

March 12th, 1970.

Minutes of meeting of Science Faculty Council held on Thursday, March 12th, 1970
at 2:40 p.m. in room 207 of the Buller Building.

Members Present: Drs.: P.K. Isaac, J.M. Wells, F.W.J. Davis, W.G. Barker,
I. Cooke, H. Lees, R. Wong, S.M. Woods, G. Woods, N. Losey,
G.O. Losey, E.R. Waygood, J. Reid, G. Robinson, D. Punter,
P.W. Aitchison, J. Gee, R.H. Green, C.C. Lindsey, K. Stewart,
H. Weisman, R.N. Evans, B. Kale, B. Johnston, S.K. Sinha,
A.H. Morrish, J.F. Templeton, F.J. Ward, T. Dandy, H. Laale,
M. Samoiloff, H.E. Welch, R. Toxopeus, F. Zeiler, N.E.R. Campbell,
H. Gesser, K.G. Standing, D.G. Wells, A. Giessinger, G. Baldwin,
H.C. Finlayson, D. Burton, R. Hawirko, W. Falk, J. Svenne,
M.E. Kettner, S. Standil, B.G. Whitmore, D.G. Douglas, J.M. Vail,
B.G. Hogg, N. Mendelsohn, D.H. Hall, H.D.E. Wilson, A. Chow,
E. Bock, K.K. Ogilvie, B.R. Henry, G.E. Dunn, D.M. McKinnon,
R.H. Betts, S.K. Sen, J.W. Walker. R.D. Connor - Chairman (64)

Regrets: H.E. Duckworth

Minutes of the last meeting of Council on November 26th, 1969 were approved by
Dr. B.G. Hogg (W.G. Barker).

Matters Arising from the Minutes

- (1) The Chairman informed the Council about the Kenneth Roulston Scholarship fund which had been established in honour of Prof. K.I. Roulston. The mechanism for accepting contributions was operative now and all contributions would be readily accepted by the Comptroller's Office.
- (2) As approved at the last meeting, a Student Affairs Committee has been formed with a membership of 6 staff and 6 students. It is to be known as the Science Advisory Committee. It has met twice in the past month. Science Staff who are members are:

Profs.	A. Chow	Chemistry
	J.A. Cherry	Earth Sciences
	R.J. Lockhart	Astronomy
	W.R. Wall	Physics
	F.W.J. Davis	Biological Sciences
	H.E. Welch	Zoology

- (3) With regard to the admission regulations to the University of Manitoba, the Chairman informed the Council that the Department of Education has dropped their University Entrance Course and General Course. In their place we will have a High School Programme consisting of all the courses previously given in these programmes from which a student can freely select.

The second matter that has developed is that there is every indication that the Minister of Education will announce the abolition of the High School Examination Board. Consequently there will no longer be Board Standing, only School Standing. What the exact result of these two developments will be was not known to the Chairman at this time, but he said that he would keep the members informed.

- (4) As a matter of information the report on the creation of a new Faculty of Science was now being written up by the Dickson Committee and was likely to be presented to Senate for the May meeting.

Some members expressed a certain amount of concern at the length of time that was being spent in writing up the report, while other members felt that such an important document should come to this Council first, before being sent to Senate Executive. One of the Science representatives on that committee stated that he would mention this fact to his Committee at their next meeting.

Item #1 Agenda

The matter of liberalizing the Basic Art Requirements for Science students was again raised at the last Science 'Lost Weekend' and as the matter is currently with the Curriculum Review Committee with no decision likely in the next while, the Chairman thought it best to bring it to this Council's attention. This matter had been raised by Students at the 'Lost Weekend' a year ago.

The current Basic Art Requirement states: "The Basic Arts requirement is met by the selection of 18 hours of credit from the following set of subjects which will be known as the Basic Arts Group:

English
The Core Languages (French, German, Greek, Latin,
Russian, and Spanish)
History
Philosophy

The students main concern is that this requirement is too restrictive. They don't mind having to take Arts Courses as credit towards their Science degree. As a matter of fact more than half the Science students in the general course take 4 or more Arts courses, but they would prefer to have more scope in their selection.

Prof. I. Cooke in speaking on this matter proposed the following motion:

"that the present Basic Arts Requirement for general degree students be modified to require Science students to take three (3) courses selected from any Arts Department(s) excepting courses approved as satisfying the Basic Science Requirement"

CARRIED

During the discussion that took place regarding the Basic Arts liberalization, the problem of Honour students reverting to the general programme was raised. Essentially the problem was that an Arts Honour student, who had completed 3rd year Honours, could revert to the general B.A. programme and receive credit for the degree notwithstanding the Basic Science Requirement, whereas a Science student who has completed the 3rd year of an Honours programme and wishes to revert to the general programme must make up the Basic Arts Requirements. This situation no longer exists. The Arts student must meet the requirements too but it is often more difficult for the Science student to meet the requirements of three basic Arts courses.

It was moved by Dr. Oretzki (H. Lees),

"that this problem be referred to the Arts and Science Executive Committee."

CARRIED

Dr. P.K. Isaac pointed out that it would be well to differentiate between a voluntarily withdrawn 3rd year Honours student and a failed one. Whereas we might wish to give the general degree credit to the student who has voluntarily reverted, having successfully completed his programme, we might decide to require the student who has failed his 3rd year Honours and must revert, to meet all the requirements of the general degree.

Item #2 Agenda

This question being so involved the Chairman invited Dr. Isaac, a member of the Senate Executive to outline the developments.

At the February 3, 1970 meeting of Senate, the Ad Hoc Committee on "Student Representation on Faculty and School Councils" presented its report and a minority report (attached). Discussion was limited to questioning the Chairman as to the meaning of certain parts of the report. On March 3rd, 1970 a lengthy discussion took place on this topic in Senate which also received the comments of its Rules and Procedure Committee on this report (attached). It was finally decided to set up a Joint Committee of the original ad hoc committee and the Rules and Procedure Committee and to invite all Faculties and Schools to communicate their views to the Joint Committee.

Dr. Isaac pointed out the difficulty with the use of the word "Department" in the original report.

It was moved by Dr. B.G. Hogg (N. Mendelsohn),

"that the Science Council endorses the principle of student representation on Faculty and School Councils but would like to work out for itself the way in which the general principle shall be implemented in its own faculty and in particular, to consider further the matter of student representation at the department level."

CARRIED

The Chairman went on to say that the Science Advisory Committee (that is the Science staff - Student Committee) is very active in its discussions and he would like permission from the Council members to put this issue on the next agenda and seek their recommendation. The Council thought this a good idea and the following motion was put forth by Dr. D. Wells (I. Cooke).

"That we recommend to the Joint Committee that items 2-5 inclusive in the Recommendation Section of the Brown Report, be referred to the Science Advisory Committee for recommendation."

CARRIED

It was suggested by Dr. G.B. Hogg that we have some Science students attend the next Faculty Council meeting. The Chairman suggested inviting the 6 student representatives from the Science Advisory Committee and this met with general approval from the Council.

There being no further business a motion for adjournment was made (H. Lees) and the meeting terminated at 4:20 p.m.

January 12, 1970

The ad hoc Committee appointed to consider guidelines for student representation on Faculty and School Councils and Department Committees reports and recommends that:

I. Preamble

The recommendations of this report represent a departure from long-standing principles and practices of the University. They are important recommendations because they represent a milestone in the development of the University as a community of scholars, indicating how far we have come and also pointing to our future possibilities.

Many of the briefs submitted to our Committee made suggestions on the number or percentage of representation of students who should be on various councils, departments and committees. The range of suggestions was very broad. In our Committee discussions, we were tempted by the possibility of submitting a suggested number or range based on a compromise of the proposals. From our recommendations, it will be seen that we did not yield to such a temptation. The only number we used specified a minimum representation.

In rejecting a number or percentage proposal, we are speaking strongly to a very important principle. By it we indicate our rejection of a false "we-thou" dichotomy and any other categorization which would imply that we wish to be other than a university community with a unified goal. In the community we feel that we must strive for, the full rights of community membership are respected for all members. Our roles will differ, but our objectives as a community will be the same.

In striving for this ideal, the question of numbers becomes subservient to the recognition that all community members can contribute to group goals. Indeed, all must be encouraged to participate to the best of their ability. All must have an equal right and an equal opportunity to express their feelings and state their ideas, and all must have the opportunity of having their feelings and their ideas listened to.

Participation by all, then, is something to be valued. The attitude towards the participants is what counts in making such a system work. The number of participants subserves the attitude.

We feel that "playing the numbers game" could have disastrous results in terms of achieving community objectives. Bloc voting by students and faculty could lead to fear and mistrust and bring about a polarization which would be pernicious to group effectiveness.

Nonetheless, we feel strongly that faculty members must recognize the value of a substantial student participation. A faculty decision which is unrealistic in its assessment of legitimate student participation and which is shortsighted in terms of the valuable contribution students can make would be an insult and a retrograde step.

With this preamble we make our recommendations.

II Observations

1. A number of the members of the Committee attended the December 16, 1969, meeting of the Executive of Senate to discuss the Committee's preliminary report. The points raised by the Executive were considered at a subsequent meeting of the Committee and a number of these have been incorporated into the report.
2. Appended is a Minority report from Mr. P. Barber a member of the Committee.

III Recommendations

1. The Committee recommends the principle of student representation on and participation in Faculty and School Councils and Departments.
2. That provision be made for student representation on and participation in Faculty and School Councils and Departments.
3. Students shall have full voting rights on Faculty and School Councils, Departments and their respective Committees, on which they are represented.
4. The method of selection of students to Faculty and School Councils and Departments be the responsibility of the Student Councils concerned.
5. If students are neither able nor willing or do not wish to fill the positions available on Councils, Departments and committees these bodies shall in no way be limited in the performance of their functions.

IV Mechanics

1. A minimum of three students be placed on each Council and Department.
2. There shall be established in each Faculty and School an ad hoc Committee, composed of fifty percent faculty and fifty percent students to include, whenever present, graduate students. The first meeting of the Committee to be called by the Dean, Director or Department Head concerned. The Chairman will be elected at the first meeting. The purpose of the ad hoc Committee shall be to recommend to the appropriate organizational unit involved, what shall be the proportion of membership of Standing ad hoc Committees now in existence in Faculty and School Councils, Departments and their respective Committees.
3. The fifty-fifty Committee shall set the minimum qualification to be required of each candidate for election.
4. Each course and/or section of each course in a Department shall elect a representative or representatives to a Student Department Committee which shall be formed to elect representative(s)

to the Department and the appropriate Department committee.

5. It is expected that Departments shall meet frequently enough to make student participation meaningful.

Members of the Committee

Mr. Ken Brown, Chairman
Mr. P. Barber
Mr. A. L. Bodie
Prof. D. A. C. Harvey
Prof. D. J. Lawless
Prof. C. R. Santos
Prof. E. W. Tyrchniewicz

February 24, 1970

From the Committee on Rules and Procedures:

With respect to the report of the Committee on Guidelines for Student Representation on Faculty and School Council and Departments, the Committee on Rules and Procedures RECOMMENDS:

- (1) That Senate endorse the principle of student representation on all Faculty and School Councils and agree that there should be a minimum of three students on every Faculty and School Council.
- (2) That each Faculty and School Council be requested to submit for Senate approval a by-law governing the number of student members it proposes to have, the way in which they are to be chosen, and their rights of participation in the affairs of the Council.
- (3) That in formulating such by-laws each Council should seek the advice and concurrence of representatives of students in the Faculty or School, preferably from a committee composed, in addition to the Dean or Director, of equal numbers of students and staff, the students to be chosen by the Student Council of the Faculty or School concerned.
- (4) That after by-laws governing student representations on a given Faculty or School Council have been passed, Council should then proceed in a manner similar to that recommended above, to formulate standing rules governing student representation on Departments and on Committees of the Council, such rules to be submitted for approval by the Faculty or School Council.
- (5) That every effort be made to complete this process within the next six months.

Professor J. W. Neilson, Dentistry
Professor E. A. Braid, Law
Professor J. O. Turner, English

MINORITY REPORT

Senate Sub-committee on Student Representation

Let me make it clear at the outset that I endorse all aspects of the majority report save one. The one I do not support is the section dealing with the proportions of students on councils and committees. I believe that, as a guiding principle, the Senate should accept that all those groups affected by a decision have a right to full and equal participation in the making of that decision. Following from that, if one is confronted with a situation where certain groups are defined as existing, e.g. faculty, administrators, students, non-academic staff, etc., then all these groups are entitled to parity representation on bodies whose decisions affect their lives. Since, in the instance of faculty and school councils, virtually the only groups affected by decisions made are faculty and students, there should be a split of 50 per cent faculty and 50 per cent students on these committees.

The issue is: In what perspective do we view student representation? If it is as participants in decision-making then there can be no justification for limitation of the students' role. If the purpose is to help faculty and administrators make more well-informed decisions, we could easily conceive ~~more efficient~~ apparatus for communicating salient information. Student representation on anything but a parity basis is a hoax and a cruel joke and is furthermore likely to be impermanent.

Respectfully submitted

Paul Barber (signed)
January 12, 1970

P.S. The purpose of the recommendations of this committee ought to be to make meaningful long-term changes in university structures. If it is to manipulate and siphon off student dissent then it is a blatant fraud. The outcome of this question will depend on the attitude adopted by Senate.



Sci Fa by Council

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE
OFFICE OF THE DEAN
WINNIPEG 19, MANITOBA
CANADA

March 6th, 1970

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE SCIENCE COUNCIL

In order not to conflict with the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council Meeting, the Science Faculty Council meeting has been re-scheduled for Thursday March 12th, 1970 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 207, Buller Building.

G. Richardson

G. Richardson
Secretary

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE SCIENCE COUNCIL

There will be a meeting of the Science Council on Tuesday March 10th,
at 2:40 p.m. in room 207, Buller Building.

AGENDA

1. Proposal to liberalize the "Basic Arts" requirement for Science students. This matter has been referred to the Science & Arts Councils by the Arts & Science Executive.
2. Recommendation to Senate regarding student participation in Faculty and School councils and committees.

Enclosed is the report of the Senate Ad-Hoc Committee appointed to establish guidelines for student representation on Faculty and School councils and departmental committees. Senate agreed to make no decision on this matter until its April meeting in order to give Faculty and School councils an opportunity to consider the matter in detail.

The Chairman regrets the short notice given for this meeting, but it is important that we attend to these matters immediately.

R. D. Connor
Chairman, Science Council

The ad hoc Committee appointed to consider guidelines for student representation on Faculty and School Councils and Department Committees reports and recommends that:

I. Preamble

The recommendations of this report represent a departure from long-standing principles and practices of the University. They are important recommendations because they represent a milestone in the development of the University as a community of scholars, indicating how far we have come and also pointing to our future possibilities.

Many of the briefs submitted to our Committee made suggestions on the number or percentage of representation of students who should be on various councils, departments and committees. The range of suggestions was very broad. In our Committee discussions, we were tempted by the possibility of submitting a suggested number or range based on a compromise of the proposals. From our recommendations, it will be seen that we did not yield to such a temptation. The only number we used specified a minimum representation.

In rejecting a number or percentage proposal, we are speaking strongly to a very important principle. By it we indicate our rejection of a false "we-thou" dichotomy or any other categorization which would imply that we wish to be other than a university community with a unified goal. In the community we feel that we must strive for, the full rights of community membership are respected for all members. Our roles will differ, but our objectives as a community will be the same.

In striving for this ideal, the question of numbers becomes subservient to the recognition that all community members can contribute to group goals. Indeed, all must be encouraged to participate to the best of their ability. All must have an equal right and an equal opportunity to express their feelings and state their ideas, and all must have the opportunity of having their feelings and their ideas listened to.

Participation by all, then, is something to be valued. The attitude towards the participants is what counts in making such a system work. The number of participants subserves the attitude.

We feel that "playing the numbers game" could have disastrous results in terms of achieving community objectives. Bloc voting by students and faculty could lead to fear and mistrust and bring about a polarization which would be pernicious to group effectiveness.

Nonetheless, we feel strongly that faculty members must recognize the value of a substantial student participation. A faculty decision which is unrealistic in its assessment of legitimate student participation and which is shortsighted in terms of the valuable contribution students can make would be an insult and a retrograde step.

With this preamble, we make our recommendations.

II Observations

1. A number of the members of the Committee attended the December 16, 1969, meeting of the Executive of Senate to discuss the Committee's preliminary report. The points raised by the Executive were considered at a subsequent meeting of the Committee and a number of these have been incorporated into the report.
2. Appended is a Minority report from Mr. P. Barber a member of the Committee.

III Recommendations

1. The Committee recommends the principle of student representation on and participation in Faculty and School Councils and Departments.
2. That provision be made for student representation on and participation in Faculty and School Councils and Departments.
3. Students shall have full voting rights on Faculty and School Councils, Departments and their respective Committees, on which they are represented.
4. The method of selection of students to Faculty and School Councils and Departments be the responsibility of the Student Councils concerned.
5. If students are neither able nor willing or do not wish to fill the positions available on Councils, Departments and committees these bodies shall in no way be limited in the performance of their functions.

IV Mechanics

1. A minimum of three students be placed on each Council and Department.
2. There shall be established in each Faculty and School an ad hoc Committee, composed of fifty percent faculty and fifty percent students to include, whenever present, graduate students. The first meeting of the Committee to be called by the Dean, Director or Department Head concerned. The Chairman will be elected at the first meeting. The purpose of the ad hoc Committee shall be to recommend to the appropriate organizational unit involved, what shall be the proportion of membership of Standing ad hoc Committees now in existence in Faculty and School Councils, Departments and their respective Committees.
3. The fifty-fifty Committee shall set the minimum qualification to be required of each candidate for election.
4. Each course and/or section of each course in a Department shall elect a representative or representatives to a Student Department Committee which shall be formed to elect representative(s)

to the Department and the appropriate Department committee.

5. It is expected that Departments shall meet frequently enough to make student participation meaningful.

Members of the Committee

Mr. Ken Brown, ^{Comm.} Chairman

Mr. P. Barber ^{arts}

Mr. A. L. Bodie ^{Eng.}

Prof. D. A. C. Harvey ^{Law}

Prof. D. J. Lawless ^{Arts}

Prof. C. R. Santos ^{Arts}

Prof. E. W. Tyrchniewicz ^{Ag. Econ.}

February 24, 1970

From the Committee on Rules and Procedures:

With respect to the report of the Committee on Guidelines for Student Representation on Faculty and School Council and Departments, the Committee on Rules and Procedures RECOMMENDS:

- (1) That Senate endorse the principle of student representation on all Faculty and School Councils and agree that there should be a minimum of three students on every Faculty and School Council.
- (2) That each Faculty and School Council be requested to submit for Senate approval a by-law governing the number of student members it proposes to have, the way in which they are to be chosen, and their rights of participation in the affairs of the Council.
- (3) That in formulating such by-laws each Council should seek the advice and concurrence of representatives of students in the Faculty or School, preferably from a committee composed, in addition to the Dean or Director, of equal numbers of students and staff, the students to be chosen by the Student Council of the Faculty or School concerned.
- (4) That after by-laws governing student representations on a given Faculty or School Council have been passed, Council should then proceed in a manner similar to that recommended above, to formulate standing rules governing student representation on Departments and on Committees of the Council, such rules to be submitted for approval by the Faculty or School Council.
- (5) That every effort be made to complete this process within the next six months.

Professor J. W. Neilson, Dentistry
Professor E. A. Braid, Law
Professor J. O. Turner, English

MINORITY REPORT

Senate Sub-committee on Student Representation

Let me make it clear at the outset that I endorse all aspects of the majority report save one. The one I do not support is the section dealing with the proportions of students on councils and committees. I believe that, as a guiding principle, the Senate should accept that all those groups affected by a decision have a right to full and equal participation in the making of that decision. Following from that, if one is confronted with a situation where certain groups are defined as existing, e.g. faculty, administrators, students, non-academic staff, etc., then all these groups are entitled to parity representation on bodies whose decisions affect their lives. Since, in the instance of faculty and school councils, virtually the only groups affected by decisions made are faculty and students, there should be a split of 50 per cent faculty and 50 per cent students on these committees.

The issue is: In what perspective do we view student representation? If it is as participants in decision-making then there can be no justification for limitation of the students' role. If the purpose is to help faculty and administrators make more well-informed decisions, we could easily conceive a more efficient apparatus for communicating salient information. Student representation on anything but a parity basis is a hoax and a cruel joke and is furthermore likely to be impermanent.

Respectfully submitted

Paul Barber(signed)
January 12, 1970

P.S. The purpose of the recommendations of this committee ought to be to make meaningful long-term changes in university structures. If it is to manipulate and siphon off student dissent then it is a blatant fraud. The outcome of this question will depend on the attitude adopted by Senate.