

The Minutes of the Thirty-third meeting of Faculty Council held on February 2, 1978 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 306 Buller Building.

Members Present: Dean R. D. Connor, Chairman; Professors B. D. Macpherson, D. A. Young, R. Quackenbush, R. Evans, T. Dandy, S. F. Fillion, W. C. Brisbin, S. Cheng, J. C. Fu, H. Halvorson, I. Suzuki, D. N. Burton, A. Chow, F. J. Ward, R. H. Betts, H. W. Duckworth, P. Loewen, R. Hawirko, J. C. Rauch, S. G. Sealy, E. Huebner, S. S. Badour, T. Dick, J. M. Stewart, A. Olchowecki, C. E. Palmer, G. R. Smith, K. Mount, R. M. Lyric, J. A. Wright, C. T. Chow, Glen Klassen, J. Svenne, A. F. Janzen, H. D. Gesser, D. M. McKinnon, S. Oh, J. W. Berry, W. Falk, F. M. Kelly, D. H. Hall, J. McKee, Mrs. E. B. Ross, Messrs. V. Simosko, W. B. Barker, Professors B. R. Henry, B. Johnston, J. F. Brewster, S. M. Woods, T. Holens, Mr. R. Parameswaran, H. Finlayson, F. Hruska, M. Samoiloff, H. Kane, J. M. Vail, D. Punter, R. S. D. Thomas, M. Doob (60); G. Richardson, Secretary.

Regrets: Professors D. Johnson, G. E. Dunn, P. Loly, J. C. Jamieson, W. van Oers, P. McClure, Messrs. G. Thompson, D. Okrusko, B. Mayba.

1. Minutes of the Thirty-second Meeting

The minutes of the thirty-second meeting held on November 24, 1977 were approved (Kelly) Stewart.

2. Matters Arising Therefrom

There were no matters arising from the Minutes.

3. Communications

Mr. Simosko, the Science Librarian, told Council members that the library budget had been used up but that the library would still accept order cards which they would process at a later date. He also informed Council that space on the 3rd floor - the periodicals room - was scarce and they were looking into alternatives to increase the stack space for periodicals.

The information retrieval system was now working and in order to show the users how it works and what it can do, the library was planning to

demonstrate the facility on Thursday, February 9th in room 236 Machray Hall (Dean's Office area). The demonstration would include a free search for anyone wanting one; all staff were invited to attend.

4. Teaching Evaluation

Resulting from a question raised at the last Faculty Council and from the fact that Senate has just approved the ad hoc committee on Merit Pay and Promotion's report, the Executive Committee had discussed teaching evaluation. It was the Executive's feeling that this would be a very difficult matter to discuss and would best be done at the department level. It was the feeling of the Executive that any regulation with regard to teaching evaluation could not be made at the faculty level because of the differences within departments. At best a set of regulations could cover a group of departments for example, the Biology Division. For discussion at the departmental councils, the Executive also suggested that a copy of the ad hoc committee's report should be sent to each department. Finally it was the Executive's consideration that discussions within the departments should include all three elements involved in merit and promotion i.e. research, administrative service and teaching and these should be included in their report.

In the subsequent discussion it was suggested that the Executive consult with other faculties to find out how they were going about getting "teaching evaluations". The Dean said that he would try and find out what it was that U.M.F.A. and the University had in mind when they proposed obtaining the evaluation. He indicated that the problem that he saw was how to get the evaluation. Short of having one's lectures attended by one's peers, he could see no acceptable way of doing this.

With regard to research evaluation the Dean said that he thought that this could be done by one's peers. They may not be able to understand the research fully, but they would have a feel for it. In concluding it was agreed that this would be a difficult matter to debate here and it was moved Duckworth (Young) that:

"the matter of evaluating teaching, research and administrative services for purposes of merit and promotion be put before the departmental councils who would report back to the Executive Committee".

CARRIED

... 3

5. Status of the Faculty's Budget

The purpose of this item was to bring Council up to date with the Faculty's budget. The faculty had just completed an exercise similar to that of previous years. From an established baseline (as of April 1, 1977) 3% of the budget had been removed plus the amount that the faculty had to pay for the extra $\frac{1}{2}$ % salary increase to all U.M.F.A. Members (and \$100 to excluded members) (\$22,000) and, based on the needs put forth by the Dean proposed addbacks were announced, the number and extent of which would depend on the size of the U.G.C. grant and the salary increases awarded for 1978-79. Addback #1 returns \$141,000, addbacks 1 & 2 - \$248,000 and addbacks 1, 2 & 3 \$319,000 to the faculty. In round numbers, if we received only addback #1 we would have to operate in 1978-79 with \$100,000 less this year. If we got #1 and #2 we would have the same dollar amount. If we receive addbacks 1, 2 and 3 this would return the total reduction of 3% + $\frac{1}{2}$ % salary increase (~~\$~~\$241,000) and give the faculty \$78,000 extra money. New projects proposed for the faculty this year are the Computer Science Co-operative Program and the Chemistry course for Engineers and a 10% inflationary increase in Supplies & Expenses, all of which would leave the faculty \$23,000 short. The Chairman said that he has approached the senior administration for consideration of this additional amount but has received no word as yet.

The Chairman mentioned that he had received the comments of the Budget Committee on Science's submission. The Committee said that their overriding concern was the faculty's falling enrolment (a drop of 10% in the number of Science students 1977-78 from the previous year). The Budget Committee did take note of our tightness and lack of manoeuvrability due to the high percentage of tenured staff and our need for technical staff and supplies. The Committee was impressed with the quality of the faculty's research which is reflected by the number and size of our research grants. The Committee took these points into consideration when awarding Science three addbacks and not a fourth, and they had given emphasis to the faculty's needs in addbacks #1 and #2 especially.

In reply to what extent do enrolment figures enter into the budget considerations, the Chairman replied that student numbers are most definitely taken into account and compared with other faculties and schools. He stated

that with a limited amount of funds available for distribution it would not be unnatural for more money to go to an area that is attracting more students. Another element that is taken into consideration is the loss of staff and staffing entitlement. Science loses very few staff and is staffed to 100% of its entitlement. This, coupled with a dropping enrolment, does not place Science in a favourable position when compared with an area that is staffed to say 78% and has an increasing enrolment.

It was noted that the more the University is required to tighten its budgets the more individual research grants were charged for services it used to receive free and the less that could be spent directly on research. The Chairman agreed with this and stated that this was exactly the situation that he was in as administrator of the faculty's budget. His purchasing power is less with the funds made available but he is being required to pay for more services.

6. Proposal for new degree regulations

The Chairman asked Dean Macpherson to speak to this item. Dean Macpherson referred to the material attached to the agenda and said that many of the other Western universities already had degrees similar to these being proposed today. They found them to be working very well.

In trying to meet a student's need it was being proposed that Science change its degree offerings from the two it has now to an offering with three degrees - a general, a specialised and an Honours. The general degree would have few regulations, be very broad in its study areas (being aimed at general education), have no restrictions on attempts and take 3 years to complete. The specialised degree would be a faculty degree as compared to the departmental degree, the Honours. This degree would have a grade point entry and graduation requirement, minimum levels for progression, a limited number of attempts and require 4 years to complete. The Honours degree would essentially remain the same. Dean Macpherson concluded by stating it was the Dean's intention to meet with each departmental council to discuss these degrees and to get from the departments some idea as to what they thought of the proposal and what problems they foresee. The departments will be asked to report to the Executive which in turn would get back to Faculty Council. The purpose of bringing this up to Faculty Council at this time was for information and general discussion.

Questioned as to the value of a three-year general program, Dean Macpherson replied that our current general degree had become so structured that it now neither satisfied the desire for general education nor professional training. There is a need to provide a program for students who had no intention of being a research or professional scientist but who wanted to go into law or education and wanted a broad area of learning. The idea of the new general degree was that it would not be a "less good" program than the one we have now but would be a different program, a genuine general program. Dean Macpherson said that he anticipated many course changes resulting from this proposal and undoubtedly these would cause problems within departments but the deans wanted to know and hoped to find out from their meetings with the departments the number and nature of the problems envisaged. He said that it was also the intention of the deans to get responses from the faculties of Arts and Education.

9. Other Business

(i) Request for Regulation Change

Dean Macpherson referred to the material distributed at the meeting which was a request to modify the faculty's regulations on academic suspension and academic reinstatement. There was a very brief discussion before it was moved by Kelly (Svenne) that

"the changes be accepted"

CARRIED

(ii) The second matter which Dean Macpherson referred to was a request for waiver of the University residence requirement. A student, new to the university, has in the department's estimation the equivalent of third year honours and by completing one more year would have fulfilled all the regulations for an honours degree except for the residence requirement (i.e. two years at the University). He was asking Faculty Council to request from Senate that this regulation be waived. He moved (Samoiloff) that

"Senate be requested to waive this regulation"

CARRIED

Before adjourning the Executive Committee reporter, Dr. Duckworth, informed Council that Dr. S. Sen had agreed to serve another year as the faculty's representative on the Tenure Appeal Panel.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m. when it was found that the call for a quorum could not be sustained.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE January 25, 1978

TO All Members of the Faculty Council of Science

FROM G. Richardson, Secretary

SUBJECT:

The thirty-third meeting of the Science Faculty Council has been called for Thursday, February 2, 1978 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 306 Buller Building.

A G E N D A

1. Approval of the Minutes of the thirty-second meeting of November 24, 1977.
2. Matters arising therefrom.
3. Communications. *Imp retrieval.*
4. Discussion on the evaluation of academic teaching for purposes of promotion and merit pay in light of the Senate's approval of the recommendation of the ad hoc Committee on Merit Pay and Promotion and the request brought forward at the last Faculty Council meeting.
5. Discussion on the status of the Faculty's budget (material attached).
6. For the information of Council, the Faculty's proposal for new general and specialised degree regulations (material attached).
7. Report from the Executive Committee.
8. Report from Senate.
9. Other business.

gr/sc
encls.

Dr. R. D. Connor
Dean of Science
Machray Hall

PROPOSAL FOR B.Sc. GENERAL DEGREE

A degree of Bachelor of Science - General will be gained upon completion of 90 credit hours (15 full courses) with a grade point average of 2.0 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) At least 48 credit hours (8 courses) must be in the Faculty of Science.
- 2) In the 90 credit hours (15 courses) offered for the general degree "general course units"* must be completed in at least two departments in the Faculty of Science.
- 3) In the 90 credit hours (15 courses) offered for the general degree at least 24 credit hours (4 courses) shall be taken outside the Faculty of Science from lists of courses prepared and approved by the other faculties as appropriate for this purpose.

* Science departments will prescribe in the calendar "general course units" consisting of 18 credit hours from their offerings. Prerequisite courses from within a department shall be included in the general course unit.