

11
2
Twenty-Seventh Meeting

December 2, 1976

Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE November 24, 1976

TO MEMBERS OF THE SCIENCE FACULTY COUNCIL

FROM G. Richardson, Secretary

SUBJECT:

The twenty-seventh meeting of the Science Faculty Council has been called for Thursday, December 2, 1976 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 207 Buller Building.

A G E N D A

1. Approval of the minutes of the twenty-sixth meeting held on October 15, 1976.
2. Matters Arising Therefrom:
 - (i) Status of Faculty Selection/Review Committees.
3. Communications
 - (i) Letter from the Safety Officer regarding the atmospheric levels of asbestos and fibreglass in the Allen Building.
 - (ii) *See as radiation officer.*
4. Status of the Faculty budget. (Material attached)
5. Discussion on Faculty guidelines and procedures for academic promotion.
6. Report from the Executive Committee:
 - (i) Earth Sciences departmental council by-laws.
 - (ii) Discussion on possible changes to the Summer School program.
7. Report from Senate.
8. Other business.

/fk
encl.

The Minutes of the twenty-seventh meeting of the Faculty Council of Science held on Thursday, December 2, 1976 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 207 Buller.

Present: Dr. R.D. Connor, Chairman; Drs. P.K. Isaac, I. Cooke, G. Gratzner, R. Padmanabhan, H.W. Duckworth, J.C. Jamieson, D. McKinnon, M. Rayburn, B.D. Macpherson, J.A. Gerhard, S. Cheng, K. Mount, I. Suzuki, D. Kelly, H. Lakser, P. Loewen, M. Samoiloff, A. Olchowecki, R.S. Harrison, R. Venkataraman, P.D. Loly, W.G. Baldwin, J. Sichler, R.S.D. Thomas, J.M. Vail, J. Svenne, J.P. McClure, R. Wong, G. Losey, G. Woods, H. Finlayson, M.R. Parameswaran, B. Henry, C.R. Platt, R. Dowling, N.S. Mendelsohn, J.F. Brewster, D. Johnson, H.R. Coish, H.E. Welch, Ms. H. Peat, Mr. H. Penner, Mr. G. Thompson, Mr. G. Richardson, Secretary (46).

Regrets: Drs. Van Oers, J. Reid, J. Shay, N. Davison, N. Losey, T. Dandy, M. Clutton-Brock, J. Gee, L. Van Caesele, Ms. Judi Barnes.

1. Minutes of the twenty-sixth meeting

The minutes of the twenty-sixth meeting of Faculty Council held on October 15, 1976 were approved. Cooke (Svenne).

2. Matters Arising Therefrom:

- (i) The Chairman gave a brief announcement as to the status of the Faculty's Headship Selection/Review Committees for Drs. Stanton and Brisbin. The committees will be holding their first meeting within the week; for Dr. Welch, the committee had already met once.

3. Communications

- (i) The Chairman said that he had hoped that the report from the Provincial Department on Environment regarding the levels of asbestos and fibreglass in the Allen and Parker Buildings would be available for this meeting, however, it hadn't as yet been received. It was known though that a report had been made and was about to be sent to the University.
- (ii) Faculty Radiation Safety Officer
The Chairman informed Council that the Faculty's Radiation Safety Officer was Dr. S. Sen of the Department of Physics. The Chairman

also said that the Radiochem lab in the basement of Allen would be available for all the Faculty to use, as was the services and advice of Dr. Sen. Intending users should consult with Dr. Sen as to isotope licences, safe handling procedures and the actual use of the lab.

4. Status of the Faculty Budget

The Chairman referred to the material attached to the agenda for this meeting. Column 1 he explained was the April 1, 1975 budget position of the Faculty prior to the settlement of any of the Union contracts, column 2 was the Dean's guess at what the budget would be after the settlements. Both these columns had been reported to Council last year. Column 3 was the actual budget for the fiscal year April 1, 1975 - March 31, 1976. The final column was this year's Faculty budget position, again prior to either of the two union contracts being included.

In reply to a comment that the Faculty's supplies budget had decreased but that inflation was still increasing, the Chairman stated that this point had been made very definitely to the Budget Committee at our recent meeting with them. He stated that this was one area in the Faculty where no further decreases could be tolerated without a corresponding announcement of the Faculty's reduction in services. The Chairman concluded by saying that this point had been made to the University Budget Committee and the Vice-President (Administration), and he felt it had been well received.

In answer to a question as to the possible future tie-ins between student numbers and budget allocation, the Chairman replied that he felt that this was not likely because of the effect this would have on small faculties who required a fixed number of staff and funds just to offer the basics of their program.

5. Promotion Guidelines

The Chairman referred to the material that had been distributed to the members at the beginning of the meeting. It was hoped that a preliminary discussion could take place today with a follow up at a later meeting. He explained that the draft of the proposed promotion guidelines and procedures had as its basis the promotion guidelines recently drawn up by the Faculty of Arts. He very briefly went through the draft pointing

out the significant parts and changes over the existing procedures and then suggested to Council that at this meeting, questions be answered and suggestion and recommendation be heard. He hoped members would study the document and in the light of the discussion send him their comments in writing.

A lengthy discussion followed, in which criticisms, recommendations, suggestions were put forth. The following comments are representative of the discussion.

- (i) In answer to 'how do students get information on promotions and how do they get information back to the departmental committee,' the Chairman replied that he really didn't know. This particular point was made in the UMFA contract (Article XX 2 a (2) states in part:

"The written opinions of students and/or fellow faculty members should normally be sought.").

No mechanism was offered as to how these opinions should be obtained. The Chairman suggested that he thought it likely that departmental committees could work through the office of the Science Senior Stick.

- (ii) In reply to why nothing was included in the section on 'criteria' regarding external evaluation, and required number of publications, the Chairman said that he felt this would be something that the different departmental committees could include for their particular department as the stress on number of publications would vary from department to department.

- (iii) The comment was made that the way in which the promotion procedure was set up, via departmental committees, would lead to diversity in criteria and not uniformity, yet it was one of the faculty committee's duties to ensure uniformity. This point should be clarified, perhaps there should be only minimum faculty-wide criteria for all departments to follow.

It was suggested that the term 'successful teaching' on page 3 was not a good one and that just teaching be used, also 'participation in research' should be just 'research'.

It was suggested that something should be put into the criteria section as to normal periods of time between promotion, eg. five to seven years.

The Chairman said that his original draft had mentioned periods of time but that on advice received, he had deleted the reference.

(iv) It was recommended that any advice that a Head received from his committee should be given in writing. It was also recommended that any additional material that a Head may submit to the Faculty committee should be made available to the candidate and the committee and that there should be no additional material known only to the Head. The last sentence on page 1 should state that when a negative recommendation is going to be made by the Head, the Faculty member had to be notified.

(v) Replying to the question of the rank of the departmental committee members in relation to the candidate, the Chairman stated that this decision would be up to the department.

(vi) Several members felt that the role of the faculty committee needed clarification. Could this committee recommend against a departmental decision? Could it turn down a departmental decision and return the case back to the department; would this committee enforce the faculty's criteria for promotion?

The Chairman said that he felt that one of the first duties of the faculty based committee would be to establish certain minimum faculty criteria which all departments would agree to. This would be the basis for the faculty uniformity. Beyond that he said that he wanted to get the members' views and recommendation on the procedure and committee role.

(vii) What the criteria for promotion to full Professor should be produced some very diverse views. Devotion and service to the University was felt to be very important and ought to be recognized. 'Successful' teaching, although difficult to assess was felt to be of importance. Recognition and impact on areas outside the University was felt by some to be of ultimate importance for promotion to this rank. Others felt that a mix of all these aspects was necessary in order to qualify for promotion to Professor. The Chairman stated that he could see merit in all these views and that this was a very difficult problem with strongly held opposing views. For example, some held the views just expressed. Others strongly believed that to be a Professor of anything, say Physics, one had to be recognized externally as well as

internally by a peer group as a scientist contributing to the discipline. As a Professor of Physics, such things as University and external service would be expected of a man at so senior a level and would not weigh much in evaluating the possibility of promotion. Although he could not say at this time what the final answer would be, the Chairman felt that this would be one question that the committee and himself would be taking a hard look at in the near future.

- (viii) Being questioned again as to the function of the faculty committee, the Chairman said that he could foresee this committee as advising him that the candidate had received a fair and just hearing and that the department had taken into consideration all of its criteria in assessing the man. He said that at this moment he could envisage the committee recommending that the Dean return a case back to a department with its views for a contrary recommendation.

At this point in the discussions the following motion was proposed Duckworth (LeJohn).

"that Faculty Council recommend to the Dean that he establish a Faculty Level Committee on Promotions; that this committee establish criteria for promotion negotiating/consulting with the departments as to the particular needs of the different subjects; that this committee have the authority to choose these criteria so that they are reasonably consistent across the Faculty and that the criteria for promotion to Professor be those characteristics of a scholar in his/her field of study."

In speaking to the motion, Dr. Duckworth said that he felt that the Faculty Committee must have authority to advise changes and it must be the final authority for recommendation to the Dean at the Faculty level.

Professor Henry said that he did not like the idea of the Faculty committee set up. He said that any final decision in matters of this sort had to be the Dean's. The Dean could gather all the advice he felt he required but the final decision had to be his, not a committee's. This being so, then any type of formal structure such as the faculty committee could prove to be detrimental. With regard to promotion to full Professor, Prof. Henry said that he felt that this must be through recognition and

publication. The important thing should be the intensity of the candidate's interaction with his field. One of the duties of a full Professor was the teaching of graduate students and this could only be done if the individual was active in research. He also felt that full Professor should add material to their graduate courses and again this could only be done where the individual was active in research. Other services to the University such as devotion were recognized in other ways, such as through salary.

With the approval of the proposer and seconder, the motion was changed to read:

".... this committee establish minimum criteria for"

Prof. Macpherson, in speaking against the proposed motion said that he did not see how a committee made up of staff members from outside the promoting department could possibly say that that department's criteria were not suitable or adequate. He said that he felt that if a faculty committee was to make such a statement, the departmental committee would find it very difficult to accept.

Dr. Mendelsohn said there should be normal criteria and a committee should be able to go beyond these with justification being provided. Dr. Duckworth agreed with this view and proposed a change to his motion however, the Chairman suggested that the motion remain as is but be regarded as a notice of motion for the next meeting. The proposer and seconder agreed.

6. Report from the Executive Committee

The report was given by Dr. Duckworth. There had been only one meeting since last Faculty Council. At that meeting there were three main items of business.

(1) Earth Sciences Council By-law

With the changes suggested by the Executive Committee, it was recommended that these by-laws be forwarded to Senate. This was agreed to. A copy would be kept in the Dean's Office for a few days should any Council member wish to examine it.

- (ii) The summer school questionnaire sent to all summer school teachers and departments was discussed. It was the Executive Committee's feeling that enrolment in summer school by Science students was usually for a different reason than for other faculty students. Whereas other faculty students take the summer courses for the first time, the majority of Science students are usually repeating the course. This being so, it was not a concern of the Science Faculty that the summer school term was not long enough. The matter was left with the Dean to discuss with the Director of Summer School at their upcoming meeting.
- (iii) Guidelines and criteria for promotion were discussed. This was included as an item of business for Faculty Council and had been discussed today.

With regard to the Summer School questionnaire, Dean Cooke said that he had just received the results of that questionnaire. All five proposals had been rejected however, the Summer School Committee had decided to take the least objectionable and recommend it. The result was that that Committee was recommending that the Summer School period be extended by twenty minutes thus giving the total length of a course an additional ten hours (eg. sixty to seventy hours). Mr. G. Thompson, Director of the Summer Session said that only 117 questionnaires were returned and that because of the pressure on their committee to increase the length of summer session they decided to recommend the proposal to increase each period by twenty minutes. The decision was being circulated to all faculties active in Summer Session teaching and requested their comments.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.