

May 9, 1974

Twenty-third meeting

RDC

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE May 6, 1974.

TO Members of Science Executive Committee.

FROM G. Richardson, Secretary to Executive Committee.

SUBJECT:

The 23rd meeting of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council has been scheduled for Thursday, May 9, 1974, at 1:30 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room, 250 Allen Building.

AGENDA

1. Adoption of the minutes of the 21st and 22nd meetings held on April 26th and 30th respectively.
2. Matters arising therefrom.
3. Selection of the winners of the University Gold Medal in Science (General) and Science (Honours).
4. Discussion on Professor Henry's letter requesting a review of the awarding of the University Gold Medal.
5. Other business.

GR/nlh

Enclosures

Minutes of the twenty-third meeting of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council, held on Thursday, May 9, 1974, at 1:30 p.m., in the Faculty Conference Room, 250 Allen Building.

Members Present: Dean P.K. Isaac, Chairman; Deans I. Cooke and N.E.R. Campbell; Professors B.R. Henry, B.K. Kale, K.W. Stewart, D.N. Burton, B. Macpherson, G.O. Losey, D. Punter; Mr. G. Steindel; G. Richardson, Secretary.

Visitor: Mr. R. McDole.

I. Minutes of the last meetings

The minutes of the twenty-first and twenty-second meetings were not ready for circulation at the time of this meeting and therefore their approval was deferred until next meeting.

II. Matters Arising Therefrom

There were no matters arising for discussion.

III. Gold Medal Winners

The chairman asked Mr. McDole to speak to this matter. Mr. McDole gave a brief explanation on how the gold medal winner had been selected in the past and how the material which had been circulated to the members had been prepared.

After a short discussion it was moved by Dr. Kale (Campbell) that:

"Boreski, Charles Victor, #093125, be awarded the Science Gold Medal (Honours)."

Carried
unanimous

It was further moved by Dr. Cooke (Losey) that:

"Chmielowiec, Chester Joel, #156395, be awarded the Science Gold Medal (General)."

Carried
nem con

IV. Discussion on Awarding the Gold Medal

The committee agreed that it was a difficult matter to distinguish between many of the students nominated for the awards on the basis of the letter grade marks. In the case of a faculty the size of Science, the numbers of students eligible for the two gold medals was high and many of them had grades that were identical. It was suggested that perhaps Science could award more than two gold medals, say one per department, or even one per group of departments. It was pointed out that one gold medal per department would be awkward, particularly where certain departments were small or in the case outside Science where there were no departments in the faculty. It was noted that the gold medal was awarded for highest standing in a degree program and departments didn't offer degrees. As far as awarding a gold medal for a certain group of departments (e.g. Biological, Mathematical, or Physical Science group) potential problems could be seen where there were programs that overlapped (e.g. Chemistry and Microbiology).

Further discussion brought forth the suggestions that perhaps more awards could be offered at the departmental level, that perhaps more consideration should be given to student performance in years other than the final year and finally, that in the case of ties, the committee might consider the student's complete program.

It was moved by Dr. Cooke (Stewart) that:

"A+'s be used to break ties and that if further tie breaking is necessary then extra courses and work in previous years be considered."

Carried

With approval of this motion the committee agreed to keep the number of gold medals in the faculty to two, these being one for the general program and one for the honours program.

V. Other Business

The chairman read a letter that he had received from Senate which requested a faculty recommendation on a proposal from Brandon University to initiate a four year general degree program in Arts and Science.

The Science departments affected by this proposal were Botany, Zoology, and Earth Sciences. Senate had requested the faculty's reply by May 21st.

The members questioned the deadline imposed by Senate, feeling that such an involved matter as this required far more time than had been allowed. The members felt that any reply at this time could only be at a very superficial level.

It was generally the feeling of the committee that a four year general degree program was a good idea. They agreed that there was a place in industry for such a student and such a program would not impinge upon the honours programs.

Dr. Stewart stated that it was unfortunate this proposal did not come from the University of Manitoba as most members in his department shared the view that such a program was highly desirable. However, he did question the program as put forth by Brandon. Considering the present staff members in Brandon's department of Zoology and the fact that the proposal did not intend to increase the funds allotted to the department, he did not see how a viable fourth year could be accomplished.

Some members of the committee felt that the fourth year was really meant to be a preparatory year in order to get Brandon students into graduate school. The extra year would either develop into a pre-masters year or be expanded in such a way to form a basis for an honours program. The members concurred that there would still exist a very significant difference between the four year general program and an honours program and should Brandon succeed in establishing the four year program it could in no way guarantee graduates direct admittance to graduate school.

Dr. Stewart questioned the fact that the fourth year appeared to be optional and students who decided not to take the extra year graduated with a B.Sc. degree as did those who completed the fourth year. He could not see how both graduates could receive similar degrees. It was his opinion that it might be more appropriate for the three year graduate to receive a diploma. He also questioned how students graduating from other departments in Arts and Science would be distinguished from those in the four year program.

It was obvious to the committee that there were many problems that were not answered in the proposal. The committee did not feel they could in any way recommend on the specific Brandon proposal. However, they did feel a more general response on the concept of a four year general degree program was possible. While some members thought the response should be only in academic terms others felt that the financial considerations were important too, and that the establishment of an extra year in any program was bound to be of some cost if the courses were to be of any value.

It was agreed that Dean Cooke would compose a letter which would be the basis for a reply to Senate outlining the faculty's views. The tenor of the response would be that while the faculty approves in principle to a four year general degree program, it does see problems with the specific proposal from Brandon, and that some of these problems would be alluded to in the letter.

Having dealt with the immediate problem it was agreed that a sub-committee should be struck to consider the specific Brandon proposal as well as the more general matter of a four year general degree. It was moved by Dr. Cooke (Losey) that:

" A sub-committee be established, to examine Brandon's proposal and give an interim response, with a view to advising faculty, by February, 1975, on how to respond to this matter on a long term basis."

Carried
nem con

Before adjournment it was agreed that the next meeting of the Executive Committee would be on Wednesday, May 29, 1974, at which time the awards to Science students would be determined. The meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

GR

May 28, 1974