

December 10, 1971.

Special Meeting

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE November 30, 1971

TO ALL MEMBERS OF FACULTY COUNCIL

FROM Mr. G. Richardson, Secretary - Faculty Council *GR*

SUBJECT:

A special meeting of Faculty Council has been called for Friday, December 10, 1971 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 207 Buller Building. The item for discussion will be the Report on the B.Sc. (Gen.).

Copies of the report can be obtained in the Secretary's office, 206 Allen Building.

GR:wac

December 20, 1971

Minutes of a special meeting of Faculty Council held on Friday, December 10, 1971 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 207, Buller Building.

Members Present: Dr. R. D. Connor; Chairman, Professors I. Cooke, F. W. J. Davis, D. Punter, J. Reid, J. M. Shay, E. R. Waygood, R. J. Collens, P. A. Collens, C. R. Peterkin, J. E. Lewandowski, W. G. Barker, W. D. Hoskins, G. E. McMaster, J. C. Muzio, R. A. Kingsley, R. Hawirko, R. M. Evans, J. H. Gee, G. G. Hickling, P. R. King, A. Robinson, J. C. Rauch, A. Olchowecki, K. W. Stewart, C. C. Lindsey, F. J. Ward, P. D. Loly, D. A. Hutcheon, G. Baldwin, E. M. Kartzmark, E. Bock, K. Ogilvie, J. A. Gerhard, B. G. Whitmore, J. P. Svenne, G. C. Tabisz, W. H. Kleiner, K. Mount, J. F. Lawless, J. J. Williams, R. Wong, P. McClure, G. Woods, N. E. R. Campbell, P. K. Isaac, B. Johnston, J. A. Wright, J. M. Vail, H. R. Coish, F. M. Kelly, H. B. LeJohn, D. Burton, I. Suzuki, R. M. Lyric, L. VanCaesele, C. T. Chow, P. Maeba, W. Wall, A. Giesinger, G. E. Dunn, D. W. Trim, N. Gupta, R. H. Betts, H. Halvorson, L. P. Stene, R. Venkataraman, J. M. Stewart, S. S. Badour, H. Weisman, G. F. Atkinson, B. Kale, B. R. Irvine, T. Booth, L. C. Graham, G. O. Losey, N. S. Mendelsohn, R. Bochonko, J. G. Eales, J. H. Loudfoot, M. F. Halasz, B. Noonan, Messrs. D. Sutherland, ~~Z. Frankel~~, E. Schollenberg, P. Wyatt, J. Boyd, J. Kelly, D. Mackinnon, Misses D. Wallace, A. Siba, *z. Frankel*, G. Sweetland. (93) J. Stewart, Acting Secretary.

Regrets: Drs. W. M. Sibley, D. O. Wells, J. Meeles, Rector St. Denis, Professor R. J. Lockhart.

Report on the B.Sc. (Gen.) Degree (Draft 2).

The Chairman asked Dr. Cooke to report on the Liaison Committee meeting of the previous week. The Liaison Committee had been presented with the above proposals in advance of its meeting. Dr. Cooke reported that the members of the Arts Faculty could not see anything in the report the implementation of which would have any serious effects on their Faculty. They had raised some points

of interest and Dr. Cooke requested the following revisions as a result of their suggestions:

Top of p. 3 The sentence beginning "It is envisaged that courses be approved on an individual basis by Faculty Council according to our existing procedure" to include "with the exception that all courses offered by Arts departments and acceptable to the Faculty of Arts will be approved automatically."

Top of p. 4 The sentence as revised would read:

(a) "That the fifteen courses for the degree include a Major approved by the Faculty of Science and a minimum of eight Science courses including the Major."

The Chairman asked the members if anyone wished to make observations on the document as a whole before proceeding to clause by clause consideration. Dr. Reid requested permission to report (see attachment #1). By way of clarification of Dr. Reid's comments Dr. Cooke pointed out that two questions appeared in the report: 1) programs already in existence and 2) programs planned for the future. He noted that future programs must receive the approval of Faculty Council. With regard to programs already in existence he observed that all of the existing Majors in the Botany Department could be encompassed within the framework of the new proposals with the physiological orientation in the Major taking the program to its limit (i.e. three Chemistry ancillaries and the specified five course Major). The existing ecological stream would allow the addition of an extra course. Dr. Cooke noted that 71.125 could be regarded as an ancillary course.

Dr. Betts questioned whether one department's particular problems were being discussed rather than a consideration of the overall proposals. Dean Connor indicated that Dr. Reid had a motion to defer in mind, following discussion of his report.

Dr. Whitmore commented that possibly more than the specified five courses for the major, i.e. allowing the two additional options in the same area as the major might resolve the problem outlined. Dr. Cooke responded that the view of the committee was that the upper limit to the number of courses ^{in a major} from a single department should be five and that the upper limit to the additional number of courses associated with the major should be three.

Dr. Isaac raised the question of interpretation of the position of prerequisite courses and pointed out that the major department had no control over other department's course prerequisites.

Dr. Cooke suggested as a way of proceeding that Dr. Reid move an amendment to the original proposal so that the material in Dr. Reid's report might be further discussed.

Dr. Reid (Isaac) moved that:

- (a) the ancillaries be raised up to five full courses
- (b) the core courses could appear in the ancillary section

Dr. Kelly commented that the Botany Department's position could be viewed as a problem in every department but that his impression of the report before us was that it was a move toward making regulations more flexible and allowing students to decide what courses they wished to elect.

Dr. Kale questioned whether the major program could be considered to contain a minimum of five full courses with an upper limit of ten full courses. Dr. Dunn felt that this would result in "professional training" and that such a program should be an honours program.

Dr. Reid's reference to "professional training" in his report was discussed and several member of Faculty Council referred to the proposal's use of "a reasonable base for professional training".

Mr. Kelly stated that he felt the suggested amendment would result in the fifteen courses for the degree being specified.

Dr. Kelly pointed out that students with over 80% could enter a Botany major directly, missing the 71.125 entirely.

Dr. Reid felt the present program proposal could not meet the Botany Department's existing needs.

Dr. LeJohn commented that the problem faced by the Botany Department was not applicable to the Microbiology Department. He suggested that perhaps the present core courses are not all required courses and that the Biology Division should reconsider its core courses.

Dr. Mendelsohn felt the Botany Department's problem could not be encompassed in the spirit of the General Degree program.

Dr. Lindsay commented that the proposal for the General Degree would present some problems for the Department of Zoology but that the members of his Department had not thought through this section of the report.

The Chairman asked Dr. Cooke if he had any concluding remarks to make regarding Dr. Reid's report. Dr. Cooke pointed out that the problem as to whether 71.125, the six credit hours of core course(s) and three Botany courses represented a major package of three or five courses was a Biology Division problem, whereas the major and a particular number of ancillaries (for a total of eight full courses in the original proposal) was a Faculty problem insofar as an increase in the number of courses in the major or ancillary areas was concerned. In addition, Dr. Cooke

pointed out that the number of Botany majors presently minoring in the division was six out of fifteen students; so that this group was not in the majority.

It was moved by Dr. Lindsay (Barker):

"that the proposals for the B.Sc. (General) degree be deferred for sixty days."

Motion Defeated

30 in favour

47 opposed

Mr. ^{W. yatt} ~~Whyte~~ spoke regarding the amendment before Faculty Council and stated that up to ten specified courses following a first year program of five sampling courses was too restrictive.

Dr. Cooke was asked to respond to a question from Dr. Green on the objective of the general degree program. Dr. Cooke felt that providing the objective for the general degree program had been difficult for the committee but that they had tried to achieve an academic program in which there was some depth and some breadth. The attitude of the committee had been to keep only those constraints necessary to safeguard the integrity and reputation of the degree program.

Dr. Gesser asked what would be the variation in program for an Ecology Honours and an Ecology General Degree student? Dr. Reid felt that it was not possible to introduce a major in Ecology with the new proposals unamended. Dr. Isaac pointed out that the Honours and General programs in Botany were common, with an extra year in the Honours program.

Dr. Wall felt that limiting a student in more than eight courses was basically wrong.

Dr. Isaac pointed out that the present listing of prerequisites was an efficient way of counselling students about course content.

Dr. Kelly (Wall) moved:

"that amendment (a) be revised to include the proviso "providing there is more than one Department involved in the major"." Amendment (a) would now read "The ancillaries be raised to five full courses (provided there is more than one Department involved in the major). Dr. Reid and Dr. Isaac, the original mover and seconder, agreed to this amendment. Dr. Isaac commented that he had understood that he was seconding only amendment (a). The Chairman called for a seconder to amendment (b), seconded by Dr. Waygood. Neither of the amendments was voted on at this meeting.

It was moved by Mr. Boyd (Green):

"that the proposals for the B.Sc. (General) degree be deferred until January 14, 1972."

Carried

Dr. Bock requested that the Chairman set-up a subcommittee containing some members of the Biological Science Division to discuss the problems reported at this meeting. Miss Sweetland asked that students be represented on this committee. The Chairman agreed to refer the problem to the Biological Science Division Curriculum Committee which was already in existence. Two student members were to be added to the Committee to study this question only. Miss Gail Sweetland and Mr. Ed Schollenberg were nominated and the nominations accepted.

Dr. Waygood moved that meeting adjourn at 4:35 p.m.

JS:wac

December 21, 1971

RE: B.Sc. (Gen.) Report

Careful consideration of the report of the Faculty of Science Committee on General Studies on the B.Sc. (Gen.) program has led a number of my colleagues, and myself, to conclude that some of the proposals contained therein have been made without a clear understanding of the effects they could have on certain of our present departmental programs and on programs which some of us would like to propose in the immediate future.

Our major concern is with the proposal that a Major program or area Major will consist of only five full courses or the equivalent designated by the departments and that the Minor requirement will be removed and be replaced by three ancillary or prerequisite courses outside the department. While we can appreciate the rationale for the removal of the Minor, its removal will cause difficulties.

I would like to mention first an area Major and the problems one such Major would encounter.

Recently, members of the departments of Botany and Zoology have been considering the advisability of a combined program in Ecology. It seems only logical that such a program would be a fitting candidate for an area Major. However, in the Biology Division, we have a requirement that all Biology students must take the core courses, i.e. Biology 125, Cell Biology and Genetics, a total of two full courses and these are counted as part of the students Major program. In order to take any advanced courses in the two departments, the department of Botany requires students to take 1.220 (full course) and the Zoology department would require Comp. Zoo I and probably Comp. Zoo. II (two full courses). The area Major would have used up its five stipulated courses and the students would not have taken a

single Ecology course. Ecology courses could not be taken as part of the ancillary since these would be reserved for courses outside the departments involved in the area Major.

This problem will occur in all area Majors which might be proposed within the Biology Division and also between a department in the Division and some other department. We therefore believe it is pointless to suggest the possibility of an area Major when only five full courses can be stipulated by the departments concerned.

I would now like to explain some of our problems with respect to the Major. Again, please remember our core course requirement mentioned earlier.

At present, the departments of Botany and Zoology have, in effect, two Major streams. If a student registered as a Major in Botany takes a Minor within the Division, then Biology 125 counts as part of the Minor. The student uses the two half courses of the core program as part of the Major, leaving the departments four courses within the Major department. If a Major student takes a Minor outside of the Division, then Biology 125 is part of the Major as well as the two half courses of the core program. This leaves the Major department with only three courses in which to provide the student with "a reasonable base for professional training". Microbiology always falls in the latter case.

At present, a majority of the Major students minor within the Division so we have at least the four departmental courses in the Major, but if the Minor is abolished, we would have to include Biology 125 in all our Major programs leaving our students with only three Major courses.

The above mentioned problems cannot be resolved within the 5 and 3 proposal contained in this report, and we believe we must be given more time to either adjust the Divisional program to fit such a scheme or until

we can decide how many required courses would fit our needs and bring an alternate proposal to this council.

We further feel that since proposals I - VIII and X of this report are all related to the 5 and 3 proposal, no action should be taken on these at this time.

I therefore move that this proposal be tabled for a period not to exceed 75 days to permit resolution of the problems which would be created by this report if it were implemented in its present form.

J. REID,
Department of Botany