

S. Catt, Secretary  
Faculty Council of Science

The Minutes of the 47th Meeting of Science Faculty Council held on Thursday, November 3rd, 1983 at 3:30 p.m. in Room 315 Buller Building.

Present: C.C. Bigelow (Chair), P.K. Isaac, N.E. Losey, G.S. Clark, L.K. Chan, J. Berry, J. Bate, P. Buhr, P.R. King, G. Ditchfield, H.W. Laale, B.R. Henry, G. Woods, H.W. Duckworth, J.C. Jamieson, D.N. Burton, R.M. Lyric, I. Suzuki, K.L. Sadana, R. Hawirko, J. Rauch, L.C. Graham, P. Loewen, W.G. Baldwin, A.F. Janzen, W. Falk, J. Birchall, J. Svenne, B. McCamis, T. Dandy, J.H. Gee, J. Williams, A. Olchowecki, D. Teich (SSA), L. Van Caesele, J. Reid, J.S.C. McKee, D.M. McKinnon, B. Southern, B.D. Macpherson, C.D. Anderson, G. Doak (SSA), T. Hellmuth (Visitor), D. Eyolfson (SSA), Z. Ondracek (SSA), D. Trosky (SSA), K. Graham (SSA), A. Chow, D. Gudmundson (SSA), F.M. Arscott, S. Johannson (Visitor), J. McConnell (Visitor); R. Chabluk, Recording Secretary.

Regrets: H.B. LeJohn, D.A. Young, R. Ferguson, D. Punter, M. Sumner, N.D. Gupta, F. Stambrook, N.E.R. Campbell, R. Venkataraman, H.E. Duckworth, J. Shay, W. Last.

1. The minutes of the 46th meeting were APPROVED with the addition of Dr. Arscott and Dr. Punter to the list of those present, on a motion by Dr. Henry (Arscott).
2. Dr. Dandy requested a moment for discussion of the document "Academic Promotion Policies - Faculty of Science" as circulated in its 'Revised October 1983' format. Dr. Bigelow agreed, and also suggested an editorial change. This would move the paragraph beginning "The Dean Shall be responsible ..... (teaching, research, service and administrative duties).", nearer the beginning of the document and it would thus become the second paragraph. This request was approved without motion.

Moved by Dr. Dandy that, under the heading "Promotion Procedures (a)", the following sentence be inserted:  
"These three members shall be selected by the staff members with academic rank in the department." Seconded by Dr. Woods, and CARRIED.

3. Dean Bigelow addressed himself to the matter of enrolment limitations as set forth in the document entitled "Admissions", dated October 27, 1983, in an attempt to deal with admissions procedures within the Faculty. These procedures will have to fit in and mesh with other offices on campus. Dean Bigelow suggested that it was possible that our outlook on admissions could change, especially if the President

could discover extra funding for the Faculty. Our answers to some of the questions could be time-dependent.

Dean Bigelow mentioned that he had spent three hours discussing with the President and senior administrators how we would control our intake. At the end of the meeting we were asked how much money and support would be necessary before the Faculty of Science could change its first year quota from the proposed 1200 students to 1500 students. It appeared that this would take about 3/4 of a million dollars. He felt from this discussion he could infer that a possibility existed that Science might have a first year student quota that fluctuated every year in correspondence to funds available to the Faculty.

The Chairman asked the members to consider the proposed change in the Science calendar entry.

Questions were raised as to comparison of high school letter grades to 63%; as to whether the proposed requirement would result in too few students qualifying for admission, thereby losing any increase in funding that might be available to us; as to the value of the 63% average when different high schools have different marking systems; as to whether the Department of Education might return to standard examinations; as to whether the 63% would apply to Summer students.

The Chairman indicated that we could do nothing about high school marking systems and that the Department of Education did not plan to institute standard exams nor did the University Senate approve of entrance exams. Summer Session students would have to meet the standard to enter Science.

Discussion of the Recommendations themselves began.

Recommendation 1. Admission to the Faculty of Science be based on Mathematics 300, one other Science 300, and one other 300.

Dr. Henry moved that Recommendation 1 be amended as follows:

"Competition for admission to the Faculty of Science be based on Math 300; one of Biology 300, Chemistry 300, Physics 300; and one other 300." Seconded by Dr. N. Losey, APPROVED.

A student member of Council proposed an amendment to Recommendation 1:

"That the average mark was to be 63% on three courses with a minimum mark for each course to be defined at some later time." This proposed amendment FAILED.

Recommendation 1 as amended was voted on and APPROVED.

Recommendation 2. A minimum average of 63% over Mathematics 300, next best Science 300, and next best 300 level subject be required for entry to the Faculty of Science.

Dr. Macpherson moved that Recommendation 2 be amended to read:

"A minimum average of 63% in the three 300-level Science courses used for admission, with a minimum mark of 60% in each course, be required for admission." Seconded by Dr. Duckworth, APPROVED.

Discussion with regard to date of admission and confirmation of admission followed. Dean Losey suggested we would admit students provisionally in May, with confirmation after receipt of the June high school mark statements.

Recommendation 2 as amended was voted on and APPROVED.

Recommendation 3. We state that preference may be given to applicants who are Canadian citizens or permanent residents.

Dr. Janzen moved that Recommendation 3 be accepted as is. APPROVED.

Recommendation 4. That no more than 15% of the first year class be visa students.

Recommendation 4 was discussed. Questions arose as to how visa students would be chosen. Dean Losey confirmed that this would be done strictly on academic grounds.

Dr. Henry asked why we do not charge differential fees for visa students and commented on the difficulty of academically rating visa students who have come through Canadian high schools against those from other countries. Dean Losey responded that a ranking mechanism exists and that it is likely that visa students from local schools would be favoured over outside visa students.

Dr. J. Berry suggested that arguments in favor of admitting visa students are economic, political, and idealistic, especially for students from third world countries.

It was moved by Dr. J. Berry

"That visa students who are sponsored by recognized international agencies or governments should be admitted independently of the 15% quota." (There are approximately 12 in the Faculty of Science per year.) APPROVED.

Dr. Dandy moved

"That we change the 15% limit to a 10% limit." Seconded by Dr. Arscott, DEFEATED 15-10.

A motion was made that Recommendation 4 be accepted as it appeared. Seconded and APPROVED.

Recommendation 5, That a Faculty of Science Admissions Committee be

established to advise the Dean in matters of admission. The membership of this committee is to be approved by the Executive of the Faculty. The committee shall consist of five faculty members, and a chair appointed by the Dean. This committee will also bring forward suggested regulations about admissions for the approval of Faculty Council.

Recommendation 5 was discussed. A motion was made

"That the Science Admissions Committee consist of 10 members, one from each department." Seconded by Dr. McKee, DEFEATED.

An amendment to Recommendation 5 was proposed by Deborah Teich (SSA),

"That one student be on the Faculty of Science Admissions Committee, as a full voting member." Seconded by Karen Graham (SSA), and APPROVED.

Prof. Laale moved an amendment that the Foreign Student Advisor be invited to attend as an observer. The proposed amendment was not seconded.

Some comments on the main motion were heard. Dr. Burton asked if the Chair of the Admissions Committee would be a member of the Senate Admissions Committee. Dean Losey said that Science already had representation on that committee; therefore, our Chair would not necessarily be a member. Dr. Macpherson asked how the Executive would decide membership. Dean Losey replied that the membership would be appointed in the same way as for the Committee on Student Standing. Dr. Reid (seconded by Dr. Dandy) proposed an amendment to have one member from each department sit on the committee. This proposed amendment was DEFEATED. Dr. Lyric asked what powers the Admissions Committee would have. Dean Bigelow responded that it would advise Faculty Council. Dr. Lyric also asked if some other existing Faculty committee could handle admissions as well. Dean Losey replied that they felt it could not.

The vote on the main motion as amended was called. APPROVED.

Recommendation 6. Students who transfer in to Science have as a minimum 2.0 (or C) average on their previous university work. This is to be computed on their cumulative standing in their previous program of registration.

Dr. Reid asked if our transfer credit policy would change as a result of approval of Recommendation 6. Dean Losey said that Recommendation 6 would be in addition to current regulations.

Recommendation 6 was voted on and APPROVED.

Recommendation 7. The standard for the admission of transfer students be based on the standard of entry of first year students the previous year.

Dean Bigelow introduced a wording change to Recommendation 7, as follows:

Recommendation 7. "The standard for the admission of transfer students be based on a standard of entry comparable to that used for first year students."

Dean Bigelow noted that admission of transfer students "into each year" was implied. Dean Losey explained what "comparable" meant. After some discussion, Recommendation 7 was APPROVED.

A motion to adjourn was proposed by J. Berry (Svenne) and APPROVED at 5:30 p.m. Recommendations 8, 9, and 10 will be considered at a meeting next week.

Continuation of Meeting on Tuesday, November 8, 1983

Present: C.C. Bigelow (Chair), N.E. Losey, L.C. Graham, B.R. Henry, I. Suzuki, D. Burton, R. Venkataraman, D. Trosky (SSA), D. Teich (SSA), R. McCamis, N.E.R. Campbell, P. Loewen, J. Reid, L.K. Chan, G. Ditchfield, P.R. King, J. Bate, J. Svenne, B.D. Macpherson, J. Berry, A. Gerhard, G. Doak (SSA), G. Baldwin, D. Singh, A.H. Morrish, N.R. Hunter, G. Woods, T. Dandy, J.C. Jamieson, G.B. Hawrysh (SSA), T. Hellmuth (Visitor); S. Catt, Secretary.

Regrets: R. Lyric, H.B. LeJohn, M. Samoiloff, P. McClure, M. Doyle, Z. Ondracek (SSA).

Recommendation 8. That regulations be devised to ensure that students admitted to Science have places in Science courses, and to ensure that students not be able to study a first year Science program while enrolled in another faculty.

Discussion commenced on Recommendation 8 of the admissions document. A question was raised as to whether the regulations would be devised by the Admissions Committee; the Chairman said, "Or by negotiation with other faculties". Any such regulation would be brought to Faculty Council for approval. It was explained, in response to a question, that pre-medical students could satisfy medical admission requirements by registering in either Arts or Science.

A vote was taken and Recommendation 8 was APPROVED.

Recommendation 9. That the Faculty of Science have a first year class of 1200 students.

This recommendation had been reworded and now read

Recommendation 9. That the Faculty of Science have a first year class whose size will be determined by the Dean in consultation with the Executive Committee.

A member questioned why consultation would be with the Executive and not the Admissions Committee. The Chairman felt the Executive would want the advice of the Admissions Committee, and it was pointed out that the Admissions Committee is advisory to the Dean. The recommendation was amended by adding at the end

"and the Admissions Committee".

The amendment was voted on and APPROVED.

Questions were raised regarding the level of funding affecting enrolment numbers, space limitations, etc. A member thought that a 1200 limit might be too large a cut back in view of the fact that we are now coping with more than 1600. Dean Losey's view was that the

faculty had not been coping for the last three years. Classrooms were overbooked, teaching loads were heavier. Also, an analysis of 1982-83 admissions showed an estimated 130 students had come in with under 65% average and most of these were showing signs of stress by Christmas.

A second amendment to Recommendation 9 was proposed; to add at the end

"and approval ratified by Science Faculty Council".  
The amendment was DEFEATED.

The vote on the amended Recommendation 9 was taken, and was APPROVED.

Recommendation 10. That the Faculty not admit students as mature students, if qualified students have to be turned away.

The Chairman said this recommendation was not meant to deny mature students access to the Faculty. They can still register in Arts or Continuing Education, achieve regular student status, and transfer into Science.

Several members expressed their opposition. Some felt having mature students was beneficial to a class. Dean Losey said a mature student is not necessarily someone of a certain age group, but one who is over a certain age and does not meet normal admission requirements. Students could qualify as regular students by registering in Continuing Education or by attending night school and completing high school. A member was concerned that mature students might be prohibited by Recommendation 7, since most are likely to be deficient in some area, have problems associated with their background, etc. To get into Science they would have to reach a standard comparable to admission to first year. In response to a question Dean Losey said that other closed faculties admit mature students from Arts and Continuing Education.

After some further debate the vote was taken and Recommendation 10 was APPROVED.

It was moved by Prof. Macpherson that

"Faculty Council be on record that we regard the policy on limiting enrolment as an interim policy, and will reconsider it in 3 years' time." The motion was APPROVED.

Professor Reid asked whether approval at a higher level was required. The Dean said he will be writing to the President, who will discuss it with the Board of Governors, but the Faculty may have to provide exact definitions of Recommendations 1 - 3 to Senate. He would also be sending a letter to Principals and Guidance Counsellors saying students should be made aware of the new policy.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

## Inter-Departmental Correspondence

---

DATE October 27, 1983.

TO All Members of Science Faculty Council

FROM: S. Catt, Secretary

SUBJECT: The 47th Meeting of the Science Faculty Council is scheduled for 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, November 3, 1983 in Room 315 Buller Building.

### AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the 46th Meeting
2. Enrolment Limitations (copy attached)
3. Other Business

S. Catt, Secretary  
Faculty Council of Science