

SENATE MINUTES

OCTOBER 10, 2000

The regular meeting of Senate was held on Tuesday, October 10, 2000, at 4:00 p.m. in Room E5004.

8. PRESENT

Dr. E. Simpson (Acting Chair), Dr. K. Keough, Professor A. Fowler, Dean W. Blake, Dean I. Bowmer, Dean B. Burnaby, Mrs. M. O'Dea (for Mr. G. Collins), Professor J. Dempster, Mr. R. Ellis, Dean G. Kealey, Dean R. Lucas, Dr. J. Black (for Dean T. Murphy), Dr. M. Haddara (for Dean Seshadri), Dr. T. Gordon, Dr. L. Walker, Ms. D. Whalen (for Professor H. Weir), Dr. R. Adamec, Dr. J. Ashton, Professor P. Ayres, Dr. J. Bear, Dr. M. Brosnan, Professor M. Coyne, Dr. J. deBruyn, Mr. C. Dennis, Mrs. C. Dutton, Dr. D. Goldstein, Dr. G. Herzberg, Dr. M. Kara, Dr. D. Kimberley, Professor K. Knowles, Professor V. Kuester, Ms. K. Lippold, Dr. D. McKay, Dr. J. McLean, Dr. M. Mulligan, Dr. M. Murray, Dr. H. Pike, Dr. V. Richardson, Dr. D. Rideout, Dr. G. Sabin, Dr. S. Saha, Dr. W. Schipper, Dr. C. Sharpe, Dr. P. Sinclair, Dr. D. Treslan, Dr. J. Usher, Professor D. Walsh, Dr. B. Watson, Dr. M. Wernerheim, Mr. B. Whitelaw, Ms. Anna Muselius, Mr. K. Dunne, Ms. J. Mahoney, Mr. D. Nowak, Mr. L. Walsh.

9. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Mr. Gerald Galway, Dr. C. Higgs, Dr. C. Orchard, Dr. G. Bassler, Dr. G. Clark, Dr. V. Gadag, Dr. R. Gosine, Dr. V. Maxwell, Ms. K. McDonald.

10. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on September 12, 2000 were taken as read and confirmed.

11. Report of the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial

A memorandum dated October 2, 2000 was received from the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial recommending to Senate that Professor Noel Veitch be re-appointed as University

Marshal for a period of three years commencing immediately and expiring on October 10, 2003.

Following consideration, it was moved by Dr. Sabin, seconded by Dr. Adamec and carried, that in accordance with Section V.D.4. of the Handbook of Senate By-Laws and Procedures, Dr. Veitch be re-appointed as University Marshal for a period of three years commencing immediately and expiring on October 10, 2003.

Dr. Simpson reminded Senators that nominations for honorary degrees should be submitted to the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Ceremonial by mid-October for consideration by the Committee for Spring and Fall Convocation, 2001.

12. Report of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies

12.1 Election of Chair for 2000-20001 Academic Year

A memorandum dated September 20, 2000 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., the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies has elected Professor Donna Walsh as Chair for the 2000-2001 academic year.

Dr. Simpson congratulated Professor Walsh on her election and welcomed her as Chair of the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Studies.

12.2 Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science: Proposed New Courses - Term 1 and 2 Engineering Design Courses

Page 387, 2000-2001 Calendar, following the heading Course List, delete the entries for Engineering 1503 and 2502 in their entirety:

New Courses

1504. Engineering Graphics. Graphics Fundamentals: This part of the course covers the fundamentals of effective graphic communication skills, including drawing with instruments, freehand sketching, orthographic projections of solid objects, auxiliary views,

sections, three dimensional pictorials, dimensioning and tolerances, working drawings, and assembly drawings. Computer Graphics: This part of the course introduces the use of a computer aided design package for the construction of two-dimensional drawings and three-dimensional models of engineering objects. These models are used for creating all the necessary projections for the production of engineering drawings. The engineering graphics principles and visualization skills developed in the graphics portion of the course are employed and reinforced.

2503. Engineering Design. This course introduces students to the design process through project based activities. Students will develop a systematic approach to open-ended problem solving. Topics incorporated into the design activities include the development of problem statements and design criteria, solution generation, solution evaluation, feasibility analysis, team work, project management and effective communications. The lab portion of the course provides exposure to practical design issues, familiarity with common shop practice and tools, and an opportunity to fabricate some of the proposed design solutions.

13. Report of the Academic Council of the School of Graduate Studies

13.1 Revision to General Regulation H) and J)

Page 446, 2000–2001 Calendar, following the subheading H) Comprehensive Examinations, delete the entry in its entirety and replace with the following:

"1. Master's Comprehensive Examination

a) The composition of the Comprehensive Examination Committee is specified in the degree and departmental regulations, and the Committee is appointed by the Dean. The Dean of Graduate Studies or delegate may exercise the right to attend. All members of the Committee including the Chairperson, but excluding The Dean of Graduate Studies, shall be voting members.

b) In this examination the candidates must demonstrate an advanced knowledge of the academic discipline as defined by the academic unit in which they are students. Therefore, in order to be

eligible to sit the examination, all course requirements must be completed.

c) Members of the Comprehensive Examination Committee shall decide the results of the comprehensive examination as indicated in i-iv below:

1. The category of "pass with distinction" will be awarded to candidates who demonstrate superior knowledge of their chosen field. This category requires unanimous support of the Comprehensive Examination Committee.

2. The category of "pass" will be awarded to candidates who demonstrate an acceptable knowledge of their chosen area and requires a simple majority vote.

3. The category of "re-examination" selects those candidates with an understanding of their research area that lacks sufficient depth and scope as indicated by a simple majority of the Comprehensive Examination Committee. Only one such re-examination is possible and students in this category are not eligible for the award of "pass with distinction". If a re-examination is to be held, it must be conducted not less than one month and not more than six months after the first examination. The decision of the voting members of the Committee following this re-examination can only be "pass" or "fail" decided by simple majority. Failure will lead to immediate termination of the candidate's programme. There is no option for further re-examination.

4. Students awarded a "fail" are deemed, by unanimous vote of the Comprehensive Examination Committee, to be unable to demonstrate an adequate understanding of their research area. The candidate's programme is terminated.

d) The Chairperson of the Comprehensive Examination Committee shall report to the Head of the academic unit who shall report to the Dean. The result of the comprehensive examination(s) shall be reported to the candidate by the Dean.

2. PH.D. Comprehensive Examination

a) The candidate shall submit to a comprehensive examination, which may be written or oral or both as determined by the academic unit. Candidates shall normally take the examination no later than the end of the seventh semester in the doctoral programme. Unless

an extension is approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies, failure to take the examination at this time will result in the termination of the candidate's programme.

b) This examination, whether written or oral, shall be conducted by a Committee appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies on the recommendation of the academic unit. It shall consist of the Head of the academic unit (or delegate) who shall be the Chairperson, the candidate's supervisor, the Dean of Graduate Studies (or delegate), and at least three other members, the total voting members to be an odd number. All members of the Committee including the Chairperson, but excluding the Dean of Graduate Studies, shall be voting members.

c) In this examination, the candidate must demonstrate a mastery of those sub-disciplines appropriate to his/her research area, as defined by the academic unit in which they are students. Those sub-disciplines upon which the candidate will be examined should be made known to the candidate no later than three months prior to the examination. The candidate must further be able to relate the specialization of his/her research to the larger context of these sub-disciplines.

d) Members of the Comprehensive Examination Committee shall decide the results of the comprehensive examination as indicated in i-iv below:

i. The category of "pass with distinction" will be awarded to candidates who demonstrate superior knowledge of their chosen field. This category requires unanimous support of the Comprehensive Examination Committee.

ii. The category of "pass" will be awarded to candidates who demonstrate an acceptable knowledge of their chosen area and requires a simple majority vote.

iii. The category of "re-examination" selects those candidates with an understanding of their research area that lacks sufficient depth and scope as indicated by a simple majority of the Comprehensive Examination Committee. Only one such re-examination is possible and students in this category are not eligible for the award of "pass with distinction". If a re-examination

is to be held, it must be conducted not less than one month and not more than six months after the first examination. The decision of the voting members of the Committee following this re-examination can only be "pass" or "fail" decided by simple majority. Failure will lead to immediate termination of the candidate's programme. There is no option for further re-examination.

iv. Students awarded a "fail" are deemed, by unanimous vote of the Comprehensive Examination Committee, to be unable to demonstrate an adequate understanding of their research area. The candidate's programme is terminated.

e) The Chairperson of the Comprehensive Examination Committee shall report to the Head of the academic unit who shall report to the Dean. The result of the comprehensive examination(s) shall be reported to the candidate by the Dean."

Page 447, 2000–2001 Calendar, following the subheading J) Theses and Reports, delete clause 4. c) 5. in its entirety and replace with the following:

"5. Following the defence, the Board will meet in camera to render a final assessment of the thesis and of the candidate's ability to defend his/her work. The Board will recommend one of the following categories to the Dean:

i. "Passed with distinction" (Awarded to candidates who demonstrate superior knowledge of their chosen field; this category requires unanimous support of the Board¹.)

ii. "Passed" (Awarded to candidates who demonstrate an acceptable knowledge of their chosen area and requires a simple majority vote¹.)

iii. "Re-examination" (Selects those candidates with an understanding of their research area that lacks sufficient depth and scope as indicated by a simple majority of the Board.² The re-examination must be conducted not less than one month and not more than 12 months after the first examination. Only one such re-examination is possible and students in this category are not eligible for the award of "pass with distinction". The decision of the voting members of the Board following this re-examination can

only be "pass" or "fail" decided by simple majority. Failure will lead to immediate termination of the candidate's programme. There is no option for further re-examination.)

iii. "Fail" (Selects candidates who, by unanimous vote of the Board, are deemed to be unable to demonstrate an adequate understanding of their research area. The candidate's programme is terminated.)

1 This recommendation may have attached to it the requirement that the candidate complete certain specified revisions to the satisfaction of the Supervisory Committee, the Head of the academic unit and the Dean.

2 The members of the Thesis Examination Board may attach to this recommendation a list of any requirements which they feel are appropriate. (See General Regulation J.5.)

10. A Strategic Framework for Memorial University (Draft)

Because Dr. Simpson is Chair of the University Planning and Budget Committee and the author of the document entitled "A Strategic Framework for Memorial (Draft) which emanates from that Committee, Dr. Keough assumed the Chair during Senate's consideration of this item of business. He asked Dr. Simpson to make preliminary remarks regarding the document.

Dr. Simpson advised that this document embodies the Statement of Principles and Goals which was adopted by Senate in April, 1999. These principles and goals resulted from discussions and agreements reached in three University Assemblies which were held in St. John's and Corner Brook. A number of strategic thrusts were identified and an external consultation process was then undertaken throughout the province. The document now before Senate reflects the observations from within Memorial and is augmented by the perception of the University by the public, particularly in light of Memorial's responsibilities as the province's only university, and the opportunities which are presented by our location, culture, history and commitment to academic excellence.

Many of the challenges facing the University at this time are recognized in the document, and acknowledged areas for strategic

development are listed . Dr. Simpson acknowledged that there may be flaws or omissions in the document and mentioned some which had already been brought to his attention.

Dr. Keough then invited Senators to discuss the document and to make suggestions regarding specific points which may have been

A lengthy discussion then ensued during which Senators made a number of suggestions for amendments to the document.

Dr. Keough advised Senators that any further suggestions for changes should be forwarded to Dr. Simpson within the next ten days for the information of the University Planning and Budget Committee..

Dr. Simpson thanked Senators for their suggestions and advised that a revised document, which will take into consideration the suggestions made at this meeting and any further comments which are received within the next ten days, will be prepared for the next meeting of Senate.

11. Report of the Committee on Committees

At a meeting held on June, 13, 2000, Senate approved the following recommendations contained in the Report of the Steering Committee on Course Evaluations (including Appendices D and E):

1. That Memorial University adopts the Core Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) as a universal questionnaire.

2. That the CEQ be administered in accordance with the attached Policies and Procedures.

3. That the administration and dissemination of the results of the CEQ be supervised by a standing Committee of Senate as described in the attached appendix.

The Committee on Committees was asked to review the Terms of Reference for the proposed Senate standing committee (Committee on Course Evaluations) as outlined in Appendix E. of the Report,

prepare terms of reference and nominate a slate of members for the consideration of Senate.

At today's meeting Dr. Saha, on behalf of the Committee on Committees presented the proposed membership and terms of reference for the consideration of Senate.

Ms. Jade Mahoney, President of the Sir Wilfred Grenfell College Students' Union volunteered to serve as the student representative from the College on the Committee.

It was then moved by Dr. Saha, seconded by Dr. Adamec and carried, that the following slate of candidates, including Ms. Jade Mahoney, be approved:

Member Until September 2002

Mr. Michael Wallack (Political Science)

Dr. Donald McKay (Medicine) (Senator)

Dr. Alex Faseruk (Business)

Dr. Andrea Rose (Education)

Dr. Raymond Penney (Psychology)

Dr. Glyn George

Mr. Liam Walsh (undergraduate student)

Ms. Jade Mahoney (undergraduate student)

Ms. Donelda Macdonald (Graduate Student)

It was then moved by Dr. Saha, seconded by Dr. Adamec and carried, that the following terms of reference for the Committee be approved:

Membership

* Six faculty members, including one Senator

Appointed by Senate on recommendation of the Committee on Committees.

* Two undergraduate students, one appointed by Senate on nomination by MUNSU, and one appointed by Senate on nomination by SWGCSU.

* One graduate student, appointed by Senate on nomination by the GSU.

* Manager, Instructional Development Office (ex-officio), Secretary of the Committee

Governing Procedures

* The members of the Committee shall elect the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson in September each year

* The Committee shall meet at least once each semester

* A quorum for the conduct of business shall be five members

Duties and Responsibilities

1. The committee shall monitor the administration of the Core Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) and related procedures, including the release and publication of results, in accordance with the Senate Policies and Procedures for Student Rating of Courses and Instruction.

2. The committee shall prepare written guidelines providing information to students on the purposes of the rating procedure and on university policies for distribution and publication of results.

3. The committee may, in cooperation with the Instructional Development Office, develop specific operational guidelines and protocols for efficient and consistent completion of the mandated student rating procedures.

1. The committee shall receive reports of alternative methods of evaluation in courses for which the standard CEQ is not required. The Committee may comment to the academic unit concerning the appropriateness of such methods.

2. The committee shall, upon request, approve alternative methods of administration of the CEQ for regular classroom courses, providing that such methods assure student anonymity and other principles in the normal procedures.

3. The committee shall receive and respond to queries and comments from academic units, faculty members and students concerning the CEQ and student rating procedures.

4. The committee shall deal with requests for access to unsummarized data from course evaluations archived by the Instructional Development Office.

5. The committee shall provide direction to the Instructional Development Office and responsible staff members regarding responses to requests for supplementary questionnaire items or requests for special reports and analysis of data.

6. The committee shall report to Senate in September each year on the operation of the Policies and Procedures, including advice on possible revision of the Policies and Procedures and the Core Evaluation Questionnaire.

7. The committee shall respond to queries from Senate, and may provide Senate with such other reports and recommendations as the Committee deems appropriate within its mandate.

8. The committee shall carry out any other duties as described in "Student Rating of Courses and Instruction, Administrative Policies and Procedures."

OTHER BUSINESS

16. Special Meeting and Change of Date of Senate Meeting

Dr. Simpson advised Senators that there would be a special meeting following the regular meeting of Senate in November. The University Planning and Budget Committee proposed to give a presentation regarding the development of a marketing plan for Memorial. Dr. Jim Barnes has been asked to present the topic at the special meeting, however, he is unavailable on November 14, the scheduled date for the Senate meeting. It was also noted that November 14 falls during mid-term break. Dr. Simpson asked Senate if it would be prepared to consider bringing forward the date of the Senate meeting to November 7, since that date would also enable student representatives, who might otherwise be away from campus, to attend the meeting.

It was moved by Dr. Adamec, seconded by Dean Lucas and carried that the date of the November meeting of Senate be brought forward to November 7.

17. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.