

Minutes on Special Meeting of Faculty Council November 1, 1994, 3:00 p.m., held in Senate Chambers.

Present:	J.C. Jamieson (Chair)	L. Graham	R. Quackenbush
	<i>M.A.</i> Abrahams	N. Halden	G. Robinson
	R. Barber	B. Hann	D. Salomon
	L. Batten	E. Huebner	D. Scuse
	P. Bettess	P. Hultin	K. Sharma
	J. Birchall	B. Johnston	P. Shivakumar
	P. Blunden	K. Keen	J. Sichler
	M. Butler	G. Klassen	B. Southern
	J. Charlton	H. Laale	R. Sparling
	S. Cheng	K. Lalbaharie	M. Sumner
	G. Clark	D. Lin	I. Suzuki
	R. Collens	P. Loewen	J. Svenne
	K. Cranston	P. Loly	G. Tabisz
	M. Doob	N. Losey	R. Thomas
	A. Ducas	R. Lyric	J. Vail
	H.W. Duckworth	R. MacArthur	H. Williams
	J.G. Eales	R. McGowan	G. Woods
	J. Fabrykowski	J. McKee	Q. Ye
	I. Ferguson	W. Moon	P. Zetner
	H. Finlayson	T. Osborn	
B. Ford	M. Perles	Visitors:	
A. Gerhard	L. Pratt	L. Chartier	
H. Gesser	D. Punter (<i>Psychology</i>)	J. McConnell	
D. Gillis	<i>J.R. Wilson</i> <i>called</i>		
Regrets:	H. Lebrun	D. Singh	R. Theberge
	R. Riewe	J. Teller	L. Van Caesele

The meeting began with a presentation on the United Way. Prof. Brian Stimpson, Engineering, introduced Shep Shell who is on loan from ISM (Information Systems Management). Mr. Shell asked Faculty to consider making a donation to the United Way. He gave an account of his experiences and the help he had been given through the Canadian Institute for the Blind.

Dean Jamieson (Chair) introduced the new members of the Dean's Office to Faculty Council.

Plan 2000

Dean Jamieson mentioned that Arts Faculty Council are holding a similar informational meeting. There will be a Special Meeting of Senate to discuss Plan 2000 on November 9.

About two weeks ago we received the Schedule of Budget Options. The request was different this year in that addbacks are dependent on initiatives proposed by units and based on the material in Plan 2000. The Dean's Office consulted with heads of departments and prepared a number of initiatives which have been submitted to the Central Administration.

Dean Jamieson then gave the history of the Plan and Dean Gerhard provided information on the Faculty's reaction to it.

Dean Jamieson reported that the first version of Plan 2000 arrived in Dean's Office in June and Harley Cohen asked that he handle the response. The new Deans prepared a response, in consultation with the Administrative Council of Science and Deans of Arts and following a joint meeting of Arts and Science with the President.

The present version, received in September, was also discussed at the Science Retreat attended by Administrative Council members. The published version is quite different from the original.

Improvements in the new version:

- Less negative language about Science
- Contentious items removed or restated
 - The Manitoba Learning Institute is now a footnote in the document
 - Bachelor of General Studies degree is limited to Continuing Education
 - Schools of Advanced Study--clearly identified faculty participation.

The targets for increased funding are:

- Undergraduate education and the "transition year"
- Graduate students
- Start-up funds for new staff, intended to maintain or increase staff
- Research support
- Library support

The funding for these targetted items will come from redistribution among faculties/units.

Dean Gerhard addressed the various issues in the Plan:

- Action statement UG1 identifies the common pool of first year students. The way it would be organized is addressed in UG2.

- UG2 action statement is to have an organizational “entity” to deliver the courses. Arts and Science are proposing that they be the “entity” in charge of the "common first year".
- UG3 speaks to how students would be admitted to faculties from the pool of the "common first year"
- UG4 speaks to admission to first year University. With the current Arts and Science standards, some discussion would have to take place.
- UG5: in the first version, the attrition rate was suggested to be 10%; new version attrition rate in Faculty might be 10% which is not be too far from where we are now.
- UG6 action statement is to offer remedial courses on a cost recovery basis.

There have been several meetings with the Deans of Arts and more recently a meeting with Deans of Arts and the President and Vice-President (Academic). The discussions were very positive. Part of the discussions had to do with the 3 yr. degrees and the UG9 action statement. What we're talking about is a parallel 3 yr. degree. Students would be exposed to a significant courses in Arts and Science.

Implications:

- Service courses may not be needed
- New deal with regard to Faculty Fees; the whole question of how this might be funded will have to be negotiated.
- Would have to be harmonization of Arts/Science regulations
- Number of students in Science could increase.
- The role of Continuing Education needs to be reviewed.

Dean Jamieson mentioned that the new deal on faculty fees arose when it became clear that, if there was a common first year, there would have to be a review of the faculty fees.

Dean Jamieson stated that we have been asked to submit initiatives. Input was received from the Department Heads and the final report consisted of 7 initiatives. The total proposal for year 1 is \$750,000. We've asked for what we need and connected the request to Plan 2000. The seven initiatives in the proposal are:

- Core Function and the Restructured First Year
- Environmental Science
- Research Related Initiatives
- Computing Coordinator
- Computers and Teaching
- Statistical Advisory Service
- Women in Science and Engineering; a joint submission with Engineering (we considered this one as a Central Initiative).

Dean Jamieson stated that the President regards the common first year approach as being an important part of his plan.

The Plan will be the topic of the Special meeting of Senate November 9 and may come up at the upcoming Deans' Retreat.

Comments and Concerns expressed by Faculty members:

- How do you visualize this common year? Do you see the 3 degrees vanishing?

The model we've constructed is an approach which will have to be reconciled with the Faculty of Arts. With the Bachelor of General Studies degree it seemed that Continuing Education was going to be the entity. The Bachelor of General Studies is intended for people that Continuing Education would normally cater to. I believe it's a different type of approach than we have in our model. We don't know what is in the BGS degree. The current 3 yr. Arts and Science degrees would be replaced by a joint 3 year degree.

- What percentage of budget has been set aside to promote Plan 2000?

The money set aside at option 1 is \$500K.

- It looks like we're going through a lot of reorganization for little or no benefit.
- There will be costs relating to introducing new programs. Professional programs will be increased; the total costs will be substantial. Money to University has not been increasing, it has been decreasing. There will be effects on libraries, support of teaching, increased workload amongst the faculty. The program fails to address efficiency. Year after year, the University is becoming more and more ambitious with less money. There is more pressure on research and other areas. Plan is unrealistic. The Faculty of Science plan is unrealistic unless money is added to the University. Other faculties will take a tremendous thrashing in order to give to Science.

Dean Jamieson stated that the President has formulated a plan. We reacted to the plan, very negatively at first, less negatively now. With respect to support for research, graduate students, library, it is difficult to know what the outcome will be since it will all depend on budget.

- A big problem with first year in the current version is that I can't see how we can avoid having easier first year courses. Material in first year will not be as good as now.

- Has this kind of approach been tried anywhere else and has it been successful?

Dean Jamieson stated that University of Calgary has a Faculty of General Studies. They set up a special unit to run a first year program in much the same way as we will. Depending on who you talk to it's either been successful or a disaster.

- What is a common first year ? What courses would students take that are mandatory and what are general?

Dean Jamieson stated this is unresolved at the moment.

- More concern about support for libraries.
- Not everything in report has been costed out; either the savings and additional costs.
- New version has been watered down. May well be necessary to make deep cuts to fund new initiatives.
- Somebody has to teach the transition year courses. Continuing Education has never paid the full cost for what they put on. There is a shift in document to lower years with no increase in faculty. Number of actions give cause for concern; fewer courses at undergraduate level.
- The seven areas which will receive extra funding will presumably be at the expense of spending on other things. Action GS2.5, does that concern Faculty of Science?

Dean Jamieson stated that it is difficult to answer until April when we know what the budget is and what we'll be dealing with. With regard to action GS2.5, Dean Jamieson didn't think it concerned Science.

- Will the Bachelor of General Studies degree, for the most part, be an off-campus degree.

Dean Jamieson thought so but we don't know at the present time what will be in the program. The intent is for an adult clientele.

- With a cut in Federal transfer payments, would this increase tuition and lower student enrolment?

Dean Jamieson stated that he can't be sure. We don't know what the University's decision will be for next year.

If the Axworthy proposal was implemented there would be quite a restructuring of fees; with fees being allowed to increase quite substantially.

- The reason for the Plan seems to me to save money; doing the job with low priced help instead of high priced help. Are we going to see pressure from the first year entity to hire more instructors instead of faculty members?

Dean Jamieson has not seen that, but can't know whether this will happen. It has not been mentioned by the President in the discussions we've had.

- What is the time frame for implementation of common first year?

Dean Jamieson thought that the earliest would be two years from now. The faculty fees may have to be renegotiated if we were asked to take in more students.

- As presently outlined, there are no engineering courses at all in first year.

Dean Jamieson mentioned that Engineering has passed a one year, pre-professional program, not taught by them.

- UG9: What will happen to departments?

Dean Jamieson said they may remain the same. There is a possibility of consolidation or rationalization of courses. We haven't looked that far down the road. I agree there is a potential for some changes.

- GOA13: The integration of the Engineering Library into the Science Library.

Dean Jamieson mentioned there will be a need to find space for the Departments affected by this amalgamation.

- Cutbacks always impact research and rarely impact teaching; witness unpaid days and how they are chosen. There is an important issue of morale of faculty.

Dean Jamieson stated that he will be interested in how our research initiatives are treated.

- What is the Faculty research initiative?

Dean Jamieson stated that it had three parts: 1. graduate student support; not all graduate students are supported at the same level. There is a request for funds to level the field to provide departments with support \$120K request. 2. USRA (Undergraduate Student

Research Awards) program request \$48K to add to the pool that we get from NSERC.
3. Start-up funding of new staff. request for \$50K to be matched equally from Central.

Dean Jamieson stated that Gordon Robinson was responsible for drafting the environmental science proposal.

- The Research initiative emphasizes start-up funding for new faculty members. There is also a need for infrastructure support, such as, more support for libraries, shops, etc.

Dean Gerhard mentioned that the initiative for a computer coordinator was identified as something that was seriously lacking.

- one section that, if any area is serious, is in graduate research and training. It would certainly be appropriate to include substantial funding in this category.
- Is there any danger that Central wants us to have less permanent positions at the academic level?

Dean Jamieson stated that he hadn't detected anything in our discussions with Central, which indicated that this was being planned.

- There is nothing in plan that addresses undergraduate laboratories.

It was M/S/C:

"That, without indicating any general approval of the Plan, the Faculty of Science encourages the Dean to continue the process of discussion with the Faculty of Arts and Central Administration about the common first year proposal."

Meeting adjourned 4:50 p.m.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Faculty of Science
250 Machray Hall
Office of the Dean

Inter-Departmental Correspondence

October 24, 1994.

P. Pachol, Secretary
Faculty Council of Science

TO: All Members of the Faculty Council of Science

FROM: P.A. Pachol, Secretary



A Special Meeting of the Faculty Council of Science is scheduled for Tuesday, November 1, 1994 at 3:00 p.m. in **Senate Chamber, 245 Engineering Building.**

Agenda

1. Introduction of new members of Dean's Office
2. Plan 2000
The Plan was carried as a Supplement in the September 22 issue of the University Bulletin.