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Special Session: Science Faculty Council

Jan 11, 1967. Room 206 Buller 3:40 P.M.

The following (46) members attended:

Following acceptance of the minutes of the last meeting (motion by A. N. Campbell (W. E. Campbell) R.D.)

Dean Crum stated the purpose of the meeting and shifted its scope to a discussion of the science entry requirement as adopted. He noted that the Executive had considered the Science Council motion and had asked that two points be reconsidered:

1. Biology 300 to be an entrance subject and
2. The requirement of English along with Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry as mandatory entry subjects be reconsidered.

Dean W. M. Schley spoke to these matters.
I  Biology

Science Council

1. The University is on record as agreeing to accept an improved Biology offering. Course 300 is recognizedly superior to the old offering, a fact according to University Biology Heads, and should be and since it is sound should be accepted.

2. Although the BSCS Course is being adopted it will not be universal for some time. This will result in a loss to the science faculty of good students unless the 300 is accepted.

3. The university accepts 300 into arts, agriculture and home economics and can hardly be excluded by science since BSCS was not made a prerequisite to Biology.

4. The fear was expressed that by accepting 300 as a pre-requisite the progress of BSCS might slow the progress of BSCS. (This was not noted in the minutes.) This should be stated publicly. A public statement to the effect that this meeting takes place wouldn't

5. The BSCS + 300 courses fail in line with the A + O concept of courses and perhaps should be considered in that light. Although to this Council may not have been ready to discuss A + O and courses because of incomplete information.

It is known that entry courses are often unexpected (e.g. Physics (2 courses) and Chemistry (2 courses))
Perhaps however, Biology 300 may be an approximation of BSCS Biology than either the chemistry or physics second year class due to its respective first year course.

Waygood sees no problem in accepting Biology 300 and finds Dr. Schley's remarks very convincing. I should like it shown that I voted against the motion and everyone abstained on the motion at the last meeting.

Welch is not familiar with the 300 course and text and has discussed it with the people in education. He supports BSCS and the 300 course.

Leh's there was pressure to force BSCS acceptance to support Dean Schley's request.

The chairman said Biology 300 was the General Course Biology 301, only the same text minus the lab with more time devoted to the course which enabled it to be studied in depth.

Discussion:
- Dr. Hogg noted that
- Biology 301 is a second course. A Biology 300 course
- should be a professional course. A Biology 300 course
- is no longer demanded and that the
detailed study of the 301 course using the same text
- at 300 in the same context will be a satisfactory
- content.

Further discussion centered around the calibre.
the teaching and dealt with the refresher program.
(Hogg, Isaac, Waygood, Lees, Armstrong, Cooke, Levin)

On the motion of A. N. Campbell (Waygood) proposing the acceptance of Biology 300 (20)
the vote was: for - large number.
against - one.

Peer Sibley suggested as a rider to the motion that the acceptance of the 300 course be predicated on the understanding that this not be to the detriment of the introduction of the science biology.

II. English

Speaking to the decision of the Science faculty to demand English exam entry Peer Sibley asked if once again the Executive had asked for a reconsideration. In support he made the following points:
The decision to make English mandatory

1. The recent acceptance of English as a core subject is a departure from a decision, taken in establishing the Major Third program, to place English, French, Latin, and History on equal footing.

2. If this decision has to do with ensuring that all students have command of the language, then it is just as valid an argument for supporting Latin — that makes why exclude History or Geography?

3. With respect to University entrance, how many considerations, e.g., should a science student have a reading knowledge of a second language? Perhaps the only clear approach is to have a prerequisite in certain areas. We must distinguish between what is advisable and what is compulsory. Perhaps such a system as this would work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>Physical Sciences - physics, chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>Biology, History, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A general entry to consist of:

One of Group I
One of Group II
One of Group III

Two options from Group IV subject to departmental prerequisites
1) Dr. Softly suggested former language requirements, which were untenable pleading that if a distinction is to be made regarding entrance requirements it should be accompanied by a clear rationale. Perhaps it would be best to have a matriculation scheme which would uniformly demand a minimal standing in a list of subjects with each faculty superimposing its own requirements (e.g., a C average).

Discussion

The discussion centered about the Faculty's desire to have students enter university with the ability to write and understand good English. Additionally (Campbell), it was noted that perhaps an acceptable language should have a cultural content and a literature. The fear was expressed that unless English is a mandatory subject its teaching in high school would be downgraded. Mention was made that the high school during did not promote the ability to use English. (Armstrong). Indeed (Romans, in terms of grade 9-12 History) superior to English.

The Mathematician

Additionally (Larry Mendelson, in contrast to mathematics) the stated preface requirement of physics and chemistry was regarded as unnecessary and redundant.
A motion was introduced (Isaac - he's) "That the science entry requirement shall be:

Mathematics, chemistry, physics and two A Level Biology (BSCS 300), English, second language, history.

Dr. Ross and Mendelson expressed the view that the math restriction, physics, chemistry, that the motion was unsatisfactory and unnecessary.

From the standpoint of mathematics and supported the scheme suggested in Dean Sibley's remarks. Each department to establish its own prerequisites. Drs. Bette and Randy agreed. Dr. Hees suggested that all sciences other than mathematics would require the math, physics, and chemistry.

Dean Connor stated that with the advent of SACU admission rules, all other requirements would be set aside. Meanwhile, noting that math was universally wanted, he asked for an opinion on a scheme with four options: Math and four of physics, chemistry, English, Biology (BSCS 300), languages, history.
This suggestion was offered as an amendment (Cara Johnston) and was debated at length. It was noted that a student could enter science with math, English, history, and biology which is unsatisfactory. The difficulty of applying students to exams was mentioned (Lee), a view supported by Campbell who pointed out that high school students didn't know University regulations let alone Departmental. Dean Schley suggested that with new high school courses and sequences students would know much earlier when their competence lay. He proposed that we lay down our requirements without too much concern about the student, who will put themselves out of grade 12. Dean Cameron described the summer school make up as fairly necessary to a student who had made a bad choice.

Against amendment.

At this time Dr. Isaac was asked to clarify his
matter with regard to the acceptability of Geography, Music, Ait (not included) and with regard to the languages considered acceptable: there are French, German, Latin, Ukrainian, Russian and Spanish.

A motion by Cooke (Kettner) to table the matter until a further meeting was defeated, five supporting.

The motion (Isaac, Less) was passed with a large majority (10 deferred).

The meeting was moved adjourned (Isaac: Berken) following Dean Lewis's invitation to the Council to avoid themselves of the new Faculty Conference Room (36 seats) in the Annex building.
December 16th, 1966.

TO: Science Faculty Council

FROM: R. D. Connor

Re: Science Faculty Council Special Meeting

A special meeting has been called for Wednesday, January 11th, 1967 at 3:40 P.M. in 207 Buller Building.

The business will consist of one item, viz, the matter of Biology as an entrance subject in Science. This has been referred to us for further study and comment by the Executive Committee.

RDC/ek