

MINUTES

**134th Meeting of the Science Faculty Council
held on Thursday, April 17, 2014, at 10:00 a.m. in
201 Armes Building**

PRESENT: M. Whitmore (Chair) P. Graham M. Piercey-Normore
P. Loewen T. Kucera D. Herbert
H. Luong J. van Wijngaarden S. McKenna
B. Southern J. van Lierop G. Gwinner
S. Kirkland M. Domaratzki S. Durocher
K. Scott J. O'Neil M. Doob
E. Huebner P. Dibrov M. Shaw
S. Whyard G. Anderson J. Markham
M. Docker Judy Anderson R. Flynn
J. McConnell B. Johnson A. Thavaneswaran
A. Samson A. Kumar D. Court
K. Brassinga P. Budzelaar M. Shantz (recorder)

REGRETS: P. Blunden R. Eskicioglu P. Pelka
John Anderson J. McKee J. Hare
R. Padmanabhan

GUESTS: M. Versace, C. Christie, T. Schultz

1. Approval of Agenda

MOTION: to approve the agenda. Moved by P. Budzelaar, seconded by A. Thavaneswaran.

CARRIED

2. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: to approve the minutes of the 133rd meeting of Faculty Council, held on February 12, 2014. Moved by T. Kucera, seconded by Judy Anderson.

CARRIED

3. Business Arising from the Minutes

- P. Graham to pursue update on why the MSpace form was not included in PhD thesis defense distribution packages.

4. Accommodation of Students with Disabilities – 20-minute presentation (attached)

M. Whitmore introduced the presenters, Maria Versace (Legal Counsel) and Carolyn Christie (Student Accessibility Services).

- There has been a great deal of Senate debate over the various aspects of the implementation group report; in particular the bona fides academic requirements and the push for development on a course-by-course basis rather than at the program level.
- Pilot projects will be done in three departments to see if implementation on a course-to-course basis works.

5. Endowment Committee Terms of Reference

M. Whitmore outlined the following proposed changes to the terms of reference:

- Item #2 under Terms of Reference: addition of “or otherwise” in first sentence
- Item #5 under Guidelines:
 - addition of Let’s Talk Science and WISE to the list of eligible applicants
- Item #6 under Guidelines: new wording, as circulated
 - The current wording gives priority to large enrolment classes.
 - There has been recent controversy in providing access to ICM students. Additional funding has been added to the fund, and access must be given to ICM students.
 - The majority of funding is from the Science students and alumni, but the majority of students in our large enrolment classes are non-Science students (60-70%).
 - The new wording is more of a balance between high enrolment classes and innovative, high quality, larger projects.
- Two columns will be added to the Endowment Fund request form: “Does ICM offer this course?” and “If so, number of ICM students in the course”.

Discussion:

- T. Schultz confirmed that some funding is received from the U1 referendum fees. The amount is split according to which Faculty the U1 students enter.
- General concerns about ICM were aired.
- M. Whitmore does not anticipate receiving any funding applications from ICM instructors.
- UM is essentially at its goal of ~10% international enrolment, with 17-20% of those students through ICM.
- Are these revisions motivated by questions which arose through equipment used by ICM? It was more a question of where the money was coming from – ICM was a wrinkle at the end.
- It was noted that most of the students in large enrolment classes (eg. in Biological Sciences and Statistics) who are benefiting from these funds are U1 students.
- Who gets priority – ICM students or our own students? If ICM students can fit into Science classes without eliminating our own students, then they have equal access to the equipment.

MOTION: to approve the above proposed changes to the Endowment Committee terms of reference. Moved by T. Kucera, seconded by P. Graham.

**CARRIED
(2 opposed)**

6. Promotion and Tenure Policies

- Under Section VI.3, item #4, bullet #2: CHANGE “The final list of referees will contain at least eight (8) names, all of whom will be contacted.” TO READ “The final list of referees will contain at least ten (10) names, eight (8) of whom will be contacted.”

MOTION: to support the above change to the Promotion and Tenure policies.
Moved by J. van Wijngaarden, seconded by P. Budzelaar.

CARRIED

7. Faculty of Science Planning Framework

M. Whitmore outlined the proposed changes, as circulated. He would like to present a document for use by the new Dean that represents a consensus of what the faculty are thinking and where we want to go.

- Title: Change FROM “Faculty of Science Interim Strategic Plan” TO “Faculty of Science Planning Framework”.
- Page 1, last paragraph: revised wording so as not to tie the hands of the new Dean
- Page 15 under Safety Matters: A safety audit was very recently turned down. Reason given was a safety audit cannot be done in Science, without doing the rest of the University – too big of a job. We were asked to carry out our own procedures.
- Page 18, item #3: new item - “Streamline our program offerings with, at most, a very cautious approach to any new programs.”
- Page 18, item #12: new wording - “Continue to build our graduate student numbers, which will require more support. Set a new target for total graduate numbers by 2019, and increase the proportion of Ph.D. students. A new target of 450 may be appropriate.”

Discussion:

- Page 18, items #9 and #10: Council members were asked if these items reflect what people are thinking. Judy Anderson absolutely supported #9 and requested that it be highlighted.
- Page 16 under Our Changing Environment – Council asked if it would be useful to include the increasing emphasis on auditing research compliance, finances, travel, safety, research ethics, supplies, purchases and justification because a lot this is falling on faculty members who have no time for what is required. In the future it will be increasingly difficult to sustain because we will be relying on staff and faculty with none, or less support.
- Is this document meant mainly for the new Dean and our own planning or a message to be sent to Central Admin? It is meant for both; it has already been read by the Provost.
- Will it go on the Science web page to replace the current document? It could, as a supplement to the current document.
- Question raised as to whether approval of this document should be done by electronic voting or by those present at Faculty Council. M. Whitmore stated there is no current ruling in place. To do this properly, a statement of when electronic voting can replace in-person voting should be clarified in the Faculty Council by-laws.

Amendments:

- Add a note on administrative overhead, auditing, etc.
- Review document to ensure that discovery research (Items #9 and #10 on page 18) is front and centre.

MOTION: to approve the Faculty of Science Planning Framework, as circulated, with the above amendments. Moved by G. Anderson, seconded by Judy Anderson.

CARRIED

8. Deans' Reports

- M. Whitmore reported:
 - We should know our new budget by the end of May. We have been instructed to prepare for a large budget decrease.
 - The goal is to have department strategic plans and the planning framework document ready for new Dean.
- P. Graham reported:
 - ADR/RLO meeting: The Office of the VP (Research and International) seems interested in reducing the number of research signature areas (currently ten). This direction was not supported by the ADRs. ADRs were asked for names of their strong researchers by area. P. Graham submitted more than the requested number. There will be more to report after the next meeting, scheduled for May 22. The area of fundamental science was not discussed, but the general feeling is that there is not much appetite for it.
 - B. Southern noted that Physics and Astronomy have invited the VP (Research and International) to talk on the subject of fundamental science.
 - NSERC grants: The success rate this year was ~68% - an increase from last year. Science received three RTIs. The overall funding increased \$235K this year.
- M. Piercey-Normore reported:
 - The course and program changes have been approved by 4Cs and are now being finalized.
 - Presently looking at performance indicators for mainly first year courses. Institutional Analysis has been asked to provide data on high school students to compare their grades with grades in first year courses. Looking for an indication of what high school students need to succeed in first year courses.
 - Looking at the possibility of direct entry into a 4-year program (without a declared Major), rather than the current 3-year program.
 - The recent Meet the Dean Pizza Lunch for indigenous students was quite successful. The students came up with good ideas on how to interact with Science.
 - The academic integrity group is preparing a faculty handbook, defining the types of infractions that incur, and how to make the penalties consistent across Faculties.
 - Bottleneck course issue – there are several committees looking at first year courses (most of which are in Science) where students are unable to register in courses which they need to progress with their degree. Aspects being looked at are course reserves, student timetable planning and creating 'S' designated courses

- The VW policy is under review in terms of the number of VWs allowed, implementation of limited access, etc.
- P. Loewen reported:
 - Update on carpentry work – not very much to report because of budget constraints. The largest renovation is an upgrade to the Machray Hall Math and Statistics main offices. There is a tentative agreement from Central to improve the Math/Statistics work space. Work was supposed to start in April, but is now expected to start mid-summer.
 - The 305 Buller research lab upgrade and the Physics and Astronomy renos are in the planning stages.
 - The machine shop ventilation issue is being looked at and should go forward sometime this year.

9. Other Business – nothing to report

10. Adjournment - meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.