

September 7, 1972.

Special Meeting

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE August 29, 1972

TO ALL MEMBERS SCIENCE FACULTY COUNCIL

FROM G. Richardson, Secretary - Science Faculty Council

SUBJECT:

GR

As was agreed at the last special meeting of Faculty Council, a second meeting to continue discussion on the newly proposed Tenure By-Law, was called for Thursday, September 7, 1972 at 1:40 p.m. in Room 207 Buller Building.

The attached notice of motion from Dr. G. Gratzner will be considered at this meeting.

GR:wac

Minutes of the second special meeting of Faculty Council held on
Thursday, September 7, 1972 at 1:40 p.m. in Room 207 Buller Building.

Members Present: Dr. I. Cooke, Chairman; Professors R. Bochonko, R. H. Betts,
R. D. Connor, R. G. Stanton, N. S. Mendelsohn, W. M. Sibley,
J. Muzio, P. King, J. Wells, M. Rayburn, M. Doob, R. Woods,
S. Woods, G. Losey, N. Losey, B. Irvine, G. Robinson, J.
Reid, I. Suzuki, H. Halvorson, J. Loudfoot, H. Finlayson,
W. Wall, K. Mount, A. Bentley, S. Badour, G. Atkinson, B.
Macpherson, J. Brewster, B. Kale, H. LeJohn, K. Stewart, J.
Rauch, M. Samoiloff, G. Gratzner, R. Padmanabhan, M. Thomas,
C. Chow, R. Lyric, R. Hawirko, F. Williams, J. McClure,
R. Wong, C. Platt, R. Quackenbush, H. Lakser, J. Sichler,
H. E. Welch, R. Graham, M. Aleksuik, G. Baldwin, P. Loly,
G. Clark, P. Gaunt, J. Vail, G. Hickling, C. Wong, W. N. R.
Stevens, A. Giesinger, N. Davison, A. Chow, J. Charlton, K.
Ogilvie, B. Henry, R. Dowling, D. Johnson, D. Burton, N. E.
R. Campbell, P. K. Isaac, A. Shephard, G. Krause, J. Svenne,
D. Lawless, R. Thomas, G. Dunn. (75) G. Richardson, Secretary.

Regrets: Professors E. Bock, E. R. Waygood, D. McCarthy, J. Gee,
Messrs. J. Perrin, J. Boyd.

Before commencing the business scheduled for this special meeting the
Chairman requested, and received, Council's agreement to discuss briefly a
significant change in the Faculty's procedure for reporting to the President.
Ever since the creation of the Faculty of Science the route had been through
Vice-President Sibley. It had just been learned that the Faculty of Science
would no longer do so, but would now report through Vice-President Fyles.

Remarking upon this significant change to the Faculty, Dr. Betts
expressed his feelings and those of the entire Council by the following
passage:

"As we have just learned from Dean Cooke, our Faculty will now
report to the President through Vice-President Fyles, and our long assoc-
iation with Dr. Sibley will formally come to an end.

As most of us know Dr. Sibley, was for many years Dean of the old Arts
and Science Faculty, and in this office he was closely associated with

all the Departments in Science, and also as a colleague with many of us here today on a personal one-to-one basis.

For a time following the creation of the separate Faculties of Arts and Science, Dr. Sibley was on a year's Sabbatical Leave, but on his return his association with our Faculty was continued and renewed, this time as Vice-President, and also through his continuing responsibility as Vice-President in charge on Planning. So in these and other ways, we in the Faculty of Science have had an enduring and happy relation with Bill Sibley. With the administrative re-arrangements now announced affecting the reporting channel for our Faculty, one of our ties with Dr. Sibley will disappear."

Dr. Betts concluded by saying that as a mark of Council's appreciation of Dr. Sibley and to allow the Faculty to continue to have him as a valued member of Council, he would move the following motion that:

"this Council request the Board of Governors, through the President, to appoint Dr. Sibley Dean Emeritus of the Faculty of Science."

In speaking to this proposed motion, Dr. Mendelsohn stated:

"I deem it to be a great honor to second the motion to recommend that Professor Sibley be named Dean Emeritus of Science.

In some ways I feel that I am the most appropriate person to carry out this very pleasant task. I have known Dr. Sibley since 1945 when we were both new Faculty members at Queen's University. Two years later we were both at the University of Manitoba. The early years here were very happy ones. The University was a small community in which every Faculty member knew every other member. As a result, I saw Dr. Sibley on virtually every day during our first five years here and we became fast friends.

Later when he became Dean of Arts and Science and I became Department Head in Mathematics I had the opportunity of dealing with him on matters of University business and here I could see at first hand how much he did to promote the interest of the Faculty of Science. He maintains this concern for our Faculty until the present day. I, personally am sorry to see him cut the formal connection with the Faculty but I realize as do

all others associated with him in an administrative way, how arduous are his present duties.

This motion which I am now seconding will indicate to Dr. Sibley the esteem in which he is held by all members of the Faculty of Science."

Dean Connor confirmed the remarks already made by Dr. Betts and Dr. Mendelsohn and added that because of his position, first as Associate Dean of Science and later as Dean of Science, his association with Dr. Sibley has been very close for the past nine years. In the many occasions that he sought the advice or comments of Dr. Sibley, they had always been given in a most willing and knowledgeable manner. He stated that because he held their association and friendship in the highest regard, the loss of Dr. Sibley as Vice-President of the Faculty was one in which he personally would find most regrettable. Because of this he would most sincerely approve the proposed motion.

The motion was CARRIED unanimously.

The minutes of the last special meeting of Faculty Council were adopted as circulated. Dr. Connor (Campbell)

The Chairman stated that at the end of the last special Faculty Council meeting Dean Connor had invited comments and notices of motion from Faculty members. Three memos had been received. Dr. Stevens had suggested that the "Tenure Committee" be invited to attend. The Chairman had attempted to have another member of the committee (in addition to Dr. Wall) present but had discovered one was out of town, one on Sabbatical, one attending a conference, one with an important prior commitment, and one he had failed to reach.

Dr. Wall had submitted a lengthy memo (which is attached to these minutes following Dr. Wall's request at the Faculty Council meeting). The Chairman indicated that since Dr. Wall would be representing the Tenure Committee he should have an opportunity to address himself to many of the points raised in his memo.

Dr. Gratzner had given notice of motions (two) which had been circulated to members of Council. It was agreed that there should be a general discussion before proceeding to deal with any particular motion.

Dr. Mendelsohn felt that the McCarthy Committee had gone beyond its terms of reference in formulating a new by-law. He noted that in the Senate minutes on the matter, the committee had been given the task of determining how best to implement the then existing by-law. Why then, had they produced this new by-law?

Dr. Wall replied that the original task had been to work on the implementation of the 'old' tenure by-law, but that the committee soon discovered so many discrepancies and inadequacies that their revised version of the old by-law was essentially the McCarthy Report.

Several members of Council felt that there were just as many discrepancies and inadequacies in the new by-law and that perhaps we should be considering whether or not we should have tenure at all.

Dean Connor informed Council that Senate had just structured a committee to study this very matter, viz. should tenure be retained or abolished at the University.

Dr. Connor felt that the ultimate underlying substance of the tenure committee report was the question of whether departments would continue to be run by a Department Head or be turned over to a committee. It was his feeling that once a committee began monitoring the untenured staff, as the annual review committee would do, then the next logical step would be for a committee, perhaps the same committee, to make appointments.

There were several members who didn't agree with this and who felt the annual review committee would be of real value in the Departments.

At this point a discussion developed as to the best procedure to be followed for the remainder of the meeting and for the ultimate recommendation on the report. Some members felt that section 9 of the McCarthy report was the most important part and should be discussed item by item, whereas other members felt that if the report was to be discussed in detail, then discussion should begin at the beginning with the preamble. Certain staff felt that any detailed discussion of the report would be an indication that Council accepted it in principle and they felt that this was not the overall feeling. It was generally agreed by most of the members present that the report was not acceptable in its present form and some felt that there should be no detailed discussions at all. Dr. Wall, in referring to his

letter sent to the Dean, suggested that discussions commence with the items listed in his comments on section 9 of the proposed by-law. He made the following motion (Vail):

"that the points mentioned in my letter on pg. 3, item 11, a to r pertinaing to sec. 9 of the report, be examined and discussed in sequence."

Several of the members suggested that sec. 9 depended upon acceptance of the earlier sections and could not be discussed in isolation.

Dr. Mendelsohn proposed the following amendment (Sibley):

"that we start the detailed discussion of the report with the preamble and not sec. 9."

The acceptability of this amendment was challenged, but the Chairman ruled that the amendment was acceptable. After some discussion the amendment was CARRIED but the amended motion of Dr. Wall's was DEFEATED.

The discussion then turned to Dr. Gratzner's notice of motion which was seconded by Professor Doob.

An amendment to Dr. Gratzner's motion was proposed by Dr. Wall but it was ruled out of order by the Chairman on the grounds that its intent was in direct contradiction of the original motion and dealt in essence with a matter already decided by the assembly.

Several Faculty members proposed minor changes to the list of interim procedures proposed by Senate and it was agreed that rather than list all of these at this time and forward them on to Senate it would be more appropriate for Council to take note of these and send a list of recommended changes along with the motion. It was agreed that the words, "with such minor modifications as necessary", would be added to Dr. Gratzner's motion. The motion as voted upon read:

"that it be recommended to Senate that they adopt, with such minor modifications as necessary, the Senate resolution for Interim Procedures, as approved at the last Senate meeting, with the following change: viz. where reference is made to September 1972, that this read 'for the academic year 1972-73'."

CARRIED

49 in favour

9 opposed

11 abstentions

The second part of Dr. Gratzner's notice of motion was withdrawn.

It was the wish of Faculty Council that Dr. Gratzner's motion when sent to Senate be accompanied with a letter of explanation, written by the Chairman, giving Council's feelings toward the McCarthy report. It should be pointed out that Faculty Council recognizes many deficiencies and ambiguities in the Senate committee's recent report on tenure. Council also recognizes that the existing tenure by-law is not adequate. It is the considered opinion of Council that appropriate discussion of such an important matter would take substantially longer than the time allowed by Senate. In forwarding Council's motion it should be stated that it was Council's feeling that it would be more appropriate for Senate to study the report and make recommendations on it, after allowing for all reasonable input, rather than requiring full scale discussion at both Faculty and Senate levels.

Several members requested that mention of item 2(g) of the interim procedures regarding the word change, 'without to with' should also be made in the letter to Senate

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

GR:wac

September 18, 1972