

Fifty-First Meeting  
March 28, 1978

The Minutes of the Fifty-First Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council of Science held on Tuesday, March 28, 1978 at 3:40 p.m. in Room 250 Allen Building.

Members Present: Dean R. D. Connor, Chairman: Professors P. K. Isaac, B. D. Macpherson, K. Stewart, J. Brewster, K. Subrahmaniám, C. Platt, G. Robinson, H. Duckworth, P. Loewen, Mr. D. Okrusko, Mr. B. Mayba, and Mr. G. Richardson, Secretary.

Regrets: Dr. A. Olchowecki

Before commencing with the business the Chairman introduced the new Senior Stick, Mr. B. Mayba, to the members. At the same time he thanked the outgoing Senior Stick, Dave Okrusko, for his participation and contribution to the meetings.

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Fiftieth Meeting

Dr. Platt requested modification to the second last sentence of the last paragraph in item 2. He requested the sentence be changed to read:

"It had been the department's wish to drop the second part of the calculus course."

With this change the minutes were approved Isaac (Duckworth).

2. Matters Arising Therefrom:

- (i) Dean Macpherson read the letter received from the Acting Head of Computer Science regarding the questions posed by the Chairman resulting from the last Executive Committee meeting. The Chairman admitted that Professor Thomas' reply wasn't complete and did not really answer the question put by Senate regarding that department's restrictive honours program. He told the members that his office was working on a report relevant to the matter and he would report back to this committee at the next meeting.
- (ii) The Chairman read the letter that he had just sent to all departments in the faculty regarding the status of the faculty's 1978-79 budget. He said that the Heads would be

meeting with him shortly in an attempt to meet the reduction imposed upon the faculty. He concluded by saying that the reduction was of significant size to cause changes to the departments' operations.

- (iii) Resulting from a letter sent by him to all Science Departments and to twelve faculty/schools on campus, the Chairman had received many replies to the question put by him regarding the U.M.F.A. requirement for the evaluation of teaching of academics for the purposes of promotion and tenure. He had not had enough time to go through all the replies but he promised that a full report would be attached to the Minutes of this meeting.

3. Communications

There were no communications.

4. New Entrance Regulations

The Chairman asked Dean Macpherson to speak to this matter.

The Dean explained that the Faculty's current entrance regulations were:

- (i) General University Entrance requirements
- (ii) Maths 300 or 301 (300 recommended)
- (iii) One of Chemistry 300  
Physics 300  
Biology 300

The change being considered at this time was that Maths at the 300 level be required and instead of one of the three other Science courses being required, that we change this to "two of" Chemistry, Physics or Biology at the 300 level.

Most of the areas on campus, in particular Engineering and Agriculture, required Maths at the 300 level and would not accept the 301. He said that a survey recently conducted by his office revealed that over 90% of the students entering Science now had the Maths 300. The task force to study first year mathematics offerings and several of the Science departments had indicated a preference for the 300 level.

It had also been noted that such a change might alleviate some of the current problems with the levels of attainment of the first year Maths students. He admitted there would have to be further discussions with the Admissions Office with regard to the phasing in of these changes but he did not foresee any problems.

It was pointed out by Dean Isaac that the 301 level Maths was never intended to be a University entrance course. The content of the course was much more practical in nature and dealt with such items as mortgages, interest rates etc.

It was agreed that this part of the change be recommended to Faculty Council.

With regard to the changes of the second part of the regulation, Dean Macpherson referred to the statistics distributed to the members which again showed that 90% of the students entering first year Science now came with at least two of the three 300 courses. In fact 45% had all three. It was the feeling of one of the members that as long as there were Maths departments associated with the Faculty of Science, only one of the three should be required, the reason being that requiring two would impose an undue hardship for the Maths students. After some discussion it was agreed that it would be the Executive Committee's recommendation to Faculty Council that the proposal as written be accepted.

##### 5. New Degree Regulations

The Chairman explained that the Deans had met with all but two of the departments to discuss the proposed new degree regulations. He said that the responses were mixed, with most concern centered on the four year specialized degree but overall the departments were satisfied with the proposal. The Department of Computer Science stated that they were content with their present arrangement because they felt that they had a good honours program/general program balance whereas the Department of Earth Sciences said that there could be a problem with students in the specialized degree applying for professional certification when in fact that would be appropriate only for their honours graduates. As for the three year general degree there still appeared to be a fair amount of confusion as to the intent of this proposal.

It was pointed out that the present three year major program purports depth in a certain area whereas in fact students can complete this degree without taking a third year course in the major area. The degree is very varied and quite loose under its present structure and this has a detrimental effect on the student, who feels that he has been misled by believing he has "in depth" training and for the employer who has been led to believe he is getting a student with "major" training in one area. Yet to "tighten up" the program would be to move it further away from the "general" aspect of the degree. In trying to correct these shortcomings with the current program it was felt that the best approach to take was to completely separate the two intents, i.e. "in depth" training and the "general" aspect; consequently the two new programs. The three year general degree would be "general" to a greater extent than the current degree whereas the four year specialized program would give a year's additional training and more depth. It was envisaged that students who graduate with the three year general degree would be ones who never intended to be scientists and just wanted a university education in a broad area or students with the intention of going on into Law, Education, etc.

In the discussion that followed Dean Macpherson presented statistics of a similar program at the University of Alberta which clearly indicated a high static enrolment in the general program over the last four years. Dr. Stewart said that the four year specialized degree would be welcomed in his department because of their attempts to put together an interdisciplinary ecology program which they were having difficulty in doing within the current program. Dr. Brewster pointed out that the word specialization could be misleading. He felt that some people might interpret this as a higher degree than the honours. The Chairman agreed that the name could be misleading and said that he had been thinking of ways that this might be clarified. It was generally agreed that if the new program was instituted more counselling would be required in both the academic area and in the regulations.

Dave Okrusko stated that this proposal had been discussed at length at the Student Council meeting. The conclusion reached was that the proposed new degree would likely enhance the students chances for employment. This was one of the difficulties students now faced when graduating

with the present major degree.

In conclusion, the Chairman said that he hoped that within the two scheduled Faculty Council meetings the Council would be able to come to a decision regarding these new degrees. If not then he intended to call a third meeting, because in order to implement these there were several deadlines that would have to be met and these were fast approaching.

The meeting adjourned at 5:52 p.m.

rdc

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

# Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE March 20, 1978

TO Members of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council

FROM G. Richardson, Secretary



SUBJECT:

The fifty-first meeting of the Science Executive Committee has been called for March 28, 1978 at 2:40 p.m. in room 250 Allen Building.

### A G E N D A

1. Approval of the Minutes of the fiftieth meeting.
2. Matters arising therefrom:
  - (i) Dean's discussion with the department of Computer Science regarding the restrictiveness of their Honours program and the course options (i.e. 5.231) that have been deleted.
  - (ii) Status of the faculty's 1978-79 budget.
  - (iii) Result of departmental and outside Faculty/School replies to the request from Senate for the evaluation of teaching for purposes of promotion and merit pay.
3. Communications.
4. Discussion of the proposal to change the entrance requirements to the Faculty (material attached).
5. Further discussion on the new degrees proposed for the Faculty.
6. Other business.

gr/sc  
encl.