

July 26, 1972.

Special Meeting

Minutes of a Special Meeting of Faculty Council held on Wednesday, July 26, 1972 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 207 Buller Building.

Members Present: Dr. R. D. Connor; Chairman, Professors W. M. Sibley, R. G. Stanton, P. Collens, R. Quackenbush, J. Sichler, G. Gratzner, H. Lakser, R. J. Lockhart, G. Losey, N. Losey, T. Booth, W. Pruitt, P. King, J. Muzio, J. Stewart, E. R. Waygood, J. Reid, D. Punter, J. Shay, J. Gerhard, J. McClure, J. Williams, C. Platt, R. Woods, M. Doob, R. Lyric, A. Giesinger, B. Henry, E. MacGregor, J. Silins, P. K. Isaac, G. Hickling, I. Suzuki, N. E. R. Campbell, H. Gesser, E. Bock, A. Chow, J. Charlton, M. Kettner, G. Lubinsky, J. Eales, D. Burton, J. Wright, H. Halvorson, L. VanCaesele, J. Wells, H. LeJohn, C. Chow, P. Maeba, B. Johnston, B. Kale, S. Standil, H. Coish, J. Svenne, W. Falk, J. Vail, S. Sen, P. Gaunt, G. Tabisz, D. Douglas, M. Oretzki, K. Subrahmaniam, K. Subrahmaniam, R. SaintDenis, R. Hawirko, C. Anderson, S. Badour, F. Hruska, D. Trim, J. Rauch, N. Mendelsohn, Messrs. J. Perrin, J. Kelly. (74) G. Richardson, Secretary.

Regrets: Professor D. Johnson.

The Chairman explained that he had called this special meeting in order to discuss the newly proposed Tenure By-Law ('The McCarthy Report') and to seek the guidance of the members as to their recommendations regarding the future of the report. Because of the significance of the topic it was agreed that a second special meeting to continue discussions would be held on Thursday, September 7, 1972.

The views and expressions of all faculties and schools had been requested by Senate, prior to their own discussions, consequently the views expressed at this and the second meeting would be conveyed to Senate.

The Chairman outlined the background and development of tenure at this University, ultimately ending with the submission of this by-law. The Chairman pointed out that the committee which produced this by-law, had originally been requested by Senate to formulate guidelines for the implementation of the present (current) Tenure By-Law. Instead they produced the report now being discussed, which was in effect a new by-law.

At this moment there are several tenure cases on campus (three within the Faculty of Science) which have to be discussed and recommendations made before the end of September 1972. The staff involved are those who were to receive promotions this past July 1 and by so receiving would have lessened their probationary period by one year thus giving them 'instant' tenure. It was decided that rather than grant them tenure in this manner, the tenure decisions for these individuals would be advanced to this September and if successful each would receive his promotion retroactive as of July 1, 1972. For these tenure discussions, Senate had approved a set of interim procedures to be followed; these accompany the minutes. The Chairman noted that with the exception of the candidates now being invited to appear before all committees reviewing their case, there was very little difference between these and the procedures followed by Science in its tenure deliberations of last fall. These interim procedures, however, were to be followed for September only; the procedure for the tenure deliberations which are to be held prior to December 31, 1972 (viz. for those whose probationary period ends June 30, 1973) are those that the Faculty will be discussing at this meeting.

It was agreed that time alone would not allow for clause by clause discussion, therefore, it was agreed that the report would be discussed in terms of its general, overall implication.

It was the feeling of most members that the principles involved here were the more important aspects of the document. Several speakers indicated that what the report appeared to convey was a feeling of mistrust and demarcation between staff, departments, and faculty; and between the departments and the administration at all levels. There appeared to be many inconsistencies in the report (especially in terms of the review committee's membership), and implications that had not been followed through to their logical conclusions, (e.g. time spent by senior administrators on committees, the source of funds for various proposals). Dr. Gratzner thought that the procedures established last fall appeared to work well and should be tested for another year. It was too early to decide that they were unworkable. In addition he suggested that Senate should be requested to re-establish the committee to study and prepare a document on the implementation of the 1968 Tenure By-Law. This was the duty originally imposed on the McCarthy Committee.

The committee then turned to a discussion on the proposed membership of the annual review committee. It was the opinion of most that as proposed this committee was practically unworkable. The composition was large making it 'difficult' for members to speak out. It was felt that the student input was at best, awkward. The fact that non-tenured staff, who themselves were seeking continuation of their employment, were included, implied a possibility of bias on the final decision, and the fact that the committee had to meet once a year for as many as six years, dispelled any hope of continuity amongst the members. What one committee membership might stress as crucial for an individual in his "finding himself" within the department, another might consider to be unimportant.

The Chairman expressed his own unhappiness, (1) that the proposed committee of review should have himself or his designate as chairman. Being essentially a departmental body he felt this usurped the role of the Head, (2) that the Head was downgraded to a mere member of the committee, and (3) that it was apparently no one's responsibility to prepare a departmental opinion on the man. Apparently everyone just met without preparation to hear the man himself and to judge whether he had made a sufficient case for the granting of tenure.

It was pointed out by Vice-President Sibley that the cost of the committee's time would be enormous and this had obviously not been taken into consideration. He also noted that when academics are required to spend increasing amounts of time on committee work, something had to suffer and in this case it was likely to be the member's teaching or research. The report, in his opinion, eroded the responsibilities of the Department Head and Dean and at the same time increased the amount of committee work for the Dean by as many as ten committees in some faculties. The fact that there was no faculty review committee proposed could well result in non-uniformity and mistrust between and within departments.

The Chairman expressed his concern over the anxiety of the present non-tenured staff and stated that it was his view that the report did little to help them. Similar concern he said, was expressed at the tri-committee meeting (meeting of the Executive Committee, Science Senators, and Department Heads) held recently.

In response to a suggestion that Department Heads should closely supervise the work of untenured staff members, the Chairman recalled that he had made a similar proposal two years ago and at that time it had been the feeling of the faculty involved that this was not really appropriate. The faculty members made it plain that they wished to be left alone and undirected by the Head or a departmental committee. In view of the reaction the Dean had dropped any further action on this. The response from the members of Council at this time, implied a similar feeling to that expressed by the Faculty involved.

In reply to the question, what would happen if Science unanimously vetoed the report, the Chairman stated that he felt that Senate would have to respect the decision due to the fact that Science was the second largest Faculty on Campus.

The concluding remarks pointed out that the report tended to move away from the awarding of tenure for academic merit by including on the review committee people who need not be familiar with the individual's work or in fact, not even associated with his department. They also pointed out that should the departmental tenure requests by-pass the faculty offices on their way to the Board of Governors, as was proposed, and should the Board of Governors receive more requests than there were positions available, the decision as to who received tenure and who didn't, would, in all likelihood, be made by the Board of Governors. This would be another case where a non-academic body would be making decisions on academic matters.

Before adjourning the Chairman reminded members that he was prepared to receive any written comments or notices of motion before the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

GR:wac

August 2, 1972