

The minutes of the Twenty-eighth meeting of the Faculty Council of Science held on Monday, February 7, 1977 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 207 Buller.

Members Present: Dean R. D. Connor, Chairman; Professors I. Cooke, N. E. R. Campbell, J. Rauch, N. S. Mendelsohn, H. E. Welch, F. J. Ward, D. Kelly, G. Gratzner, R. Padmanabhan, J. C. Jamieson, H. W. Duckworth, H. Halvorson, S. G. Sealy, C. K. Gupta, I. Suzuki, D. N. Burton, J. Sichler, N. Gupta, R. Quackenbush, R. G. Woods, A. Gerhard, S. Cheng, K. Mount, Fr. H. Kane, C. R. Platt, S. M. Woods, P. Loewen, F. Zeiler, P. Aitchison, G. Baldwin, R. Wallace, H. R. Coish, W. R. Falk, P. D. Loly, D. M. McKinnon, R. Dowling, D. Johnson, R. Wong, P. N. Shivakumar, M. R. Parameswaran, N. Losey, T. Dandy, B. D. Macpherson, P. Gaunt, J. S. C. McKee, J. P. Svenne; Ms. H. Peat, Mr. D. Bedard, Mr. H. Penner; Mr. G. Richardson, Secretary (51)

Regrets: Professors P. McClure, S. Standil, M. Clutton-Brock, G. Losey, W. C. Brisbin, J. Reid, P. K. Isaac, H. Lees, S. Sinha, R. Johnson, A. H. Morrish; Messrs. G. Thompson, W. Semieniuk, M. Budzinski, J. Kraemer.

1. Approval of the Minutes of the Twenty-seventh meeting

The Minutes of the Twenty-seventh meeting held on December 2, 1976 were approved Welch (Ward).

2. Matters Arising Therefrom

The Chairman indicated to the members the status of the various department head review/search committees.

The review committees for Dr. Welch and Dr. Stanton had recommended reappointment for an additional five year term commencing August 1, 1978 and July 1, 1978 respectively. The Board of Governors had approved these recommendations at their January meeting.

The committees to review Drs. Mendelsohn, Morrish and Suzuki were now in the process of being formed and would be meeting shortly.

The Search Committee to find a new head for the department of Earth Sciences had just received permission to seek external as well as internal

applications and the appropriate advertisements had been sent to various magazines and journals.

Some concern was expressed by several members at the apparent shortness of time given for their department's selection of committee members. The Chairman replied that if he was formally requested by the members of a department for more time he would extend the allotted time. However, he had understood it was the wish of the Faculty that these reviews be initiated at the earliest date. Faculty members had been aware for some months that the second set of three reviews was imminent.

### 3. Communications

The Secretary read the report received from the Provincial Department of Mines, Resources & Industrial Management, via the University Safety Officer, regarding the levels of asbestos fibres in the air in the Allen building. The report indicated that there was no asbestos hazard in the building. The report is available in the Dean's Office for any member that wished to read the details.

### 4. Promotion Guidelines

The Chairman explained that the guidelines before the Council was the third draft; the first was discussed by Faculty Council on December 2, 1976, the second was put before the Executive Committee of Faculty Council and the third was the result of the Executive Committee's discussions.

Concern was expressed by several members that the document seemed to concentrate on two categories of achievement viz. teaching and research. It was felt that there were other areas where meaningful contribution could be made; an example of text book writing was mentioned. It was noted that the guidelines spoke of outstanding contributions and demonstrated superiority in only these two categories. The Chairman explained that there were many ways in which a faculty member could contribute to teaching and research. Textbook writing at the junior level could most appropriately be regarded as teaching. A text at the frontier of knowledge could easily be regarded as a research contribution. It was not intended to have two watertight compartments. He said that he hoped any of the promotion committees would look at and consider a candidate's total involvement in his/her department. It was suggested that the example given in the last paragraph of page 1 which began on line 6 could be deleted if total involvement was to be considered. The

Chairman said that he would agree to this if the minutes of this meeting indicated that council recognized the purpose of the example and sympathized with it.

It was then moved Duckworth (Gratzer) that

"the following be deleted from the last paragraph on page 1 - 'For example .... promoted to the highest rank'."

CARRIED

2 opposed

It was pointed out that the guidelines did not consider a 'double' promotion, that is, from Assistant directly to Full Professor. The Chairman said that in all the years he had been associated with this University he had never heard of this happening and didn't feel it was necessary to include it in the document.

Other areas of the draft that were referred to by different members were the inappropriateness of community service in academic promotion, the absence of a specified length of time for demonstrated superior ability and the financial implications involved with promotions. These were only briefly discussed and they resulted in no change to the draft.

In reply to a comment made about an advisory committee's decision opposite to that made by the department and the head, the Chairman stated that under no circumstances could an advisory committee recommend an opposing view without letting everyone know.

At this point it was moved Jamieson (Gratzer) that

"the question be called"

Dr. Parameswaran indicated that he had further points he wished to raise. The Chairman pointed out that if Council voted 'yes' to the motion, it prevented any further discussion on the document. If it was wished to hear further comment, the motion should be opposed. The vote was taken and the motion was CARRIED with 5 opposed.

The question was then moved on the motion;

"the document, with the deletion approved earlier in this meeting, be accepted"

CARRIED.

2 opposed

Professors Aitchison and Dowling both stated that they felt Faculty Council had by its motion on the Question purposely suppressed further debate on the document and this they regretted. The Chairman said that if anyone had further points of substance they could be committed to writing and sent to him for comment.

5. Report from Senate

The report from Senate was given by Dr. McKee. It covered the last four meetings of Senate. The main topics in Dr. McKee's report were:

- (i) the new B.Sc. degree in Education and the fact that some of the optional courses in the program were Science courses,
- (ii) the Computer Science Co-operative Program, which at the moment was in limbo while the President attempted to get some funding for the program from private business,
- (iii) report of the staffing policy committee,
- (iv) discussion on low enrolment courses and the fact that the faculties will soon be asked to justify their need for such courses in their areas.

6. Other Business

- (i) Comment was made again about the high temperatures and low humidity in the offices in Machray Hall and how Operations and Maintenance seemed unable to correct the problem.
- (ii) A request was made by Dr. Welch that the Science Librarian be requested to attend the next Faculty Council meeting in order to explain various procedures in the library and answer general questions pertaining to the faculty.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

RDC

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

## Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE January 28, 1977

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL OF SCIENCE

FROM G. Richardson, Secretary

SUBJECT:

The Twenty-Eighth meeting of the Science Faculty Council has been called for Monday, February 7, 1977 at 2:40 p.m. in Room 207 Buller Building.

### A G E N D A

1. Approval of the minutes of the Twenty-Seventh meeting.
2. Matters Arising Therefrom:
  - Status of the Headship Review Committees.
3. Communications.
  - Report from the Provincial Government regarding asbestos-in-air survey of Allen Building.
4. Further discussion on the proposed faculty guidelines and criteria for academic promotion. (Third Draft attached).
5. Report from the Senate.
6. Other Business.

gr/nl

**Inter-Departmental Correspondence**

*rdc*

DATE March 28, 1977

TO All Members of the Faculty Council of Science

FROM R. D. Connor, Dean of Science

SUBJECT:

I am pleased to send you the following items for your information.

- 1) I am happy to advise you that the Review Committee in Microbiology has recommended that Dr. Suzuki be reappointed for a further period of five years with effect from 1 July 1977.
- 2) I am happy to advise you that the Review Committee in Mathematics has recommended that Dr. Mendelsohn be reappointed for a period of four years from the date of his return from leave viz. 1 July 1978. Dr. Mendelsohn's normal retiring date is 1982.
- 3) In the Dean's Office, Dean N.E.R. Campbell has asked to be relieved of his administrative duties with effect from 31 March 1977. This is a little sooner than had been earlier planned. Dr. N.E.R. Campbell is proceeding on leave with effect from 1 July 1977. As most of you are already aware Dr. Cooke will be withdrawing from the University this spring also.

I have sought advice widely and have decided to invite Professor Brian Macpherson of the Department of Statistics to join the Dean's Office as Associate Dean with effect from 1st May 1977. Professor Macpherson's duties would be those related to the student oriented aspects of the faculty together with work and advice in the general area of mathematics. I am pleased to say that Professor Macpherson has accepted the invitation to join the Dean's Office and I am sure you will extend to him the same support and help which you have traditionally done in the past.

Yours sincerely,



R. D. Connor  
Dean of Science

rdc/nl

# Inter-Departmental Correspondence

DATE March 7, 1977

TO All Members of Faculty Council

FROM R. D. Connor, Dean of Science

SUBJECT:

I would like to bring the following items of information to your attention.

- (1) Review Committees will commence meeting according to the following schedule.

Microbiology - Wednesday, March 9th

Mathematics - Monday, March 14th

Physics - Thursday, March 10th

- (2) In accordance with our recently approved Promotion Procedure document, the following have agreed to serve if required on the Promotion Advisory Committee. They will therefore constitute the "pool" from which two will be selected to advise on promotions to the rank of Professor:

Drs. Arscott  
Robinson  
Schaefer  
Sinha  
Betts

Morrish  
C.D. Anderson  
Ferguson  
Gratzer  
LeJohn

McKee  
Ward  
Lindsey

Yours sincerely,



R. D. Connor  
Dean of Science

rdc/nl

**Inter-Departmental Correspondence**

JRC

DATE February 15, 1977

TO All Members of the Faculty Council of Science

FROM R. D. Connor, Dean of Science

SUBJECT:

Dear Colleague:

I am pleased to send you now the final version of the document on promotion in the Faculty of Science. It will be recalled that such a document was approved at the last meeting of Faculty Council. Since that approval I have made four minor alterations to the text for clarification which in no way changes the intent or thrust of the document. These changes from the third draft which you have are to be found on pages 2 and 3.

On page 2, line 1, the words "are planned for the future." have been deleted. It has been pointed out to me that promotion is based largely on work already accomplished or underway; that which is planned for the future is really irrelevant. This would not of course in any way inhibit a faculty member from indicating his future plans on his promotion document but he would not be required to.

Secondly, in the first full paragraph on page 2, line 7, I have inserted the sentence "If a committee is set up its advice to the Head should be recorded in writing." This is to prevent later misunderstandings as to the actual nature of the advice given and a few lines below I have added the word "thereon" after the words "together with the advice provided".

On page 3, I have changed the sentence "If the Dean makes a negative recommendation ..." to "If the Dean intends to make a negative recommendation ...". This is more correctly the wording in the Collective Agreement.

I think you will agree that these changes are either editorial or only clarifies that which was there before. We shall therefore make use of this document in this form for the 1977 promotions.

Yours sincerely,



R. D. Connor  
Dean of Science

rdc/nl



## ACADEMIC PROMOTION PROCEDURE - FACULTY OF SCIENCE

### Criteria for Promotion

According to the Collective Agreement promotions from rank to rank are to be based upon the contribution that a faculty member has made to the discipline, the Department, the Faculty and the University while in his/her present rank. Consideration is to be given "to research, creative works and performance, teaching, and service, which includes internal and external activities related to the research and teaching functions of the University." The achievements normally expected for promotion in the Science Faculty are successful teaching, participation in research, publication of work done since appointment to the University or since the last promotion and service as indicated above.

### The Normal Requirements

The appointment initially to Assistant Professor would be on the basis of recognized training (normally to a Ph.D. or equivalent).

CHANGED  
F. C. 10/8/77

For promotion from Assistant to Associate we would recognize contributions in the areas of research, teaching and ~~community~~ ADMINISTRATIVE service (with <sup>ADMINISTRATIVE</sup> administrative service included here) ~~and if two areas if the~~ <sup>OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF THE DUTIES TAKING THE THREE AREAS INTO ACCOUNT IS JUDGED TO BE OF HIGH QUALITY, THE PROMOTION WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE.</sup> ~~were outstanding the promotion would be acceptable.~~

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor we expect demonstrated superior ability in academic matters, primarily in research and teaching. Administrative and community service is not given the same weight as these academic considerations but is expected of an individual at this level.

It may happen that an individual offers essentially only one of the two factors mentioned, viz. research or teaching rather than demonstrated superior ability in both. In such cases the intensity of the intellectual involvement of the individual in the work of his/her department and discipline should be examined in any consideration for promotion to Professor. Length of service of itself is not of much weight.

### Department Level Procedures

According to the Collective Agreement, while a faculty member may initiate a promotion consideration by submitting to his/her Head a duly completed promotion recommendation form, promotion consideration normally will be initiated by the Head by requesting that the faculty member submit a completed form. It shall be the faculty member's responsibility to provide at the time he/she submits the duly completed promotion recommendation form any supporting documentary evidence with respect to teaching, research etc. that he/she wishes to be taken into consideration. The submission should be complete. Faculty members are encouraged to submit full information with respect to research projects

underway. Once a promotion recommendation form has been submitted by a faculty member, (whether done at the request of the Head or on the initiative of the faculty member), the Head is not free to prevent the case from going forward to the Dean nor is the Dean free to prevent it from going forward to the Vice President, so long as the faculty member continues to wish it to proceed. The faculty member however is free to have the consideration stopped at any point by submitting to the appropriate person a written request to that effect.

The Department's academic staff with faculty rank, meeting in committee, is responsible for developing the procedures whereby the department's advice to the Head with respect to promotions is to be provided. The academic staff of the Department may recommend to the Head that he/she establish a committee or committees to assist him/her or may advise alternative methods of arriving at a recommendation. If a committee is set up its advice to the Head should be recorded in writing. The Head after considering the promotion recommendation form and the supporting materials submitted by the candidate plus any submissions made by students and other faculty members, together with the advice provided thereon by the Department in accordance with procedures developed by the academic staff with faculty rank, shall submit his/her recommendation to the Dean on the final page of the promotion recommendation form, making use of an attachment if additional space is required. This promotion recommendation form is to be accompanied by all the material mentioned above. The Head's recommendation may or may not coincide with the advice received by him/her. Should the Head's recommendation to the Dean be contrary to the advice given the report of the Head to the Dean shall indicate in addition to his/her own recommendation the nature of the advice given him in accordance with these procedures and the reasons for recommending otherwise. If the Head intends to make a negative recommendation then if it is possible to do so the faculty member is to be notified of that fact prior to the recommendation actually being submitted to the Dean and is to be provided with an opportunity to withdraw the application. In any case where the Head or Acting Head is a candidate for promotion the Dean will be responsible for receiving the advice of the Department directly, which advice would still be provided in accordance with procedures developed by the Department's academic staff of faculty rank. In the case of a faculty member with a split appointment between two units the Head is to consult with the Dean to work out an ad hoc procedure that would be analogous to the one for other faculty members.

#### Faculty Level Procedures

##### (a) Promotion to Assistant and Associate Professor

The Dean will receive the documentation referred to in the previous section and after having examined it, will meet with each Department Head submitting recommendations for promotion to these levels. The Dean shall consider all the recommendations and satisfy him/her that the relevant criteria have been met or

not met as the case may be, and that the recommendations are consonant with the evidence presented.

Should the Dean feel that circumstances warrant it, the Dean should be prepared to recommend contrary to the recommendations of the Head and should the Head's recommendation differ from the advice received by him/her, should be prepared to choose between the recommendations as to his/her own recommendation. The Head shall be advised of the Dean's recommendation and the reasons therefore should the Dean's recommendation differ from the Head's. If at any stage the consensus of advice or a recommendation is at variance with the consensus of advice or recommendation at an earlier stage of the proceedings the Dean shall advise the Vice President fully as to the consensus of advice or recommendation at each stage of the proceedings up to and including his/her own recommendation to the Vice President.

If the Dean intends to make a negative recommendation to the Vice President irrespective of whether the recommendation received from the Head was negative or positive the Dean shall notify the faculty member in writing of this fact and in the case of a faculty member covered by the Collective Agreement, advise him/her of his/her right to appeal in accordance with the Collective Agreement.

(b) Promotion to Professor

The Dean having received the recommendations of the Heads shall, prior to the preparing of his/her own recommendation to the Vice President on any candidate, establish and seek advice from a committee set up by him/her specifically for this purpose. The committee shall consist of two full professors and the Dean as Chairman. This committee will be drawn from a pool of individuals designated for the purpose. The name of the committee will be the Advisory Committee on Promotions.

For each Department the Head shall present his/her recommendations for promotion to this committee. It would not be the purpose at this stage to re-do all the work of the departmental committee but to examine procedures and the criteria used in evaluating those coming up for promotion consideration and to check for uniformity of treatment as among the various Departments. Where a member of the committee is a member of a Department presenting a promotion he/she shall be replaced by another member from the faculty pool from a different Department while that Department's promotions are being considered.

The Dean while serving as the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Promotions will work to assist the committee to produce a recommendation that is correct and defensible. Nonetheless there are other roles for the Dean in the promotion decision process. Should the circumstances warrant it the Dean should be prepared to recommend contrary to the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Promotions. If his recommendation would differ from

that of the Advisory Committee the members of the Advisory Committee and the Head would be advised of that fact together with the Dean's reasons. If at any stage the consensus of advice or a recommendation is at variance with the consensus of advice or recommendation at an earlier stage of the proceedings the Dean shall advise the Vice President fully as to the consensus of advice or recommendation at each stage of the proceedings up to and including his/her own recommendation to the Vice President. If the Dean makes a negative recommendation to the Vice President irrespective of whether the recommendation received from the Head was negative or positive the Dean shall notify the faculty member in writing of this fact and in the case of a faculty member covered by the Collective Agreement advise him/her of his/her right to appeal in accordance with the Collective Agreement.

February 15, 1977