

January 5th, 1972

Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE December 15, 1971TO ALL SCIENCE EXECUTIVE MEMBERSFROM Mr. G. Richardson, Secretary

SUBJECT:

GR

The ninth and tenth meetings of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council have been scheduled for Wednesday, January 5, 1972 and Friday, January 7, 1972 at 2:40 p.m. in the Faculty Conference Room, 250 Allen Building.

AGENDA

1. Minutes of the last meeting.
2. Matters arising therefrom:
 - precise description of the David Renfrew Petrie Memorial Medal as received from the Awards Office.
3. Communications.
4. Departmental comments on lower limits to class size in courses given by Summer and Evening Sessions (Chairman's letter to Secretary of Senate).
- ✓ 5. Report of the Committee on Selection (Davis' Report).
6. Proposal to Senate by UMSU - Class Representatives.
- ✓ 7. Terms of Reference - Committee on Student Standing (material attached).
- Refer.* 8. Establishment of a Disciplinary Unit in Science (material attached).
- ✓ 9. Discussion of Faculty Council's motion: "that the Executive Committee decide how the Faculty will arrange the Festival with the students."
- ✓ 10. Faculty spokesman of Senate.
- ✓ 11. Letter from Professor G. Gratzner proposing:
 - (i) procedure for electing members of the Executive Committee and Science Senators.
 - (ii) new distribution of Faculty Council minutes.
- ✓ 12. Consideration of a Faculty representative on the Manitoba Research Council.
13. Other Business.

GR:wac
Encls.

January 17, 1972

Minutes of the ninth meeting of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council, held in the Faculty Conference Room, 250 Allen Building on Wednesday, January 5, 1972 at 2:40 p.m.

Members Present: Dr. R. D. Connor; Chairman, Drs. M. Kettner, P. K. Isaac, J. Reid, J. Vail, J. Svenne, G. Dunn, G. Woods, Mr. D. Sutherland. (9) G. Richardson, Secretary.

Regrets: Drs. G. Losey and I. Cooke.

I. Minutes of the Last Meeting.

The minutes of the eighth meeting, duly circulated, were approved. Reid (Svenne).

II. Matters Arising Therefrom.

The Secretary read the description of the David Renfrew Petrie Memorial Medal as supplied by the Awards Office. It was noted that the medal and prize of \$25.00 were awarded to the student obtaining the highest standing in any three honours courses in third year honours Chemistry. The description went on to state that the marks of the recipient of the award should not be less than 80%.

It was pointed out by Dr. Svenne that the requirement of 80% was out-dated as the official marking system of the University was now the alphabetical system. The Chairman also noted that there was still some ambiguity in the description in that it was not entirely clear whether or not the courses had to be honours Chemistry courses or merely honours courses in the Chemistry program, i.e. an honours Mathematics or Physics course etc.

It was suggested by the Committee that the Secretary write the Awards Office, pointing out the 80% attainment figure and this ambiguity and request them to meet with the Science Student Association to revise and up-date the description.

III. Communications.

There were no communications.

IV. Lower Limit to Class Size.

The Chairman explained that at the seventh meeting of the Executive Committee he had been requested to draft a letter for Senate, giving the Science department's rationale behind their replies on lower limits to class size. The letter was to be presented to the Executive at a subsequent meeting for their approval. At the same time the Chairman was to contact the Science departments regarding their feelings on the low enrolment in Summer and Evening Sessions courses.

The Chairman noted that both these requests had been seen to; the draft letter had been distributed to the members and the replies from the departments collected.

A summary of the replies to the questions posed was as follows:

Question 1. Do you feel that it should be possible to cancel a course because of low enrolment, if the course was advertised in the Summer and Evening Sessions Calendar and is part of the five-year program project?

YES - 7

NO - 3

Question 2. Do you feel that Science departments should have more say in what courses are offered in the Summer and Evening program?

YES - 2

NO - 3

NO REPLY - 5

Question 3. Do you feel that once courses are advertised in our Faculty Calendar we are committed to give the course regardless of what the enrolment for that course might turn out to be?

YES - 1

NO - 6

Qualified Answer - 3

In the discussion that followed the Chairman pointed out that whereas the University receives a certain sum of money per student enrolled in the regular day session from the University Grants Commission, it receives nothing for those students taught in the Summer and Evening Sessions. The Department of Summer and Evening Sessions was supposedly a self-funding organization with the money collected going to pay the costs of instructors, demonstrators, and office staff. However, there were some expenses such as supplies drawn from the departmental stores and overhead expenses that were not paid for by Summer and Evening Sessions and these were picked up by the departments.

Staff who taught Summer and Evening Sessions courses were paid an additional sum for this as it was considered extra work above the regular duties of the normal day session.

It was pointed out by Dr. Vail that potential conflicts exist where day session instructors were required to teach their courses during the evening because of heavy enrolments or time-table problems and were not paid the evening stipend. He also felt that because payment of the Summer and Evening stipend constituted payment for extra work, it fell into the category of consulting, thus he requested that the Dean ensure that the Chairman of the Faculty Committee on Consulting be made aware of this and asked to consider the matter.

The Chairman stated that it was the feeling of the Summer and Evening Sessions that on the average an enrolment of 27 students/course was required in order to cover the costs of offering a single course during the summer or evening session. A letter from Dean Cooke on this subject proposed that a possible lower limit of 25 be put on courses offered. Dr. Reid was of the opinion that no specific figure could be given as the lower limit because there could always be circumstances where this figure would not be appropriate. He gave as an example the ecology course given at the Delta Marsh this past summer where the enrolment/section was purposely set at 15 simply because it was impossible to handle more with the existing facilities.

Dr. Vail added that to a large extent summer courses were given to teachers wanting to further their training and it would be unfair of the University to put limits on such courses. He also felt that the summer courses were somewhat inferior to the regular day courses

in that the total contents of the course were crammed into 6 weeks as compared to 25 weeks during the regular session. It was the Chairman's feeling that such a time constraint was more hindering to Arts courses than Science ones and that the concentration of the work into periods of two hours each day enabled the instructor to cover the full course in the restricted time. Where mature reflection was needed as in Philosophy such a condensed offering may not be appropriate.

Dr. Vail stated that when an instructor is asked to take on the task of teaching a summer or evening course, his regular duties at the University, i.e. teaching, research, administration work were disrupted and reduced and that in the long run this could be detrimental to him in terms of salary increases and promotion. He felt that all courses given by the University should be of the same category.

In concluding Dr. Vail felt that Senate should be asked to study this problem further and he proposed the following motion (Dunn):

"that the Executive Committee recommends to Senate that they consider the question of integrating Summer and Evening Sessions into the regular University program."

Carried
nem. con.

At this point Dean Connor left the meeting and Dean Isaac assumed the Chair.

A brief discussion followed on the idea that evening courses should have to be justified by reasons other than enrolment before they could be offered. It followed, however, that if such a procedure was adopted for evening courses the same would have to apply to winter courses; this was not desired at this time.

With regard to the Chairman's letter to Senate, it was agreed that it covered all the points satisfactorily. It could be expanded in like vein to include Summer and Evening Sessions so, it was moved by Vail (Reid):

"that the letter be revamped by the Chairman to include the comments on Summer and Evening Sessions."

Carried
Unanimously

It was agreed that the revised letter need not be shown to this Committee before forwarding to Senate.

Dean Connor assumed the Chair at this time.

X. Faculty Spokesman.

The Chairman asked Dean Isaac to speak to this matter.

The suggestion that each Faculty have a spokesman who would report back to the Faculty on Senate's action during its meetings, arose from Senate's concern over the apparent lack of communication between itself and the general faculties. Current means of information transfer, i.e. minutes in the Library and outlines of Senate meetings in the Bulletin were inadequate and to supply all staff copies of the agendas and minutes would be an extremely onerous and expensive task. However, Dean Isaac stated that whereas smaller faculties could easily pick out the items of interest and relevance and speak on them, for the larger faculties such as Arts and Science practically every item discussed in Senate had some importance to them and it would be almost impossible to discuss them all at Council meetings.

Dr. Vail agreed that it would be useful for Council to be informed on Senate's actions and suggested that each Council meeting have a five minute item on the agenda in which one of the Science Senators would select topics which he felt were interesting and important to Science and report on these. He felt that if the Science Senators took turns doing this and if the time allowed for reporting was adhered to, the task would not become too involved.

The Committee requested the Chairman to approach the Science Senators at their next meeting to see if they would be willing to do this.

XI. Letter from Dr. Gratzner.

The Chairman explained that he had received a letter from Dr. G. Gratzner in Mathematics which outlined a procedure for proposing nominees for membership to the Executive Committee and Senate that he would like to see followed. Dr. Gratzner proposed that nominations were made in advance of the meeting and signed by a seconder. Information on the nominees background would be provided in writing, either by the nominee or the nominator and distributed to all council members

before the meeting in which the elections were to be made.

The Committee agreed that more information on the nominee would be valuable. They suggested that a standard form be prepared by the Dean's Office which would be used for all nominations. They recommended a short form on which no more than a hundred words of background information would be supplied. Rather than have nominations made, say three weeks in advance of the meeting and the information circulated one week before the meeting, the Committee members suggested that nominations be made at one meeting, the pertinent information circulated before the second meeting, and elections held during the second meeting. This would provide adequate time for Faculty members to consider the nominees. The Committee did not feel that it would be necessary to have a different form for student nominees. They did stress, however, that the form should be quite brief and standard for all elections.

It was decided to adjourn the meeting at this time and continue the discussion at the tenth meeting scheduled for Friday, January 7, 1972.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

GR:wac

January 18, 1972