

May 4, 1976
Twenty-Fifth Meeting

May 14, 1976

Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth meeting of the Faculty Council of Science held on Tuesday, May 4 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 207 Buller Bldg.

Members Present: Dean R.D. Connor, Chairman; Professors N.E.R. Campbell, P.K. Isaac, R. Bochonko, A. Turnock, J. Reid, B. Irvine, G. Robinson, D.A. Young, E. Huebner, J.C. Rauch, R.M. Evans, J.C. Jamieson, J. Berry, P. McClure, J.A. Gerhard, N.S. Mendelsohn, J.A. Wright, A.H. Morrish, W. Falk, J.S.C. McKee, R.M. Lyric, I. Suzuki, G. Gratzer, R. Quackenbush, H.E. Welch, R. Dowling, D. Johnson, P.L. Ellis, R. Padmanabhan, F.M. Kelly, P. Loewen, A. Olchowecki, C.R. Platt, G. Klassen, H.R. Coish, G.E. Dunn, D.M. McKinnon, H.W. Duckworth, D.N. Burton, N.E. Davison, F.M. Arscott, S. Cheng, B.D. Macpherson, B. Kale, J. Venkataraman, H. Finlayson, M.R. Parameswaran, G. Losey, N. Losey, K. Mount, Mr. S. Boychuk and Mr. G. Richardson, Secretary.

Regrets: Dr. J.M. Shay, Dr. S.G. Sealy, Dr. W.C. Brisbin and Dr. S. Sinha.

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Twenty-Fourth meeting held on February 23, 1976.

The minutes of the Twenty-Fourth meeting with the correction noted on the agenda, were approved McClure (Isaac).

2. Matters Arising Therefrom:

- (i) The Chairman stated that he had been in touch with the Librarian and had been advised that Faculty Council's request was being acted upon. He indicated that as journals were borrowed the 7 day card would be removed and an overnight substituted. Where the journal was available for 7 days the existing procedure would be followed. In reply to a question regarding the installation of a duplicating machine in the Science Library, the Chairman said that he would have to speak to the Librarian about this to find out where the matter stood.
- (ii) In speaking to the problem of purchasing materials from grants, Dr. McKee read the results of Faculty Council's motion, which was forwarded to Senate, from the Senate minutes of March 9, 1976. He indicated that matters seemed to be less stringent now and he was willing to let the problem lie. He did say though that

should any grantee wishing to expedite purchase by not having it quoted upon by different suppliers, the grantee could put on the purchase requisition "no substitutes acceptable" and this would release the Purchasing Office of any further responsibility regarding comparable prices. If at a later date the price was questioned by the auditors the Purchasing Office could refer them directly to the grantee.

3. Communications

There was one item of communication that would come up under "Other Business".

4. Elections

The Chairman informed the members that there would be three positions to fill in the elections to Senate; Dr. Gesser would be stepping down from his post as Science Senator when he left for his Sabbatical on July 1.

The Chairman explained the procedure and the tightness of the timetable, especially for the nominations to the Research Board as the Faculty of Graduate Studies had advanced their meeting by two weeks. Because of this the Chairman suggested that the elections to nominate two members to run for election to the Research Board be done at this meeting rather than by the mail ballot as done normally; the members agreed.

Nominated to run for election to Senate were:

NOMINATED	NOMINATOR	SECONDER
Dr. J. McKee	Dr. H. Duckworth	Dr. J. Jamieson
Dr. G. Paul	Dr. N. Losey	Professor H. Finlayson
Dr. D. McKinnon	Dr. G. Dunn	Dr. J. Jamieson
Dr. D. Young	Dr. G. Gratzner	Dr. J. Reid

It was moved by Professor Quackenbush (Padmanabhan) that nominations close.

CARRIED
Unanimous.

Nominated to stand for election to the Executive Committee of Faculty Council were:

NOMINATED	NOMINATOR	SECONDER
Dr. K. Subrahmaniam	Prof. B. Macpherson	Prof. S. Cheng
Dr. A. Olchowecki	Dr. J. Wright	Dr. R. Lyric
Dr. G. Robinson	Dr. J. Reid	Dr. H. Welch
Prof. C. Platt	Prof. R. Quackenbush	Prof. J. Gerhard

It was moved that nominations close Mendelsohn (McClure)

CARRIED
Unanimous.

Since there were four vacancies to fill on the Executive Committee and there was no need to have any particular academic rank represented this year, the four nominees were elected by acclamation.

The Chairman moved that the newly elected Science Senior Stick, Ms. Holly Peat, be elected to the Executive Committee as the student representative. This was seconded by Dean Campbell and CARRIED unanimously.

Elected to be nominated to stand for election to the Research Board were:

NOMINATED	NOMINATOR	SECONDER
Dr. R. Barber	Dr. A. Morrish	Dr. J. McKee
Prof. G. Eales	Dr. H. Welch	Prof. D. Young

It was moved that nominations close Jamieson (Dunn)

CARRIED
Unanimous.

Again, since there were only two nominations required, those nominated were elected by acclamation. The names would now be forwarded to the Faculty of Graduate Studies to stand for election to the Research Board.

Elected as scrutineers were Drs. Berry and Macpherson.

5. Faculty Budget Position

With the material distributed at the meeting the Chairman explained the status of the faculty's budget. He noted the increases between the April 1, 1975 budget column and the "Actual Spent" column especially the salary category which increased 17.6%. He said that until this year's union contracts have been determined the increase in this year's salaries would not be known. He stated that the \$156,000 that the faculty had to reduce from its budget prior to striking of the April 1, 1976 budget came mainly from the special academic and supplies categories. These reduced bases were then increased, supplies by \approx 15% and the special academic only slightly, to arrive at the figures for the April 1, 1976 budget, i.e. \$441,078 and \$458,145 respectively.

The Chairman concluded by saying that the University has put aside funds to cover the salary increases, academic travel, and utilities. Should the University not have to use this entire amount, the remaining balance could then be used for other purposes. Similarly if the University required more than the amount put aside, these funds would have to be found from existing budgets.

6. Report from the Executive

The report was given by Professor Duckworth.

- (i) Course Change Procedure - it was agreed to leave the existing procedure unaltered.
- (ii) Academic Promotion Criteria - this was still being discussed by the Executive Committee.
- (iii) Earth Sciences Departmental Council By-Laws - the by-laws were returned by the Executive Committee to the department with two changes recommended. This is the last set of by-laws to be completed.
- (iv) Service Courses - this matter is currently being discussed by the Executive. The Committee has solicited additional information from the departments.
- (v) Definition of a Major - an ad hoc committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Davison has been struck and will be reporting back to the Executive.

(vi) Centennial Project - Dr. Duckworth indicated that it was likely that this committee of which he was Chairman, would be recommending that the faculty proceed to establishing a Centennial Lecture Series. Most people spoken to, including members of the University Centennial Project Committee, thought the idea a good one. The series would likely be in two parts, a spring and a fall series with the spring one getting underway in February 1977. The lectures would be open to the public and some might be held downtown. They would be given mainly by staff from within the faculty. There might be some incidental expenses involved with advertising, rent, etc. but he had been given assurance that these could be found, if not by the University Centennial Project fund, then by the faculty.

In reply to a question on whether or not a brochure was being produced, Dr. Duckworth said his committee had not discussed this but he would put it before them at their next meeting.

It was also pointed out that a brochure might be more appropriate in 1979 when the Faculty celebrated its 75th Anniversary.

7. Report from Senate

The report was given by Professor Dowling and covered the meetings of March 2, 9, 30 and April 6. Two of these were special meetings to deal with the University Priorities report. Many of the recommendations made by the Priorities Committee were modified by the Senate Executive before forwarding to Senate for discussion. Several of these pertaining to our faculty were discussed briefly by the Council. The item that produced the most discussion in Council originated at the regular meeting of April 6 and had to do with the establishment by Senate of an ad hoc committee to 'study and report on a Merit Pay Policy and Promotion policy'. It was stated that this committee would solicit advice 'from staff of the University'. Having just experienced the results of a committee which seemed to have drawn its advice from undefined staff of the University, the Council members were quite concerned that this ad hoc committee might end up with similar results. Consequently it was moved Kale (Arscott):

"that the Senate ad hoc committee to study and report on Merit pay policy and Promotion policy consult with Deans and Department Heads in addition to 'staff of the University'"

CARRIED

Nem. Con.

Before concluding discussion on this item it was suggested that it would be of interest to members of the faculty if they could get some idea of the Science Library future plans, budget allocation etc. To this suggestion the Chairman agreed to ask the Science Librarian to prepare a report for Council members.

8. New Business

The Chairman stated that he had received a memo from Dr. Coish, who was Chairman of the 'Committee to Survey the Mathematics Area', asking for information and clarification on several matters concerning the faculty. The first of these had to do with accepted norms as regards to the average teaching load per faculty member. Dr. Coish wished to know if special consideration was given to areas which have unique responsibilities such as the Cyclotron in Physics, the journals in Mathematics and Computer Science, and the Statistics Advisory Service.

In responding to this question, the Chairman stated that there were no norms for teaching loads in the University, however, the Science Faculty did have a general yardstick which it had used in the past. For an individual with graduate students, the average load was 2 full courses with their accompanying labs. Over the years however, the 'graduate student' portion of this guideline seemed to have become lost and now it is commonly believed that the average teaching load for a Science instructor is 2 full courses without the associated labs. This is not so. What has also happened over the years is that the number of graduate students has increased such that labs nowadays are commonly put in charge of graduate students.

With regard to the second portion of the enquiry, the Chairman replied that the special commitments in Mathematics and Statistics did not get them any special consideration in terms of appointments. At one time Mathematics did receive additional funds to help support their

journal but that is no longer the case. The Cyclotron did get specific appointments for research but these appointments were also required to teach. The Chairman could recall one other area not mentioned by Dr. Coish, that had been allocated a special appointment and that was Botany. He did confirm that there were no pure research positions in the faculty. He was aware that the teaching loads in the Science departments did vary among departments and indeed among the members of an individual department.

At this point the Chairman asked Dean Campbell to comment on the comparable review now underway in the Division of Biology. Dean Campbell reported that having almost finished the ground work he was preparing to call his committee together. He pointed out that his committee's terms of reference were very similar to those of Dr. Coish's. His committee was planning on doing a very thorough review of all aspects of the Biology teaching. It was noted that his committee's review followed a review of the entire Division structure undertaken by Dean Isaac, the consensus of which was that the Division was still providing an adequate service to the students and for the Division.

Several members voiced their concern over the apparent direct intervention of the U.G.C. through the Program Advisory Committee, into the faculty's operations. The Chairman stated that this had concerned him as well and he had passed his concern onto the Chairman of the U.G.C. The U.G.C. did have the right, under its Act, to show this kind of direct concern. He had requested that both Dr. Coish and himself be invited to the next meeting of the Program Advisory Committee.

Dr. Arscott explained that his invitation to the Program Advisory Committee had been to give information pertaining directly to his own department. He said that the questions were very searching and the committee appeared to be genuinely concerned with possible overlap between his department and other similar areas. He detected much goodwill, however, and felt their enquiries were motivated by genuine interest and concern.

Before concluding the meeting two other comments were made. Dr. Welch suggested that there should be more publicity about Grads Farewell.

He said that he had attended this year's Farewell and was surprised at the few staff members in attendance. When he checked with his colleagues he found that very few of them were aware of the party. The Chairman promised he would bring this to the attention of the students.

The other matter concerned Convocation. Professor Macpherson, the parade marshall, said that there was always a shortage of academic staff attending the ceremony and with the public attending this affair it would certainly enhance the University's image if more could attend, even if only the convocation of the Science graduates. The Chairman said that he would notify the faculty members.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

/nl