

## SENATE MINUTES

October 8, 1996

The regular meeting of Senate was held on Tuesday, October 8, 1996, at 4:00 p.m. in Room E5004.

### 7. PRESENT

The President, Dr. J. Tuinman, Dr. K. Bindon, Mr. G. Collins, Mr. R. Ellis, Professor M. Lamb, Dr. G. Gardner (for Dean A. Law), Dr. B. Johnston (for Dean W. Ludlow), Dean T. Murphy, Dr. J. Pennell, Dr. W. Redden, Dean R. Seshadri, Acting Dean C. Sharpe, Acting Dean D. Whalen, Dr. M. Volk, Dr. A. Aboulazm, Dr. G. Bassler, Dr. J. Bear, Professor L. Bennett, Mr. E. Brown, Professor A. Chadwick, Dr. S. Chandra, Dr. G. Clark, Dr. W. Davidson, Dr. J. Evans, Dr. G. Gunther, Dr. M. Haddara, Professor K. Hestekin, Dr. O. Janzen, Dr. G. Kealey, Dr. W. Locke, Dr. R. Lucas, Dr. M. Mulligan, Dr. V. Maxwell, Dr. D. McKay, Capt. W. Norman, Dr. M. Paul, Dr. R. Payne, Dr. N. Rich, Dr. V. Richardson, Dr. R. Rivkin, Dr. G. Sabin, Dr. S. Saha, Dr. D. Tulett, Dr. C. Turner, Dr. K. Vidyasankar, Professor D. Walsh, Dr. C. Wood, Mr. K. Smedbol, Mr. D. Baker, Mr. K. Clarke, Mr. S. Ennis, Mr. M. Harvey, Ms. D. Johnston, Mr. R. Mendoza, Mr. S. Musseau, Mr. B. Penney.

The President advised Senate that because Mr. G. Collins had indicated that his previous involvement with student #7663263 could place him in a perceived conflict of interest position, Mrs. M. O'Dea, Deputy Registrar, would present this student case.

### 8. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Dr. K. Keough, Dean W. Blake, Dr. F. Marsh, Dean T. Piper, Dr. G. Burford, Dr. I. Mazurkewich, Dr. D. Treslan, Dr. S. Wolinetz.

### 9. MINUTES

The Minutes of the regular meeting held on September 10, 1996 were taken as read and confirmed.

### 10. Report of the Honorary Degrees Committee

The names of four candidates recommended by the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial were presented to the Senate for awarding of doctoral degrees honoris causa. Dr. K. Bindon made a brief statement about two of the candidates and Dr. R. Lucas and Professor Donna Walsh each made a brief statement about one candidate. Members were given the opportunity to discuss the merits of the candidates before voting. Upon voting by a show of hands, each candidate was approved by at least a two-thirds majority vote.

#### 11. \*REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF SENATE

It was agreed by separate motion where necessary, that the report of the Executive Committee be approved as follows:

##### 11.1 Student Appeal to Senate

MUN NO. 7663263

At a meeting held on September 24, 1996 the Executive Committee of Senate agreed to forward to Senate an appeal submitted on behalf of the above-noted student for (i) readmission to the university and (ii) readmission to the Faculty of Education.

Given the volume of material related to this case, Mrs. O'Dea, Deputy Registrar, provided a verbal summary for the information of Senate.

Senators first discussed whether the appeal should be considered since a previous appeal on behalf of the student making similar requests was denied at a meeting held on September 12, 1995. General Regulation C.3.iv states "Should a student's appeal be denied by the Senate he/she will be advised that within the University no further appeal is possible." In light of the dissension among Senators regarding the interpretation of this regulation, the Chair ruled that while the regulation does not permit a further appeal to a higher body within the University than the Senate, the student has the right to appeal a second time to Senate if new information is provided.

It was moved by Dr. Tulett and seconded by Dr. Sharpe that the appeal of student No. 7663263 be DENIED.

Following further discussion, it was moved by Mr. Ellis, seconded by Dr. Clark and carried to table the motion to deny the appeal and to refer the appeal back to the Executive Committee of Senate with the instruction that the Committee act upon the suggestion contained in a memorandum dated 1996 09 12 from Mr. W. W. Thistle, Legal Counsel, that an independent assessment of the medical information submitted with this student's appeal be carried out, following which the Executive Committee is to report back to Senate.

It was agreed that while the medical assessment is to be undertaken by medical practitioners acceptable to the Executive Committee with time frames and conditions to be set by the Executive Committee, consent of the student is needed to have contact made directly with his attending physicians and other medical personnel.

Further, it was noted that the lawyer acting on behalf of the student, should be advised that this independent medical assessment will be taken into consideration with the documentation previously submitted, when this case is brought back to Senate. As well it should be made clear that the question of readmission to the Faculty of Education will have to be referred back to that Faculty but this will be done if and only if the student is readmitted to the University by the Senate.

Following discussion of this student case, it was suggested that a review of General Regulation C.3.iv should be undertaken to clarify any perceived anomalies which may be contained in the wording.

It was also suggested that in cases where the advice of the University's Legal Counsel has been sought, counsel should be invited to attend the meeting when the case is being discussed in order to answer any questions which may arise pertaining to the advice given.

#### Report of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

11.2 A memorandum dated September 6, 1996 was received from the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies advising that, in accordance with the HANDBOOK OF SENATE BY-LAWS AND PROCEDURES, SECTION VI SENATE COMMITTEES – SELECTION AND

PROCEDURES, A.Senate Committee Procedures, Clause 7., Dr. Dennis Treslan has been elected as Chair of that Committee for the 1996–97 academic year.

### 11.3 \*Proposed New Honours Programme in Computer Science

At a meeting held on August 29, 1996, the Executive Committee of Senate reviewed a proposal for a new Honours Programme in Computer Science. Following a lengthy discussion it was agreed that the proposal be referred back to the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies with a recommendation that an external review be undertaken to ensure that the University is utilizing all of its resources to provide the strongest degree that it can offer in this area.

Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies responded that, in its view, an external review is not necessary, and recommended that this matter should be referred to the Senate Committee on Academic Planning where a review can and should be undertaken if deemed necessary.

At a meeting held on September 24, 1996, the Executive Committee of Senate considered the response of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies and a request from the Dean of Science that the matter be forwarded to Senate. In a memorandum dated September 26, 1996, the Executive Committee forwarded this item of business to Senate with a recommendation that an ad hoc committee be established, comprising two members from the Department of Computer Science, two members from the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science and three additional members (one of whom will be designated as Convenor), to be named by Senate on the recommendation of the Committee on Committees, to review this proposal with a view to the following:

- to examine the direction the University should take with programmes and resources in this area
- to ensure that the University is utilizing all of its resources to provide the strongest degree that it can offer in this area

- to examine the proposal in the context of similar national and international programmes and in light of anticipated changes in the area of software engineering within the next 5 - 10 years
- to present a report for the consideration of Senate following its deliberations of the above-noted points as well as any other related topics which the Committee considers relevant.

It was moved by Mr. Collins and seconded by Dr. Sabin, to accept the recommendation of the Executive Committee of Senate that an ad hoc committee be appointed as outlined in the memorandum dated September 26, 1996.

During the ensuing debate a number of Senators expressed concern with the suggestion that the proposed programme, which, in their view, had been

thoroughly examined and approved for submission to Senate at all the usual committee levels, should now be reviewed by an ad hoc committee.

A number of speakers, including Dr. A. Deb from the Department of Computer Science (a non-senator who was granted permission to speak on this item by Senate), pointed out that the proposed programme is a reorganization of existing courses requiring no new resources and a number of students have expressed an interest in the programme.

Proponents of the motion spoke with regard to the importance of offering the best possible degree, and suggested that in many Canadian universities, engineers and computer scientists are collaborating to produce better programmes in software engineering.

Following further lengthy discussion, the motion was put to a vote and was DEFEATED.

At 6:00 p.m. it was moved by Dr. Rich, seconded by Dr. Maxwell and carried, the time of the meeting be extended for fifteen minutes.

It was moved by Dr. Clark and seconded by Dr. Davidson that the proposed Honours Programme in Computer Software Engineering be approved.

Following further discussion it was moved by Dr. Turner and seconded by Dr. Sabin that the motion to approve be tabled and that efforts be made to bring together members from the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science and the Department of Computer Science in an attempt to come to a mutually agreeable solution before the November 12 meeting of Senate. When put to a vote the motion FAILED.

The motion to approve was then put to a vote, and the following calendar changes relating to the proposed Honours Programme in Software Engineering were APPROVED.

Page 199, 1996–97 Calendar, following the heading Programmes in Computer Science add new clause c to read as follows:

"c) Honours in Computer Science (Software Engineering)(B.Sc. only)"

Relabel c) to k) as d) – l).

Page 200, following the section Honours in Computer Science insert the following new section:

"HONOURS IN COMPUTER SCIENCE (SOFTWARE ENGINEERING) (B.Sc. ONLY)

1) See General regulations for the Honours Degree (B.Sc.).

2) Twenty-one Computer Science courses are required for the Honours Degree in Computer Science (Software Engineering), including:

a) Computer Science 1700, 2710, 2711, 2740, 2741, 3711, 3714, 3718, 3724, 3725, 3740, 4716, 4718, 4719, 4721, 4759 and 4780.

b) Three additional Computer Science courses at the 4000 level.

c) One additional Computer Science course at the 3000 level or beyond.

3) Additional courses required are: Mathematics 2000, 2050, Statistics 2510 and one additional Mathematics course at the 2000 level or beyond, excluding Mathematics 2090.

NOTES: 1) Students in Computer Science (Software Engineering) Honours shall not receive credit for Computer Science Service courses.

2) The Honours project (4780) must be in the area of Software Engineering.

## 12. Deferral of Agenda Items

It was agreed that Agenda items 4B, 4C, 4D, 5, 6 and 7 be deferred until the November 12, 1996 meeting of Senate.

## 13. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.