

Minutes of the 90th meeting of Science Faculty Council held Monday, December 11, 2000 in the Senate Chambers

Present:	J.C. Jamieson	P. Loewen
	M. Abrahams	P.D. Loly
	P. Blunden	J. McConnell
	W. Buchannon	J. McLeese
	J. Charlton	S. McLachlan
	A. Chow	I. Oresnik
	N. Chow	J.H. Page
	D. Court	S. Page
	N. Davison	M. Piercey-Normore
	P. Dibrov	D. Punter
	J.G. Eales	G. Robinson
	W. Falk	M. Shaw
	I. Ferguson	B. Sherriff
	B. Ford	R. Sparling
	J. Gardner	M. Speare
	A. Gerhard	B. Southern
	D. Gillis	T. Suzuki
	G. Goldsborough	J. Svenne
	L. Graham	J. Teller
	N.Halden	J. van Rees
	B. Hann	F. Wang
	J. Hare	I. Waters
	G. Hausner	T. Wiens
	G. Hickling	H. Williams
	P. Hultin	J.J. Williams
	N.R. Hunter	E. Worobec
	P.R. King	J. Young
	T. Kucera	
	W. Last	
Regrets:	M. Doob	J. Shay
	J. Hoskins	W. van Oers
	E. Huebner	G. Woods
	D. Lenoski	

Dean Jamieson indicated that the motion, which was deferred, needs a slight editorial change. The motion (with the editorial changes) now reads:

"That the Faculty Council of Science accepts, in principle, the proposal from the Environmental Science Program faculty as an alternative to the FEERS proposal."

This meeting was called to continue the discussion on item 6 of the November 28th meeting of Faculty council and the motion, which was deferred. Dr. Goldsborough was asked to make a more detailed presentation on Environmental Science faculty proposal. Dean Jamieson mentioned that both Dr. Gardner and Dr. Goldsborough had presented their proposals to the Arts Faculty Council on December 7. At the Arts Faculty Council, there was a document from Native Studies that was critical of the FEERS proposal. Dr. Goldsborough will also be making a presentation at Deans' Council on December 14.

Dr. Gardner highlighted areas of his Proposal for Faculty Council.

- The rationale for the proposal
- The proposal's characteristics
- Dr. Gardner went into detail on the issues that arose with the draft proposal
- The name of the Faculty; no one is wedded to the title "FEERS".
- Other units, it is hoped, will become more involved and cross boundaries, for example with adjunct professor appointments; there are other cross appointment options. He also indicated that we are not getting much in revenue and space is a big issue. At the moment, there is no single building or space available which contains all the elements of the proposed Faculty; this is not ideal and would present some barriers.
- The conclusion and the 11 goals of the proposal were stated. Gardner emphasized the duplication and overlap of existing course content found in Geology, ESP and Geography. Some units are in a state of erosion, primarily from resignations and retirements and the first thing to be affected is course offerings. He also indicated the need for an area on atmosphere.

Dr. Goldsborough stated that, in principle, he supported all 11 goals in the FEERS proposal. He feels that we can get beyond this without recourse of a new Faculty. In his presentation, he highlighted:

- Various environmental initiatives at University of Manitoba
- Some concerns about the FEERS proposal (some have been addressed in the revised proposal recently received)
- Responses pro and con to the FEERS proposal from Faculty of Science
- An alternative to FEERS
- Why an "amorphous" FEERS is not desirable for ESP
- Premises for an alternative model
- School of the Environment
- Definition of Schools (Senate Policy 407)
- Why a School?
- Rationale for linking School with the Faculties of Arts and Science
- Relationship of School with other Departments and Faculties
- Possible faculty complement of School of the Environment
- Structure of the School
- Degrees
- Undergraduate programs
- Focus areas of Environment Science Program

- Some ESP courses that could be useful for Environmental Studies
- What will it cost? What will it NOT cost?
- Miscellaneous details
- Conclusions
- Advantages of the proposal: cost-effective, inclusive, interdisciplinary, student-focussed, high profile

Vice-President Gardner and Professor Goldsborough responded to questions and comments with regard to their proposals. There was a very lengthy and spirited discussion period, which ended in the following motions.

Original motion moved by Goldsborough/seconded by Duckworth:

"That the Faculty Council of Science accepts, in principle, the proposal from the Environmental Science Program faculty as an alternative to the FEERS proposal."

The vote was called and passed 37 (in favour), 4 (opposed), 1 abstention.

Another motion, moved by Svenne, did not have a seconder: It was:

"That the Faculty Council of Science accepts, in principle, the FEERS proposal."

Another motion was moved Ferguson/Svenne:

"That the FEERS Proposal provides an effective mechanism for studying the earth, environment and resources."

The vote was called and the motion failed 3 (in favour), 25 (opposed), 1 abstention.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
Faculty of Science
250 Machray Hall
Office of the Dean
Inter-Departmental Correspondence

December 6, 2000

TO: All Members of the Faculty Council of Science

FROM: P.A. Pachol, Secretary



AGENDA
90TH meeting of SCIENCE FACULTY COUNCIL
Monday, December 11, 2000
1:00 p.m.
Senate Chambers, 245 Engineering Building

Further to the Agenda notice dated December 1, 2000, I attach the following information for Faculty Council's consideration:

1. A Proposal for Interdisciplinary Environmental Education at the University of Manitoba--(pages 1-8)
2.
 - i. Process for Report from ESPAC (Environmental Science Program Advisory Committee)-- (pages 9-10)
 - ii. November 2, 2000 Report--(pages 11-12)
 - iii. Revised Report dated November 7, 2000--(pages 13-15).

/pap

Attachments