

UNIVERSITY SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting of August 7, 1980

PRESENT: Dr. J. Daniel (Vice-Chairman) Dean T. Emery; Prof. M. A. Malik; Prof. D. McKeen; Mr. W. Kan; Prof. G. D. Xistris; Dean P. Simon; Prof. S. Morris; Prof. A. Lauziere; Dean J. Chaikelson; Prof. G. J. Trudel; Prof. S. McEvenue; Dean S. G. French; Prof. J. Locke; Prof. C. Giguere; Dean M. Cohen

ABSENT WITH REGRETS: Prof. P. Seraganian; Prof. H. Fink; Dean M.N.S. Swamy; Dean D. Taddeo; Prof. H. B. Ripstein; Prof. V. Kirpalani; Prof. G. Gross; Prof. S. Dubas
Mr. N. Finestone

Call to Order

80-7-1 The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m.

Dr. Daniel advised that this was a special meeting to consider a proposal for a Ph.D. programme in Educational Technology and also a course, Psychology 500, in the Diploma programme in Art Therapy.

Ph.D. in Educational Technology

80-7-2 IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN FRENCH, SECONDED BY MR. KAN, THAT, GIVEN THE POSITIVE RECOMMENDATIONS OF B.G.S., (DOCUMENT US-80-7-D2), U.C.C.C., (DOCUMENT US-80-7-D3), AND THE PRIORITIES AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION COMMITTEE, (DOCUMENT US-80-7-D4), THE PROPOSED PH.D. PROGRAMME IN EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY, (DOCUMENT US-80-7-D1), BE APPROVED FOR SUBMISSION TO THE COMITE CONJOINT DES PROGRAMMES ON OR BEFORE SEPTEMBER 1, 1980.

In explaining the background of the proposal, Dean French advised that it had been approved by the Department of Education, the Arts and Science Faculty Council, an evaluation committee of the Board of Graduate Studies, the Board of Graduate Studies itself, the University Curriculum Coordinating Committee, and the Priorities and Resource Allocation Committee. He reminded Senators that with the permission of Senate at its meeting of May 23, 1980, a letter of intent had already been forwarded by the University to the Comité conjoint des programmes, advising that the programme would be forthcoming. It had also been agreed at that time, that should the programme be turned down by Senate at this meeting, the Comité conjoint des programmes would be notified that we would not be sending the proposed programme forward.

n response to a question concerning funding, it was explained that if the programme was approved without the necessary resources, the programme itself could be scaled down accordingly. If that should happen, it would be expected that a re-worked proposal would eventually be submitted to Senate for approval.

Concern was voiced over the phrase "... Quebec, Canada, and overseas...", (last paragraph, page 2, document US-80-7-D1), the feeling being expressed that the wording implied that Quebec was a separate country.

It was agreed that, rather than adopting a formal amendment, the concern would be noted in the minutes and the phrase would be appropriately re-worded when the dossier was being translated for submission to Quebec.

It was further pointed out, that the phrase as worded, excluded the U.S.A.

Suggested re-wording included "... Quebec and Canada and elsewhere..." and "... Quebec and elsewhere..." It was also suggested that perhaps the U.S.A. might be specifically mentioned in the phrase, because, at the moment, the Government appeared to be keen on cooperation between Universities in Quebec and the United States.

It was noted that the Doctoral Comprehensive Examination should be listed as "9" credits rather than "8" credits, as it appeared on page 34, document US-80-7-D1. AGREED THAT THIS BE CORRECTED TO READ "9" CREDITS.

It was pointed out that the last sentence in the first paragraph, page

19, (unnumbered), in document US-80-7-D1, was somewhat garbled and, as worded, it did not make any sense.

It was explained that the sentence in question was supposed to be a condensed version of what was on pages 17, 18 and 19, of the unabridged document, the french translation of which would be submitted to Quebec. It was suggested that, in order to make sense out of the sentence, some editorial tidying up would have to be done.

It was agreed that the sentence be changed to read" INCLUDING RESEARCH METHODS COURSES, THIS BEING AN IMPORTANT PART..."

Concern was voiced over the 10 Ph.D. graduates projected for 1986-87, (page 29, document US-80-7-D1), it being argued that the figure seemed to be somewhat inflated. It was further stated that the University's experience with Ph.D. programmes indicated that it would be a rare programme that would, graduate 10 Ph.D's in a given year. Also, if anyone was looking for reasons to cut down on the amount of financing to be given to the programme, they could easily argue that the figure was high and should be cut back and that the financing ought to be cut back accordingly. It was

suggested that the figure be looked at with a view to possibly shaving it down a bit.

Senate was advised that in the past few years there has been some documentation from Quebec, on the evaluation of programmes, which stated that any Ph.D. programme that did not graduate 10 students, was not viable.

It was suggested that perhaps a statement could be made to the effect that, while we would like to graduate 10 students at some point, realistically it might take somewhat longer than six or seven years to do so.

It was stated that this was a unique programme and one which was burgeoning and beginning to grow. It was argued that taking these factors into consideration, one could make a more optimistic estimate of the potential number of graduating students than in programmes where other competing institutions were offering the same degree. It was further explained that the original projection from the Department itself, was 8 Ph.D. graduates per year after six years, but because of the general directive that Quebec would not consider anything under 10 as being viable, the projection was changed.

It was argued that the attrition rate of 2 to 4 students per year was low and might, in fact, suggest that the programme as such, was not a very difficult one. Concern was also voiced over the projected figure of graduates in 1983-84, it being stated that experience would indicate that to anticipate that number of graduates three years after the programme was started, was unrealistic. However, by 1986-87 the projected number of ten graduates might well be reached because the compulsory course Educational Technology 890 is the blueprint of the thesis project. Once a student has taken this course, production of the thesis and graduation should follow fairly quickly.

It was pointed out that the figures on page 29 were projections and as such, they would not be taken literally by the Comité conjoint des programmes. Rather, they indicate whether it is to be a large, medium, or small programme. It was further stated that it was true that the figure of 10 graduates per annum, by 1986-87 was put in for political reasons and were the politics to change, the figure itself could be changed from 10 to 8. Finally, it was suggested that Senate should not spend further time discussing the enrolment projections.

In response to a question concerning the phrase "cultural communications", (second sentence, paragraph 3, page 30, document US-80-7-D1), it was explained that this was in reference to some of the research carried out within the Department concerning telecommunications, with adult populations and children, in isolated areas and as such, it did not include Fine Arts. However, it was recognized that there was a Ph.D. programme in Fine Arts and that, were a particular Ph.D. topic to have an artistic component, members from Fine Arts would be part of the committee. A

student wishing a Ph.D. primarily in the area of Fine Arts would be referred to that Faculty.

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

80-7-3

Dr. Daniel advised that he had spent time as a student in the Master's programme in Educational Technology at the University some years ago. He was particularly pleased that the Ph.D. programme was considered at the first meeting of Senate which he had to chair.

It was stated that educational technology could be a great help to those people faced with situations where it is impossible to teach in the normal fashion. Since we might now have our own Ph.D. programme in Educational Technology, studies and experiments on problems within the University could be most valuable.

It was explained that it was possible to undertake such studies within the limits of financial constraints. Senate was also advised that the Department of Education was aware of the particular problem in the Faculty of Commerce and Administration and that a recent graduate student had applied her thesis research to teaching accounting, one of the professors being a resource person from the Department of Accountancy. Again it was stated that while the educational technology programme was open to such ventures, they would always depend on the resources available. If it was possible to arrange "intern situations" the Department would be more than pleased to work on joint projects with other areas of the University.

Diploma in Art Therapy

80-7-4

Dean French reminded Senators that at the May 23, 1980 meeting of Senate, the Diploma in Art Therapy was approved for implementation in September, 1980. One of the proposed new courses in the programme - Psychology 500, had been approved by the Board of Graduate Studies in May, subject to approval by the Arts and Science Faculty Council. Senate was now being advised (document US-80-7-D5), that the course in question, Psychology 500, was approved by the Arts and Science Faculty Council on July 3, 1980.

He suggested there was an interpretation by which Senate would not have to approve the course since, by definition, it was the type of minor modification where authority for final approval rests with the Board of Graduate Studies. However, given the somewhat tangled history of the course in question, he felt that it would be as well to have it approved by Senate.

IT WAS MOVED BY DEAN FRENCH, SECONDED BY DEAN EMERY, THAT THE COURSE PSYCHOLOGY 500, (DOCUMENT US-80-7-D5), BE APPROVED.

- THE MOTION WAS VOTED ON AND WAS CARRIED -

Dean Cohen request that his vote against the motion be recorded.

On behalf of the Faculty of Fine Arts, Dean Emery expressed appreciation for the uncommon dispatch which had been accorded to this course, (Psychology 500); for the kindness of various departments in the University in tailoring a course for the needs of the students; and for the speed with which it has been implemented.

Adjournment

80-7-5 The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

John Noonan
Secretary of Senate