

November 20, 1974

*file*  
**Inter-Departmental Correspondence**  
*rdc*DATE November 12, 1974TO Members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council of ScienceFROM G. Richardson, Secretary *GR*

SUBJECT:

The 26th meeting of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council has been called for Wednesday, November 20, 1974 at 2:40 p.m. in the Faculty Conference Room, 250 Allen Building.

A G E N D A

1. Adoption of Minutes of the 24th meeting, May 29, 1974, and the 25th meeting, October 7, 1974.
2. Matters Arising Therefrom
3. Matters for discussion arising out of previous Executive Committee meetings:
  - (i) Proposed four-year general degree programs
  - (ii) Departmental Councils
  - (iii) Challenge examinations
  - (iv) Start date of Fall classes.
4. Other Business

gr/sc

Encls: Letter from Science Student Association 4/11/74  
Letter from Dean to Dr. Moore 1/11/74  
pages 21 & 22 of Senate Minutes (4-year general degree program)  
pages 77-84 of Senate Minutes (Interim Report of the Standing Committee  
on the Release of Information)  
Copy of Faculty Council motion re Department Councils, May 6/74.

Minutes of the twenty-sixth meeting of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council held on Wednesday, November 20, 1974 at 2:40 p.m. in the Faculty Council Room.

Members Present: R.D. Connor, I. Cooke, N.E.R. Campbell, D. Burton, B. Henry, J. Svenne, C. Anderson, J. Westmore, D. Jonasson, K. Stewart and G. Richardson.

Regrets: D. Punter

1. Adoption of the minutes of:

(i) May 29, 1974

It was moved Cooke (Losey) that the minutes be approved.

Carried.

(ii) October 7, 1974

Dr. Henry requested that the first sentence of the last paragraph on the 1st page be re-written as follows:

"Dr. Henry stated that it was his feelings that any course aimed primarily at applications of mathematics to non-mathematics students should be an applied mathematics course".

Dr. Losey suggested that the last two sentences of the 2nd last paragraph on page 1 should now be put at the end of the page and that the "He" starting that sentence should be changed to "Dr. Losey"

On page 3, 2nd last paragraph, 2nd sentence the word "mathematics" should be "material". It was also noted that the meeting was not the 21st but the 25th.

With these changes the minutes were approved Svenne (Henry).

2. Matters Arising Therefrom

The Chairman requested that two relatively short matters be attended to before the committee proceeded into the agenda.

The committee agreed.

- (1) The Chairman read a letter that he had received from the committee responsible for naming buildings on campus. This

committee had proposed the name of "Machray Hall", after the University's first Chancellor, for the N.E.M.P. building and the Chairman wished to know the members' views of this proposal.

Several members indicated that they would have preferred a name more closely associated with the faculty. They also wanted to know what became of the names that they had proposed. The Chairman stated that he didn't know for certain but it was likely they had been considered too but had not been accepted. A motion was made by Dr. Anderson (Jonasson) that the name be accepted but this was defeated, 3 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions. It was agreed that the matter go to Faculty Council without a recommendation from the Executive.

- (ii) The Chairman read a letter from Dr. Gratzner of the Department of Mathematics in which he put forth the suggestion of holding a mail vote on matters designated as "important". The purpose behind this suggestion was that it would give all faculty members a chance to take a stand on such issues; not just those present at the meeting.

It was pointed out that matters of substance before Faculty Council were now required to come up before two council meetings and at anytime Faculty Council could agree to a mail vote on matters it felt important.

It was moved Losey (Henry) that: "the Executive Committee not support this proposal".

Carried

The Chairman was instructed to indicate in his reply to Dr. Gratzner that he could if he so wished bring this matter before Faculty Council at the next meeting under "New Business".

3. (i) Four year general degree programs

The Chairman explained that the U.G.C. had proposed that the University of Manitoba, the University of Winnipeg and Brandon

University get together and discuss the merits and shortcomings of a 4 year general degree program. Although the question asked by the U.G.C. came in the wake of proposals from the University of Winnipeg and Brandon University to implement such programs, the U.G.C. was specific in its request that the committee not discuss these particular proposals. They were more concerned with the impact of such a program on the entire university community within the province. At the U.G.C.'s request, a committee had been formed to look into the matter, the Chairman was the former president of the University of Manitoba, Dr. H.H. Saunderson and there were representatives from each of the Universities. Dr. Campbell, being one of the representatives from Science, was asked to speak on this matter.

Dean Campbell explained that after several meetings of the committee as a whole, a sub-committee had been formed to prepare a report and this had just been received by him. He had not had time to fully comprehend it and was not prepared to discuss it in specific terms at this time. He did say though, that the report did not appear to answer U.G.C.'s questions fully. He stated that the general feeling of the committee was that the 3 year general degree program served a large number of students and served them well, that a 4 year general degree program would be appropriate for a much smaller number of students and that if the other two universities in the province were successful in their requests, the University of Manitoba would be forced into implementing a similar program. Although both universities had indicated that their 4 year programs would not conflict with our 4 year Honours program, it had been indicated privately that these universities hoped to get the 4 year graduates directly into master's programs. In concluding Dean Campbell said that graduates from a 4 year general degree program would be in a better position for certain types of employment than would a graduate from the 3 year program.

Dr. Henry agreed with Dean Campbell on this last point and stated that this was a very real problem with graduates from Chemistry. He did feel that there was a distinct difference between a graduate from an honours program and the 4 year general degree program. As far as employment was concerned, each was marketable in a different field but he did not think that it was likely both graduates would be able to enter into a post graduate program with the same relative ease.

Dr. Stewart pointed out that at U.B.C. the graduates from the 4 year general degree program had to make up courses in order to get into a master's program.

The Chairman said that he could foresee several additional problems occurring if the other two universities implemented the four year program and Manitoba did not. For instance he said, there would be an obvious conflict between the 4 year graduates from these schools trying to get directly into our master's programs. As it was the department heads who ultimately decided which student was eligible and which was not, there could be conflict not only between the University of Manitoba and the other universities, but also between the departments and the University. Secondly, there was the matter of finances. Part of the monies allocated to the universities is based on the number of graduate students (divided by 6) and the UGSCH (divided by 540). If the University of Manitoba required these non honours students to take a make up year, i.e. pre-masters, these students contribute to the UGSCH total, whereas, if the other universities thought of their 4 year graduates as admissible to the masters program they would count them as part of the graduate student total and consequently get more money.

It was decided that a faculty committee should be struck to look at these matters, i.e. what is the academic merit of a 4 year general degree program, what are the employment outlets for a 4 year graduate as compared to a 3 year graduate, etc. As

appropriate as it would be for this committee to be representative of the science departments, the deadlines that it will have to meet means that it will have to work very quickly; therefore the fewer members the better. In addition, if the members of this committee could be staff who already have knowledge in these matters it would be to its advantage. Consequently, it was moved Losey (Henry) that:

"A committee be struck by the Dean to examine the question of a 4 year general degree program at the University of Manitoba".

Carried.

It was agreed that this committee would solicit the advice of all science departments, would elect its own chairman, would be made up of 5 executive committee members, that student participation would not be required and that it would report back to the Executive by December 6, 1974. The composition of the committee would be:

Dr. B. Henry, Chairman  
Dr. Losey  
  
Dr. Svenne  
Dr. Anderson  
Dr. Stewart

3. (ii) Departmental Councils

The Chairman discussed the letter he had received from the Chairman of the Rules and Procedures Committee, Dr. K. Moore, which had been written in response to the questions he himself had asked Dr. Moore.

In essence, Dr. Moore's reply said that there had to be departmental councils and he suggested that Departmental Council By-laws similar to those accepted for the departments of English and Anatomy would be appropriate for Science.

Several members expressed their feelings that Dr. Moore's letter was not clear in that it did not answer all the questions

regarding departmental councils. They recommended that Dr. Moore be invited to appear before this committee so that the members could seek clarification on all aspects of departmental councils. The committee agreed to this recommendation.

8. Other Business

Promotion Criteria - before adjourning the Chairman requested a response from the Executive Committee regarding the Faculty's current promotion criteria. It was decided that in light of U.M.F.A.'s proposal to make this a bargainable item the criteria be left as is.

The meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.