

October 10, 1975  
Twenty-second Meeting

## Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE October 3, 1975

TO All Members of the Faculty Council of Science

FROM G. Richardson, Secretary of Faculty Council

SUBJECT:

The 22nd meeting of the Faculty Council of Science has been scheduled for Friday, October 10, 1975 at 2.40 p.m. in room 207 Buller Building.

### AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the 21st meeting.
2. Matters arising therefrom:
  - (i) Results of Dr. Kale's Review Committee
  - (ii) Professor/Course evaluation report
  - (iii) Appointment of Chairman of Graduate Course Approvals Committee
3. Communications.
4. Discussion on the faculty's course change proposals (outline attached, detailed material in Dean's Office, 248 NEMP for consultation before council meeting.)
5. Advice to Dean on allocation of Merit Pay. U.M.F.A. Contract Article XXV Section 2 reads:-

"Faculty or School councils ... may recommend weightings and subsidiary criteria to the Dean/Director. Based on such recommendations the Dean/Director shall establish the weightings and criteria to be used and these shall be made available in writing to Members prior to their coming into effect."
6. Report from the Executive Committee (meetings of July 2 and 31, and October 6, 1975)
  - (a) Departmental Council By-laws

The changes recommended by the Executive Committee of Faculty Council have been accepted by the Departments of Chemistry, Microbiology, Botany and Applied Mathematics. The copies of these by-laws, which have been sent to each department general office, incorporate these recommendations. Although the copy of the by-laws for the department of

Physics contains the Executive Committee's recommendations, these have not been accepted by the Department. The change recommended by the Executive Committee was the revision to item 3(i) as underlined:

3(i) "Meetings shall be open to non-members of the council subject to the right of Council to declare a closed session by a simple majority vote. 'Open meeting' and 'closed meeting' shall have the same meaning as those adopted by Senate."

(b) Executive Committee discussion on:

- (i) Role of the Standing Committee on Mathematics
- (ii) Challenge examinations
- (iii) Four-year General Degree Program
- (iv) Definition of a "major"
- (v) Results of a Senate Appeals decision

(c) Items on the agenda for the October 6, 1975 meeting:

- (i) Consideration of Departmental Council by-laws from Statistics, Computer Science, and Biology Teaching Unit.
- (ii) Faculty course change proposals
- (iii) Discussion on a suggestion for a Science Faculty Centennial Year Lecture Series.
- (iv) Mode of election for members and chairman on the Science Graduate Course Approvals Committee.

7. Report from Senate

8. Other Business.

gr/sc  
encl .

The minutes of the twenty-second meeting of Faculty Council held on Friday, October 10, 1975 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 207 Buller Building.

Members Present: Dean R. D. Connor, Chairman; Drs. N.E.R. Campbell, F. Konopasek, R. Bochonko, R.A. Usmani, D.N. Burton, D.A. Young, I. Suzuki, N.E. Davison, G. Gratzner, R. Quackenbush, N. Mendelsohn, J.C. Rauch, J. Reid, B.R. Irvine, G.G.C. Robinson, R. Padmanabhan, J.P. McClure, P.N. Shivakumar, J.J. Williams, F. Zeiler, H. Finlayson, R. Dowling, J. Berry, H.E. Welch, J. Gee, A. Turnock, C.C. Lindsey, E. Huebner, S.G. Sealy, J.G. Eales, M. Samanta, S.K. Sinha, P.L. Ellis, D.G. Douglas, H.R. Coish, F.M. Kelly, S.K. Sen, K.G. Standing, J.M. Shay, R. Hawirko, A. Olchowecki, G. Williams, B. Bhakar, C.D. Anderson, P. Loewen, J.C. Jamieson, P. Maeba, J.A. Wright, M. Clutton-Brock, G.G. Hickling, Dr. K. Subrahmaniam N.R. Hunter, J. Charlton, F. Hruska, R.H. Betts, G.E. Dunn, R.M. Evans, B.D. Macpherson, S. Cheng, J.C. Fu, F.M. Arscott, T.G. Berry, B. Kale, K. Mount, W.C. Brisbin, R. Venkataraman, M. Doob, J.S.C. McKee, J. Jovanovich, G.C. Tabisz, R.C. Barber, C.W. Searle, A.H. Morrish, H.W. Duckworth, J.B. Westmore, G. Losey, N. Losey, T. Holens, C.R. Platt, H. Lees, J. Sichler, P.W. Aitchison, G. Williams, Mr. S. Boychuk, Ms. K. Cobor, Ms. B. Vogel, and Mr. G. Richardson.

Regrets: R.H. Green, T. Dandy, L. Van Caeseele, J. Kraemer, B. Smith and B. Corbett.

Before commencing with the business referred to on the agenda, the Chairman requested Councils' advice as to whether or not proxy votes would be accepted for any of the voting that was likely to take place at today's meeting as he had received a request for a proxy.

It was moved Kelly (Brisbin) that:

"proxy votes were not to be used in this meeting"

CARRIED

On another matter the Chairman explained that due to the urgency of two items on the agenda, (Course Changes and Merit Pay) it was essential that both be covered at this meeting. He proposed that the first hour be spent discussing course changes then the meeting would shift to the item on Merit Pay, this would be concluded and the meeting would then return to the matter of course changes. It was moved Welch (Betts) that:

"Faculty Council accept this proposal"

CARRIED

1. Approval of the Minutes of the 21st meeting.

The minutes of the twenty-first meeting of Faculty Council held on June 12, 1975 were adopted. Macpherson (Kelly).

2. Matters arising therefrom:

(1) Review Committee for Dr. Kale: The Chairman explained that the Committee had met and had agreed to ask Dr. Kale to serve for an additional five year term as Head of the Department of Statistics. Dr. Kale had accepted and the Dean welcomed him to the continuation of his present responsibilities.

(ii) Professor/Course evaluation report: Nothing further had been heard on this matter and it was agreed that it should be dropped.

(iii) Appointment of Chairman of Graduate Course Approvals Committee:

This matter would be covered in the report from the Executive.

3. Communications

There were no communications.

4. Faculty Course Changes

This item was given as part of the report from the Executive Committee and was presented by Dr. Davison.

Prior to the discussion Dr. Davison enquired of Council how it wanted to vote on the changes, by department or as a total report. It was agreed to vote by department.

Applied Mathematics

Dr. Davison explained that the Executive Committee had discussed the course changes of this department at length and had culminated their

discussion with a motion that requested Dr. Arscott to speak in Faculty Council to two points regarding his proposal. The points were: (1) which courses did the department plan to offer next year and (2) how did the department intend to do this given its present resources? Dr. Davison asked Dr. Arscott if he would speak to these points.

Dr. Arscott explained that the department has at present six staff members and three affiliated members, one of whom was teaching a half course. This resulted in an average staff load this year of just under two courses each (12 credit hours). One of the reasons that they were able to keep the staff load at this level was because of the large size of some of their classes (i.e. up to 200 students). To aid in handling these large classes 'tutorial assistants' were hired as part of their special academic allotment.

In addition to the existing staff Dr. Arscott indicated that two additional affiliated staff (Actuarial and Business Mathematics) wished to teach a half course each; a member of the department who was currently teaching a half course in Mathematics would presumably not be teaching that course next year thus freeing him for additional duties in the department; interest had been expressed by a third affiliated member (Engineering) to teach a half course; assistance may be offered by the Mathematics department; there was a possibility that one of the second year Engineering courses would be combined into one section therefore saving one course; and finally there was the possibility of a member of the Mathematics department transferring into the Department of Applied Mathematics. Consequently with the courses intended to be taught in third year and the staff mentioned above, the average staff load would be approximately  $2\frac{1}{2}$  (15 credit hours) courses.

Dr. Arscott pointed out that the use of affiliated staff members should not be considered as a stop gap measure but rather as the department operating as was originally envisaged by the committee which set up the department.

With regard to the second point, Dr. Arscott outlined the minimal program that the department could operate with next year:

- (1) Core Courses - 6:3AB  
6:3AC

- (ii) at least one of 6:3BA and 6:3BE
- at least one of 6:3BD and 6:3BK
- at least one of 6:3BH and 6:3BJ
- at least one of 6:3BL and 6:3BM

making a total of six half courses (or three full courses)  
with the addition of course 6:1EC for the Economists.

Following Dr. Arscott's explanation, the accuracy of several of his statements was queried by Dr. Mendelsohn. Concern was also expressed as to the appropriateness of the backgrounds of some of the affiliated members being considered by the department. The Chairman pointed out that this was perhaps a problem related to the matter being discussed but really shouldn't be discussed at this moment. Comment was made on the fact that Engineering faculties across Canada were beginning to do more and more teaching of their own courses which up until now had been taught by other faculties, especially Science. Such a move at this University could result in very serious repercussions within our faculty. The Chairman concurred with this remark but he pointed out that the Engineering faculty had agreed in Senate in 1970 to the teaching of their courses by the Applied Mathematics department.

In reply to the question of how many credit hours were likely to be offered by the department in any one year, Dr. Arscott answered 18. It was pointed out that this would be the second highest number of credit hours taught in third year of all the Science departments and considering the anticipated number of students this appeared to be a rather lavish undertaking.

With regard to the apparent overlap of the proposed courses with existing courses, especially courses in Physics, one course in particular (6:3BA) appeared to follow very closely a course that used to be taught by the Physics Department, i.e. Properties of Matter. Dr. Morrish indicated that he had pointed this out quite some time ago. He wished it noted at this time that the Department of Physics reserves its right to re-introduce this course. Dr. Arscott replied that he had sent copies of the course outlines to all areas on campus where overlap might possibly occur. He did not recall being informed of this apparent overlap. Dr. Kelly stated that Dr. Arscott had spoke with him regarding possible overlap with course 6:3BK but having discussed the matter he

was convinced that there would be no overlap. Several other courses were questioned with regard to overlap but Dr. Arscott assured Council that all such possibilities had been explored with the likely departments.

In concluding his comments Dr. Morrish said that he felt at a time when the University was under serious financial restraint the request for 30 additional credit hours by one department was not appropriate and as a faculty member he could not and would not support the request.

At this point several members commented on the fact that consideration of these matters, having supposedly taken place in other committees, should not be taking place in Council. The Chairman commented that this was now the fifth review of the Applied Mathematics course offerings.

Dr. Arscott stated that having heard the members remarks about his request being unduly large he would be willing to reconsider his proposal and possibly reduce the number. Dr. Duckworth noted that all the proposals had gone through the appropriate channels and had, up to this point been accepted by all the other Committees. He did agree though that reducing the number of courses did seem like a good idea but he reminded Council that the University was committed to permit Applied Mathematics to establish a viable third year program.

It was moved Welch (Mr. Subrahmaniam) that:

"Faculty Council accept the full 30 credit hours (10 courses) programme (it being understood only 6½ courses would be offered the first year)."

This motion was amended by Arscott (Duckworth), the amendment being that only 6½ courses be accepted. However, this was subsequently withdrawn and a vote was taken on the motion. The motion was DEFEATED 36 in favour, 41 against. A second motion was proposed Duckworth (Reid) that:

"Faculty Council approved the offering of 6 out of the 10 courses and that the Department Head in consultation with the Dean select the 6"

CARRIED,  
1 OPPOSED

The meeting now moved on to item 5 of the agenda.

5. Advice on Merit Pay

The Chairman explained to Council that in accordance with the requirements of the UMFA agreement he was required to seek the advice from Faculty Council as to the criteria and weightings to be given in determining the Merit Pay portion of the academic salary increases. The Executive Committee had discussed this matter and had proposed the following recommendation.

"that the four criteria (research, teaching, service, and professional competence) in the agreement be accepted and that the weightings, and the awards resulting be those recommended by the Head taking such advice as the department gives after due consultation"

It was moved Davison (Kelly) that:

"Faculty Council accept the Executive Committee's recommendation"

CARRIED

It was noted that each department could use whatever weightings it felt most suitable for its particular need.

On a related matter, although not included in the agenda, the Chairman stated that advice was also required on the form of Tenure Committee to be used this fall. Faculty Council approved the following:

"that a Faculty based nucleus committee similar to that used in previous years be used for tenure recommendations this fall".

The meeting returned to item 4, course changes.

Applied Mathematics (cont'd)

With regard to course 6:1EC, Mathematics for Economists, it was pointed out by Dr. Mendelsohn that this course did not follow exactly as the procedures laid down by the Standing Committee in Mathematics for the introduction of new service courses. The Chairman stated that he was aware of this and that if fault there be, it was his in that when he had first heard of the proposal, he had omitted to tell the Department of Economics to direct the request for service to the Standing Committee so that it could decide the department best suited to provide the service. Rather, the Departments of Economics and Applied Mathematics came forward to the Standing Committee with a joint proposal.

However, it was also pointed out that this fact had been noted in each of the other committees. Nonetheless each had recommended its acceptance.

It was moved Davison (Campbell) that:

"Faculty Council accept this course"

CARRIED,  
2 OPPOSED

Chemistry

It was moved Davison (Westmore) that:

"the Chemistry course change proposals be accepted"

CARRIED

Mathematics and Astronomy

It was moved Davison (Konopasek) that:

"courses 13:1aa, 13:1ba and 13:1bb be accepted"

CARRIED

The details of the request to introduce course 13:3aa, a reading course for Astronomy students, was given by Dr. Bochonko. He stated that he had been approached during the past several years with a request to offer a reading course in Astronomy for which a student would receive credit. He anticipated that likely no more than one student would take the course in any one year. It was intended that this course would be in addition to his regular course load. Dr. Bochonko pointed out that no additional provisions were being requested. In reply as to why the Mathematics reading course 13:358 couldn't be expanded to include the Astronomy portion, Dr. Bochonko said that this was possible but that it would cause problems with identification on student transcripts. Dr. Losey felt that expanding the title to include both areas might just scare off both the Mathematics and Astronomy students. There was some concern about the introduction of a reading course at the third year level but Dr. Bochonko indicated that Astronomy did not have an honours program so really could not designate the course at the 400 level.

It was moved Bochonko (Losey):

"Faculty Council accept course 13:3aa"

CARRIED

Several remarks were made again about the length of the discussions taking place on these course changes and the fact that similar discussions

had already taken place in four other committees.

It was moved Young (Shay) that:

"Faculty Council complete the review of the courses individually and approve each on its academic merit with no debate".

Other members felt that such a move would be unfair as detailed consideration had been given to the courses considered previously. Dr. Morrish said he had requested a detailed syllabus which he had not received. The Chairman stated if the fault was his, he apologised, but could not recall the letter and asked Dr. Morrish to let him have a copy so that the matter could be looked into. He again reiterated that it was not Faculty Council's duty to discuss and debate each course change proposal in detail as this had already been done several times!

The vote was taken on the motion and it was DEFEATED.

Discussion continued on course 13:OCC, a proposed remedial course in Mathematics. Dr. Berry explained that the department now operated such a course however student participation was voluntary. The necessity for this course is due to the poor training of many students recently coming out of High School. In many cases these students have not taken material which is essential for work in the 120 course. This remedial course would be a bridge between the Grade XII and 120 course and had the department been able to make it a creditable 90 level course they were willing to provide placement tests and require certain students to take this course instead of the 120 course.

It was generally agreed that such a course was required and it received support from many members. However, as pointed out by the Dean implementation of such a course would be difficult. Would the course count for credit and if so, would it count as one of the 20 attempts? Which students would be made to take the course and which ones not? The Council recognized the Dean's assessment of the difficulties but they were uncertain as to who should try to solve these: the department, the faculty, Senate, or the Registrar's Office? Several members felt that the proposal should be returned for solution and it was moved Welch (Turnock) that:

"this course be turned down at the present time on the basis that there is no framework in which it can be brought forward and that it be sent back to the committee"

Dr. Losey brought Council's attention to the fact that this was the third time the department has proposed a remedial course and each time it has been turned down. Although everyone agreed that remedial work was necessary, each time the problems with implementation were cited and the course was not passed. The department was now at the stage where if the course was not approved they would seriously have to consider lowering their standards in the 120 course in order to provide some remedial work within the course. This would be to the detriment of about 2/3 of the students. In light of Dr. Losey's remarks, Dr. Welch with Dr. Turnock's consent withdrew his motion. It was subsequently moved Duckworth (Welch) that:

"Faculty Council recommend the course be adopted and Council express its willingness to strike a committee in faculty to solve any procedural problems"

CARRIED,  
2 CONTRARY

#### Zoology/Botany

It was moved Davison (Young) that:

"Faculty Council accept this proposal"

CARRIED

#### Earth Sciences

Question was raised as to the title of the course change being proposed. Members of the Division of Biology felt that the proposed title implied a certain amount of biological content when in fact there was little if any such material in the course. With the agreement of the Head of the Department, Dr. Brisbin, the title was changed to Introduction to Physical and Geological Oceanography and it was moved Davison (Brisbin) that:

"the course be accepted"

CARRIED

#### Physics

It was moved Davison (Bochonko) that:

"Faculty Council accept course change 16:3XXM"

CARRIED

With regard to the two Honours courses in Cosmology and Relativity and the first year course in Astrophysics, Dr. Morrish stated that it was

his feelings that Astronomy should be taught in Physics. However, meetings with the Astronomy people had been arranged to discuss overlap and other related problems, so that for the time being his department would not be proposing that the courses go forward.

6. Report from the Executive Committee

- (a) Departmental Council By-laws - It was moved Jamieson (Brisbin) that:

"The Departmental Council By-laws for Chemistry, Microbiology, Botany and Applied Mathematics be sent forward to Senate"

CARRIED

The By-law from the Department of Physics did not include the modifications proposed by the Executive Committee. The Chairman requested Council's advice as to whether or not it felt that the change was necessary, i.e. that there be a definition of open and closed meetings. It was moved Rauch (Tabisz) that:

"the definition of open and closed meetings is not required in the Physics' by-law"

CARRIED

The Physics' by-law will now be sent to Senate with the other four departmental by-laws.

The meeting adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

/nl