts and Science, and not just the so-called natural science departments.

He invited members of Senate to submit, as an input, any and all analytical, firm, and informative memoranda, to the Task Force.

Appointments

79-3-12 IT WAS MOVED BY DR. WALL, SECONDED BY MR. KAN, THAT THE FACULTY APPOINTMENTS TO THE CONCORDIA COUNCIL ON STUDENT LIFE, (DOC-US-79-3-D2), BE APPROVED.

- MOTION CARRIED -

Amendments to the Grading System

79-3-13 Dr. O'Brien explained that document US-79-3-D3 concerned the establishment of a new grade, "Med", which was discussed at the last Senate meeting. The document provided the specific way in which this new grade (sections in italics on page 2) would be included in the regulations. Mr. Adams, University Registrar, explained that the heading "INC, DNW and MED", at the top of page 2 of document US-79-3-D3, should also be in italics.

IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN CHAIKELSON, SECONDED BY DR. WALL, THAT THE REGULATIONS PRINTED IN ITALICS ON PAGE 2 OF DOCUMENT US-79-3-D3, (INCLUDING THE HEADING AT THE TOP OF THE PAGE), BE APPROVED.

- MOTION CARRIED -

During the discussion on Supplemental Examinations Regulations, (see below), it was agreed that the designation "Med/Abs" be changed to "Med/DNW".

Supplemental Examinations - Regulations

79-3-14

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. WALL, SECONDED BY DEAN CHAIKELSON, THAT THE SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATIONS - REGULATIONS (DOC-US-79-3-D4), BE APPROVED. It was wondered whether the grade "Med/Abs", which appeared at the end of item 6, document US-79-3-D4, was correct or whether it should really be "Med/DNW".

Mr. Adams stated that the above question applied also to item 7, b), and he explained that it should be understood that the grade that would be-submitted by the instructor would be the original grade of "F", or "Abs", etc., and the "Med" grade would be a technical change that would be made in the Registrar's Office once the medical certificate had been submitted.

The feeling was expressed that it appeared that two different terminologies were being used to represent the same thing, "DNW" and "Abs" and it was wondered which of these terminologies would be used with the "Med" grade.

It was agreed that the proper designation was "Med/DNW".

The mover and seconder of the motion agreed that the designation "Med/Abs", in items 6. and 7, b), (DOC-US-79-3-D4), be changed to "Med/DNW".

It was also agreed that this change would apply to document US-79-3-D3, which had just been approved.

It was suggested that a brochure or pamphlet on the basic academic regulations be drawn up, covering such things as withdrawals, examination regulations, etc., which could be included with the registration material or distributed, at least, to all new first year students entering the University.

It was also suggested that a concise set of instructions on the academic regulations, particularly on the grading system, be prepared for faculty members.

It was noted that the Supplemental Examinations Regulations (DOC-US-79-3-D4), were Undergraduate regulations and did not apply at the Graduate level.

- THE MOTION, AS CHANGED, WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

79-3-15

IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN SWAMY, SECONDED BY PROF. GIGUERE, THAT THE IMPLEMENTATION DATE FOR THE SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATIONS REGULATIONS (DOC-US-79-3-D4) BE THE 1980 SUMMER SESSION AND THAT IN THE INTERIM, THE PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED WILL BE THOSE WHICH APPEAR IN THE 1979/80 CALENDAR.

It was suggested that item 2 of the Supplemental Examinations Regulations (DOC-US-79-3-D4), which states that "A student is not permitted to write two supplemental examinations for the same course, whether or not the course is being repeated. However, a supplemental may be written for a course being repeated if the student has not written one previously for that course.", be adopted immediately as a working basis by the Examinations Office.

Mr. Adams advised that he did not see any problems with the above suggestion.

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY PROF. MORRIS, SECONDED BY PROF. BHATNAGAR, THAT ITEM 2 OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATIONS REGULATIONS (DOC-US-79-3-D4), BECOME EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY.

- THE AMENDMENT WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

- THE MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED, WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

79-2-16

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. GIGUERE, SECONDED BY DR. WALL, THAT THE NEW "MED" GRADE (DOC-US-79-3-D3), BECOME EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY.

- MOTION CARRIED -

Revised Composition of the Engineering Faculty Council

79-3-17

In presenting the Revised Composition of the Engineering Faculty Council (DOC-US-79-3-D6), Prof. Giguere explained that when the current composition of the Faculty Council was approved two years ago, part of the resolution was that the composition would be examined again within two years. The reason for this was that the Centre for Building Studies had just come into existence and it was felt that it would be appropriate to review the composition of the Council after two years of operation of the Centre. This was done this year and the Engineering Faculty Council has approved for

forwarding to Senate and the Board of Governors, the revised composition (DOC-US-79-3-D6), which was now before Senate. Prof. Giguere pointed out and explained the changes to the current composition of the Engineering Faculty Council which were being proposed in the Revised Composition.

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. GIGUERE, SECONDED BY DR. WALL, THAT THE REVISED COMPOSITION OF THE ENGINEERING FACULTY COUNCIL (DOC-US-79-3-D6), BE APPROVED AND RECOMMENDED TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR ITS APPROVAL, TO BE EFFECTIVE AS OF JUNE 1, 1979.

Concern was voiced over what was felt to be a low number of student members on Council in proportion to the number of administrative and faculty members. However, it was pointed out that the number of student representatives in the Revised Composition of the Engineering Faculty Council was identical to the number of student members in the current composition of the Faculty Council. Senate was advised that the Committee which the Faculty Council established to consider the composition, consisted of one member from each of the departments in the Faculty of Engineering and one student member. It was also reported that the student member, despite several attempts to get him to attend the meetings, did not show up. Senate was further advised that all faculty members were asked for their views on what the composition of the Faculty Council should be; it was discussed in the departments; the Engineering Student Association; and the Faculty Council.

- THE MOTION WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

Guidelines for Courses and Programmes within "Small Units"

79-3-18

Dr. O'Brien explained the background of the document concerning courses and programmes within "small units" (DOC-US-79-3-D7). He also pointed out that document US-79-3-D8 was a report from the Arts and Science Faculty Council, advising that it has considered and approved document US-79-3-D7.

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. WALL, SECONDED BY PROF. TRESIERRA, THAT THE DOCUMENT CONCERNING GUIDELINES FOR COURSES AND PROGRAMMES IN SMALL UNITS (DOC-US-79-3-D7), BE APPROVED.

Responding to a question concerning item 2, Section I, of document US-79-3-D7, Dr. Wall explained that the document was written in a way to allow for a good deal of flexibility but at the same time to provide a set of guidelines for Senate. The normal operation of a particular unit should allow for 18 credits over the three-year period. However, if the particular unit wishes to offer more than 18 credits, it must present that request to the Arts and Science Faculty Council, identifying those additional credits as above the norm. He pointed out that in no circumstances would Council approve more than 42 credits. He also outlined the curriculum, requirements for the various "small units" which have been approved, including the 33 credit

core curriculum of the Science College proposal which was included on the agenda for today's meeting.

It was pointed out that the motion was to approve the entire document, although the document itself consisted of two sections, the first on courses and the second on programmes. It was suggested that the motion should be split accordingly.

It was agreed that the motion be split and that Senate proceed to consider Part I of document US-79-3-D7, concerning courses.

Concerning item 3, Part I, document US-79-3-D7, the feeling was expressed that in addition to the Arts and Science Faculty Council, approval by Senate should also be included, particularly in light of earlier Senate discussions which indicated that some of the "small units" would probably end up being more than Arts and Science-wide, and possibly University-wide.

Dr. Wall advised that the above concern was covered in item 4 which states that courses proposed by small units would follow the same curriculum procedures at the Faculty and University level as other course proposals, which procedures included the Senate. There was no intention to by-pass Senate.

The feeling was expressed that the intention would be less ambiguous if item 4 preceded item 3. The implication in item 3 as presently worded, was that if small units did not wish to offer courses beyond the provision of item 1.2, they did not require approval of the Arts and Science Faculty Council.

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY DEAN COHEN, SECONDED BY DEAN CHAIKELSON, THAT THE ORDER OF ITEMS 3 AND 4 IN SECTION I, DOCUMENT US-79-3-D7, BE REVERSED.

It was suggested that it would be better if item 4 was placed directly after item 1.

THE MOVER AND SECONDER AGREED TO WITHDRAW THE AMENDMENT.

It was argued that there was a fundamental difference between what was stated in item 3 and what was stated in item 4. The difference was that item 3 concerns the extension beyond 18 credits, while item 4 concerns new courses. Also, item 2 establishes the norm of 18 credits and item 3 states that only the Arts and Science Council would decide whether a "small unit" could offer 24, 30, or 36, etc., credits. Again it was pointed out that since the "small units" might involve other Faculties, it would be better to amend item 3 to include approval of Senate.

Dr. Wall explained that the intention was not to by-pass any of Senate's prerogatives but rather to assert the fact that the Faculty of Arts and Science was a Faculty like any other Faculty, and should have original jurisdiction

to determine what was in the best interest of the Arts and Science Faculty concerning its own curriculum.

He further advised that to add the phrase "and Senate" to item 3 would, in fact, change the intent of the document. The intent of the document was that it would be the Arts and Science Faculty Council that would determine whether or not a "small unit" would be able to offer more than 18 credits.

The feeling was expressed that the document (DOC-US-79-3-D7), did not say clearly what it was intended to say, and it was suggested that the document should be re-written in a way that would be clearly understood by everyone.

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY PROF. MORRIS, SECONDED BY PROF. BERTRAND, THAT THE PHRASE "AND OF SENATE" BE ADDED TO ITEM 3, PART I, OF DOCUMENT US-79-3-D7.

It was argued that the amendment involved some kind of trusteeship of the Arts and Science Faculty Council which did not exist in the case of the other Faculties and it was suggested that any trusteeship of any of the Councils would be a dangerous precedent which the other Faculties might be setting for themselves in the future. Also, if Senate voted in favor of the amendment, it would, in effect, be removing from Arts and Science part of the authority which was normally delegated to other Faculty Councils.

It was argued that the authority of Senate insofar as curriculum was concerned, was the final authority and no Council had the kind of authority that was being stated explicitly in the document US-79-3-D7.

The feeling was expressed that in approving items 2 and 3, as written in the document, Senate, in effect, would be approving the right of "small units" to offer from 18 to 42 credits, and if Senate was willing to grant them that right, it should approve the document. If Senate was not willing to do so, it should so specify, and ensure that such requests would have to be approved by this body.

Responding to a question concerning the intent of item 2, as written, Dr. Wall explained that the normal expectation of the Arts and Science Faculty Council was that if a particular unit submitted a request to be allowed to offer 6, 12, or 18 credits, there would be no need for a major discussion on that and it would be considered simply on the basis of academic merit. However, when the request involved more than 18 credits, the question as to whether or not "small units" should be allowed to offer more than 18 credits, would be discussed.

Prof. Whitelaw stated that there seemed to be a problem with the word "offer" which appeared in item 2, because it was an ambiguous word and suggested that the ambiguity might be removed by combining and rephrasing items 2 and 3 to read "In addition to the above, each small unit may create courses up to 18 credits, closely related to its philosophy or purpose. In exceptional cases, where justification can be made, "small

units" may create a greater number of credits but in no case will they create more than 42 credits".

Dr. O'Brien advised that, as with so many other documents, one of the advantages of debate was to discover points of ambiguity and possible differences in interpretation and it was seldom indeed that a document of any complexity whatever was passed by Senate in the first attempt. He suggested that as has happened on previous occasions, Senate could ask that the document be re-written, rather than attempting to re-write it by virtue of a series of amendments.

He stressed, however, that there were further proposals concerning "colleges" on the agenda, which Senate should move on to deal with. He did not feel that those proposals would stand or fall on what decision is ultimately made as to whether the Arts and Science Faculty Council or Senate should give approval for being beyond certain numbers. The key thing for that purpose was whether Senate was in agreement with the basic concept that a "small unit" may create 18 credits and no more than 18 credits, without going through some further special process that will turn a spotlight on what was being done. If it then goes through that special process, which could be defined precisely in due course, it may create more than 18 credits, but only to a maximum of 42 credits. If Senate was in agreement with that basic concept, the document could be reworked to the greater satisfaction of more people.

It was wondered whether the mover and seconder of the motion were prepared to accept the wording of a combined item 2 and 3, as suggested by Prof. Whitelaw.

It was pointed out that six of the three existing "small units" were now offering more than 18 credits. The logic of items 1, 2, and 3, document US-79-3-D7, was that item 1 identifies the norm, item 2 identifies the normal exception to the norm, and item 3 identifies the abnormal exception to the norm. It was argued that the facts, as presented, indicated that fifty percent of the small units not only depart from the norm but also depart from the normal exception to the norm. Given this situation, it was wondered what was the purpose in attempting to establish guidelines.

Dr. Wall explained that the guidelines document (DOC-US-79-3-D7) was before Senate because Senate asked for it and Steering Committee insisted that there be guidelines and suggested that no new proposals should come forward without them. He agreed that it was a bit like locking the barn door after the horse had gotten out. The fact of the matter was that "colleges" were created either last year or in the fall of 1978, following which Senate requested guidelines. However, the guidelines have to reflect reality as well and the reality of existing programmes was a fact.

The feeling was expressed that passing rules and guidelines about something that has already been done and on something that the document was not going to undo, was really like passing an abstraction. There was a proposal for a new "college" on today's agenda, which may well be the last

"college" proposed to Senate, and it was felt therefore, that there was very little need for these guidelines. The proposal for a Science College was far more interesting and far more important for Senate to debate than these guidelines and Senate was urged to either table the document (DOC-US-79-3-D7) or to pass it, so that Senate could discuss the very important proposal for a Science College before 5:30 p.m.

IT WAS MOVED BY PROF. TITTLER, SECONDED BY DEAN FRENCH, THAT THE DOCUMENT (DOC-US-79-3-D7), BE TABLED.

Dr. Wall advised that he was quite prepared to vote in favor of the motion to table, provided he could be assured that in the course of the debate on the agenda items yet to be discussed, someone does not argue that Senate could not approve the proposals coming forward because there were no guidelines.

Dr. O'Brien advised that Senate could discuss and pass the proposals on the agenda concerning "colleges", without the guidelines having been approved, even if such proposals departed radically from the guidelines. He explained that the reason that the Steering Committee insisted on this document appearing at the meeting was because when the Liberal Arts College was being discussed, a view was expressed that the basic principles of how many courses the "small units" should offer, should not be forced on the back of a specific "college" proposal. Because of this, the Steering Committee felt that the mandate from Senate was to make sure that before further proposals were made, Senate would have the opportunity to establish a set of guidelines. Senate has seen what such guidelines might well look like, if ultimately adopted and if Senate now sees fit to table and proceed to the next curriculum items on the agenda, that would certainly imply, in this context, the willingness of Senate to proceed with those next items and not to refuse on the grounds that there were no guidelines.

- THE MOTION TO TABLE WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN COHEN, SECONDED BY PROF. TITTLER, THAT AGENDA ITEMS IX, c) AND d), BE REVERSED AND THAT SENATE NOW CONSIDER THE SCIENCE COLLEGE PROPOSAL.

- MOTION CARRIED -

Science College Proposal

79-3-19

IT WAS MOVED BY DR. WALL, SECONDED BY DEAN FRENCH, THAT SENATE APPROVE THE CREATION OF A SCIENCE COLLEGE AS OUTLINED IN SENATE DOCUMENT US-79-3-DIO AND SEND IT ON TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR APPROVAL - THE DATE OF ACTUAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLEGE TO BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD ON RECOMMENDATION OF THE RECTOR.

Dr. Wall presented and explained the Proposal for a Science College (DOC-US-79-3-D10).

Prof. Whitelaw, in presenting the Report from U.C.C.C. on the core curriculum elements of the proposed Science College (DOC-US-79-3-D15), explained that the recommendations contained in the Report were related to the core curriculum elements and not to the proposed B.A. Specialization in Science and Journalism, which the Committee was still studying and which presumably would be coming to Senate with the other programme proposals from the Faculty of Arts and Science, for the next meeting.

AN AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY PROF. WHITE LAW, SECONDED BY PROF. GIGUERE, THAT THE CORE CURRICULUM ELEMENTS PROPOSED FOR THE SCIENCE COLLEGE BE APPROVED, SUBJECT TO THE U.C.C.C. RECOMMENDATIONS (PAGE 3, DOCUMENT US-79-3-D15).

It was argued that the Proposal for a Science College (DOC-US-79-3-D10) was one reason why Senate must have authority to determine what the core requirements of the "colleges" were. The core requirement for the Science College was thirty credits and while the case could be made that the courses were innovative and attractive, the fact remained that thirty of the total package of ninety credits would be specified by the College. The document states that "the College is intended to attract a limited number of outstanding students". These were students which one would want to have follow Honours programmes but it was argued that the thirty credits make it impossible for such students to receive an Honours degree in Physics and perhaps also in Chemistry.

Also, it was stated in Appendix I that apart from one seventy-five credit programme, there would be no difficulty in substituting twelve college credits for twelve credits in the seventy-two credit honours programmes. It was argued that this was not true for the seventy-two credit Honours Physics programme. It was explained that in the case of Physics, the ninety-credit Honours programme was reluctantly reduced to seventy-two credits a few years ago. Also, an honours programme involved more than academic performance and an honours graduate was expected to have covered an adequate amount of background material in the courses and should not be required to take a qualifying year at the Graduate level. It was argued that if the Honours Physics programmes was reduced to sixty credits it almost automatically followed that an Honours graduate would be required to take a qualifying year.

The feeling was expressed that the word "program" in the first sentence on the first page of the General Description of the Science College (DOC-US-79-3-D10), was misleading and it was suggested that "offering" would be a more appropriate word.

Dr. Wall agreed that, given the technical meaning of the word "program", and its use in connection with curriculum matters, it would be better to substitute the word "offering" in the first sentence. With respect to the

Honours Physics programme, Dr. Wall advised that the Science College Planning Committee was aware of the fact that what was being proposed was a very tight programme and it would place a great burden on students who would be involved. However, the Science College hoped to recruit only the very best students, who, it was felt, would be able to handle the heavy burden that would be placed on them. He also pointed out that the Planning Committee had consulted with the Chairman of the Physics Department, who outlined some of the difficulties involved but felt that it would be possible, although very difficult, for students to do both the Science College core curriculum and the Honours Physics programme.

Responding to a question concerning resource implications, Dr. Wall replied that as he has stated on a number of occasions, the costs of the different "colleges" varied from "college" to "college" and that the average cost has been in the neighbourhood of fifty thousand dollars. These costs included secretarial budgets; some contracts for part-time instructors from the departments; and certain costs to purchase furnishings to create the appropriate "college" atmosphere. He advised that he did not see any reason why the Science College should cost any more than that and also that, since the Science College would not be implemented for the Fall of 1979, the costs for this unit for the coming year should be considerably less.

Responding to a question from Dean Simon concerning the number of courses to be offered and the expected enrolments, Dr. Wall advised that the Science College expected to admit approximately twenty-five new students each year; that the "College" would be offering approximately ten, three-credit courses over the three-year programme; and that the per course enrolment would be approximately twenty-five students. It was pointed out that in addition to this, some other students, with permission of the Science College, might also enrol in some of the Science College courses.

It was proposed that the Science College curriculum be reduced from thirty credits to eighteen credits. It was suggested that this could be accomplished by combining the four three-credit "Survey of a Scientific Discipline" courses, listed under Area I, into two three-credit courses, each being more intensive than what was previously intended, and by requiring only the two three-credit courses in Area II. Any other variation of the package that the Science College would prefer in order to reduce the programme to a total of eighteen credits, would also be acceptable.

Responding to a question concerning the rigidity of the programme and the fact that students enrolled in the Science College would not be able to fit elective courses in Philosophy, Sociology, etc., into the ninety-credit degree programme, Dean Cohen pointed out that we have a large number of Major students, and he suggested that it might be desirable for some outstanding students to take a Major in a discipline along with the Science College curriculum. He stated that such students would be perfectly acceptable to the best Graduate Schools in North - America, with the possible exception of Canadian Schools. He advised that he had taken an early draft of the proposal to Harvard, Stanford and Berkeley where he was told that they would actually prefer to have a student with less information, more

cognitive ability and a broader education, not in the sense of having satisfied a humanities requirement but rather, broader in the sense of having a better understanding of science. He reiterated that such students would be perfectly acceptable to those Graduate Schools, or even given preference over other students.

Dean Cohen also advised that he had presented the Science College proposal to all department chairmen in Division III and even though there was some difficulty with the Science College curriculum being combined with a disciplinary Honours programme, the reservations were outweighed by consideration of the benefits to the departments in absorbing these students and the proposal was wholeheartedly endorsed by all the departmental chairmen.

It was pointed out that the Arts and Science Faculty Council had endorsed the document on Guidelines for Courses and Programmes within "small units" (DOC-US-79-3-D7) which recommends that the norm for the number of credits to be offered by "small units" should be eighteen and it was wondered why it should not be considered reasonable, insofar as the Science College curriculum was concerned, to require only six credits in each area, as had been suggested earlier.

It was argued that the above suggestion would reduce the whole Science College core curriculum to superficiality and would deny the College the sufficient amount of time to provide the kind of education which it wished to provide and has requested.

Concern was voiced over the trend to be multiplying the number of courses which were likely to have high quality but nonetheless small enrolments, at a time when some of the shortcomings in pedagogical effectiveness in the University still remain, i.e. too many classes that have too large enrolments and remain that way fundamentally because of budgetary considerations.

It was recalled that at a meeting of Senate last Spring, Dr. Wall had estimated that average costs of the "colleges" would be sixty-four or sixty-five thousand dollars. Also, at the first meeting of this year, Dr. Wall had acknowledged that the costs had been much higher than that and in fact were closer to eighty thousand dollars. Today it was stated that the average cost was fifty thousand dollars. It was stated that one was somewhat puzzled over these three different figures and it was wondered whether one could be somewhat more precise insofar as costs were concerned.

Dr. Wall advised that every time he has mentioned costs he has stressed that these were "operating" costs and he stated again that the average operating cost for a particular "college" was about fifty thousand dollars. He explained that initially at the outset there were additional costs for furnishings, etc., that were over and above the operating costs, which raises the costs in the first year of operation of the "unit". However, once the furniture had been bought, the average expenditures would be much lower.

The feeling was expressed that the only genuine objections to the Science College that have been raised, concerned the Honours Physics programme and those objections seemed to relate less to the quality of the Science College than to the difficulties that some of the physics students might have in taking the Honours Physics programme and joining the Science College. Even here, we seem to have conflicting reports. It was suggested that if the Physics Department was interested, then some kind of modus operandi could be worked out, whereby, for instance, the Independent Study or some of the other seminars might be exchanged, as has been done in other cases. Also, what everyone seemed to be forgetting was that entrance to the Science College was optional and students did not have to register in the College unless they wished to do so. If students wished to take an Honours degree in Physics and not go into the Science College, they were perfectly free to do so.

The feeling was expressed that it was a perfectly appropriate function for a College of Science to seek to produce scientists who do their science educatedly. Equally, it was an important and appropriate function of a science department to see to it that its students do the science methodically correct. One would be perfectly happy with the document if Senate would consider the possibility of allowing the Science College to visit upon the departments the responsibility to train scientists to be investigatively methodically sound, thereby eliminating from the Science College curriculum the Independent Study Component or at least reducing it to a level at which the College requirements included only twenty-four credits, without compromise to the important aspects of its programme.

Dean Simon advised that he was definitely going to vote against the proposal for a Science College. He explained that it was not so much a question of the merit of the proposal itself, but rather, that once more at Concordia, we were going to create a very expensive proposition. If the Faculty of Commerce and Administration were to create its own colleges, for example in real estate management in other disciplines, Dean Simon stated that he did not think that Concordia would have either the financial or physical resources to support such propositions. He pointed out that many of the professors in Commerce teach more than the normal load and with enrolments of fifty or more students in each class, for which there was no compensation and where no fifty or eighty thousand dollars has been invested. This situation is going to continue to get worse in the coming years. He advised that, as of now, the Registrar did not know where he was going to be able to put the Commerce students next year. At the same time, we want to create some other entities which will require space and facilities, etc.

He explained that if it was only a question of enrolment, Commerce could find programmes that would create many more enrolments than any of the Colleges could have. He argued that it was imperative that at some time, somewhere, Senate or another appropriate body, must address itself to the question of resource allocation, because the Faculty of Commerce could not continue the way it was now doing, if at the same time, the members of the Faculty were witnessing what was going on in the Faculty of Arts and

Science. He stated that he was not capable, as the Dean of the Faculty of Commerce and Administration, of achieving a normal morale in the Faculty, if year after year the Faculty had to accept more and more burden in order to create some kind of accommodation for the enrolment that the Faculty has. He advised that he learned this morning that the Faculty of Commerce and Administration would have eighteen large classes, out of which each has more than five hundred student enrolments and he wondered how far and how well the Faculty could cope with this problem.

With respect to the financial issue, Dean Cohen advised that what we were talking about were differential costs. To establish such a unit in the Faculty of Arts and Science would cost, in operation, approximately fifty thousand dollars per year, whereas to establish such a unit in the Faculty of Commerce would cost in the order of three to four hundred thousand dollars per year. He explained that the Faculty of Arts and Science already had the faculty and lab facilities. What we were talking about was an additional differential cost, which may attract twenty-five new students, and where in fact, the differential cost would be on the plus side rather than on the negative side. This could not be done in another area of the University.

Insofar as the educational aspect of the proposal was concerned, Dean Cohen stated that the fact was that most Science departments have determined that it was feasible, although very difficult, for a student to combine an Honours programme with the Science College curriculum, within the ninety credits. An exception was the Specialization in Bio-Chemistry, but even here, Dean Cohen stated that he was sure that the Science College would consider allowing some of the Bio-Chemistry students to take some of the other science courses within the College, without taking the complete curriculum.

Responding to a question, Dr. O'Brien explained that what was presently before Senate was a motion to approve, in effect, the content of document US-79-3-DIO. There was also an amendment to make the changes that are recommended by U.C.C.C. and summarized on page 3 of document US-79-3-D15. With respect to the B.A. Specialization in Science and Journalism, he advised that if the recommendations from U.C.C.C. are approved, that programme would still remain in the document because there were no U.C.C.C. recommendations to either change or correct that programme.

Dr. Wall stated that he did not wish to deprive Senate of the opportunity to debate the programme, and since Senate has not had a chance to discuss the B.A. Specialization in Science and Journalism, nor has U.C.C.C. had an opportunity to make a report, he was prepared to leave the programme aside for the time being.

A SUB-AMENDMENT WAS MOVED BY DR. WALL, SECONDED BY PROF. BERTRAND, THAT THE B.A. SPECIALIZATION IN SCIENCE AND JOURNALISM BE TABLED AND REFERRED BACK TO U.C.C.C. AND TO SENATE FOR ITS NEXT MEETING AND THAT ALL REFERENCES TO THE B.A. SPECIALIZATION IN SCIENCE

AND JOURNALISM BE DELETED FROM THE DOCUMENT
(DOC-US-79-3-DIO).

The mover and seconder of the main motion agreed that the phrase "program is", in the first sentence on the first page of the General Description of the Science College (DOC-US-79-3-DIO), be changed to "offerings are".

- THE SUB-AMENDMENT WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

- THE AMENDMENT WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

THE MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED AND CHANGED, WAS VOTED
ON AND WAS CARRIED - (26 in favor; 5 opposed; 2 abstentions).

The following Senators asked that their votes against the motion be recorded: Prof. Curnew; Prof. Goodwin; Prof. Morris; Prof. Ripstein; Dean Simon.

Next meeting

79-3-20 Dr. O'Brien advised that there would be a special meeting of Senate at 9:30 a.m. on May 24, 1979, to deal with the Graduation Lists. The next regular meeting of Senate would be held on Friday, May 25, 1979, and would very probably be an all day meeting.

Adjournment

79-3-21 The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

John Noonan
Secretary of Senate