Faculty of Arts Council
November 25, 2010
206 Tier Building

MINUTES


SPECIAL PRESENTATION: Judy Moer of the United Way made a special presentation to Faculty Council. Judy is the Director of Special Events and gave an overview of the programs and services made possible at Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Winnipeg thanks to Winnipeggers’ support of the United Way of Winnipeg.

1. Adoption of the Agenda

MOTION: That the agenda be adopted with items 6.1 and 6.2 being moved ahead of 4 (updates).
(J. Owens/R. Eigenbrod)
CARRIED

2. Minutes from the Previous Meeting

MOTION: That the minutes of September 29, 2010 be approved as circulated.
(R. Hagiwara/G. MacLean)
CARRIED

3. Business arising from the minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.

6. New Business

6.1 Professor Emeritus nomination – Paul Thomas

George MacLean spoke on the nomination of Dr. Paul Thomas. Dr. Thomas served as department head and graduate chair, as well as holding the Duff Roblin Professorship from 1999 to 2010. In 2003 the Institute of Public Administration for Canada awarded Dr. Thomas the Vanier Medal, which is one of the foremost recognitions for Canadian public administrators. He was also named to the Order of Manitoba in 2007.

Dean Sigurdson asked Mark Lawall to take over as chair of the meetings and said a few words as well on Dr. Thomas’ nomination. He spoke in favour of Dr. Thomas’ nomination for Professor Emeritus and wanted the record to show how strongly he supported this nomination.
MOTION: That a secret ballot would take place with faculty council members voting yes or no to the nomination. The votes would be counted following the meeting with an email going out notifying council of the outcome of the vote.

(G. Maclean/C. Frank)

6.2 Revision to the Dean’s Office Policy “Annual Activity Reporting for full-time Academic Staff”

Dean Sigurdson outlined the changes he would like to implement to the annual activity reporting for full-time academic staff. The changes would include the Department Head providing feedback to faculty members, the faculty member having the opportunity to respond to the Head’s comments, and a copy of the completed report being forwarded to the Dean’s office for retention in the faculty member’s personal file. The information in these reports is important for the Dean’s Office to know. Moreover, there is a significant divergence and inconsistency between departments in how the annual report activity is completed. It could be unfair and inequitable that faculty members are not being treated equally across the Faculty. He asked Faculty Council for suggestions and ideas that perhaps he had not yet considered in his deliberations to update this process.

Several members of Faculty Council stated their opinion on this matter and for the most part, those that spoke were not in agreement with the changes. M. Gabbert noted that at previous meetings where this subject had been discussed the proposed changes were not well accepted. He feels that may be due in part because his colleges feel that the new procedures are intrusive, hierarchical and bureaucratic. In addition these procedures take away the department head’s ability to deal with things in a formative manner. He also stated he does not understand to what end the Dean would want to see and review reports on every faculty member. He did agree though that if there is inconsistency in how the department heads are mentoring their faculty members, especially those probationary appointments, it should be addressed. He also noted people who have been through the probationary period in his department have a right to not expect to not have to go through this process again unless there is a problem.

Dean Sigurdson asked whether M. Gabbert felt that just forwarding the annual performance report without the Department Head’s commentary would be satisfactory. M. Gabbert responded that individual’s CV’s as well as annual report information is already forwarded to the Dean’s office.

G. MacLean agreed with M. Gabbert and indicated that moving forward quickly towards something new without thoroughly evaluating this issue would be a mistake. He suggested the logical next step is to canvass the department heads to determine what the difference in standards are between departments and ensure the reports are done the same without taking over the department heads role in overseeing the process.

Dean Sigurdson asked whether a set of “smart practices” would be agreeable to help ensure that Department Heads are all following the same criteria and practices. G. MacLean said that beginning a dialogue with the Department Heads to determine what is currently being done, which to some degree has already started taking place would be a good start. He feels that the process is just being hurried along and discussions have really just begun taking place.

T. Chen stated that “My Research Tools” is a mechanism that is available to anyone requiring an update on a faculty member’s status. She also noted that section 2 of the new annual report indicates that faculty members will have to include future plans and goals, which can change very quickly. She also noted that these plans and goals generally require pre-approval and are
therefore already known at the Dean’s office and Department level. She feels that the reporting of multiple things in multiple places is problematic.

J. Owens stated that she has discussed this at a departmental level and that all are in agreement that the new process is not conducive to collegiality. She indicated that she and her colleagues would also like to know to what end the section on future planning would be used. Dean Sigurdson suggested that faculty members should want to indicate a change in the distribution of their activity if they are, for example, taking on new service work or developing a new course. Reviews done the following year would then make sense and would match the new distribution of the faculty member’s time.

A. Young stated that people who are not accountable will not become accountable simply by instating these new steps. Moreover, she said that CV’s are submitted to the Dean’s office annually and could be used for this purpose. Dean Sigurdson said expecting the Dean’s office to compile information from several sources to reconstruct an evaluation on a faculty member is not efficient and could produce errors or omissions in the record. In response to the repeated concern that the Dean will be using these reports for evaluative purposes, he reiterated that the Dean is not doing the reviewing or evaluation under Article 35, since that is the role of the department head. A. Young asked then why, if certain department heads are not doing their jobs properly, the Dean is not concentrating on correcting those issues instead of having all the departments change their procedures. Dean Sigurdson again explained that unless the reviews are being forwarded to the Dean’s Office, there is no way to know who is or who is not doing a thorough job. A. Young replied that proper training and mentoring of department heads should be implemented and perhaps that would correct the inconsistencies in the reporting as well as being a much more collegial solution than what the Dean is currently proposing.

M. Joyal stated that it seems to him that the new process is more about ensuring that there is consistency across the Faculty in how the performance evaluations are being done. He agrees with previous suggestions that workshops and further training of heads would be a better solution to this problem than having the Dean sign off on all performance evaluations.

Dean Sigurdson commented that whether he meets with department heads and devises a procedure or whether he encourages further training, ultimately he will not know whether the training or procedures are working and whether heads are being accountable without the reports being submitted to his office. Dean Sigurdson again stated that all other faculties at the University of Manitoba follow these procedures.

4. Updates

4.1 Associate Deans

*M. Lawall - absent*

*R. Hoppa – absent. His report was read by L. Wilson*

- The 2011 Federal Indirect Costs of Research Competition has been announced and Heads have been sent a MEMO by Barry Ferguson and R. Hoppa requesting their submission for this competition by 17 Dec.
- TODAY the next CFI Leaders Opportunity Fund (LOF) was announced. The e-MEMO has been sent to all Arts academics. Anyone who is thinking or planning on submitting an application for this round (due at the end of March) should let Rob Hoppa know as soon as possible. Also note the info session for the CFI process here on the FG campus, Monday December 13 from 9:30 until 11:30 in 210 Helen Glass.
For information regarding grant applications submitted in the fall cycle:

**EXTERNAL**
- SSHRC (Standard Research Grants) 32
- NSERC (Discovery) 1
- CIHR (Catalyst) 3
- CIHR (Operating Grant) 5

**INTERNAL**
- UM/SSHRC 3
- UM/SSHRC Travel 2
- URGP (New Faculty) 14

L. Wilson

- **Arts Student Discipline Report.** The Dean’s Office compiled all departmental submissions with our records to produce the final Arts report that was submitted to the Secretary of Senate last week. Total cases of academic discipline handled at the departmental/program, Dean’s level, or both, have increased from 48 cases (of cheating or plagiarism) in 2008-2009 to 61 cases in 2009-2010. Of these, cases of plagiarism declined by 2.0%; whereas, cases of cheating saw an increase of 700% (from 2 – 16). These data do not include other forms of academic dishonesty, which are less numerous, but still occur, such as personating and fraud.

A recent in-house study was done at a US University where the instructor in one class required the completion of an on-line plagiarism tutorial before his/her students submitted their major written work for the term and the instructor in another similar class (same topic, same level) did not. Although the methodology is imperfect, the results showed that the class that had directly interacted with the tutorial had many fewer cases of plagiarism than the class that did not have this explicit experience. It’s too late to include this strategy for this term, but it may be worth considering being even more explicit in discussions with students about the importance of integrity in their work.

- **Rhodes Scholarships.** The 2011 Rhodes Scholarships have been announced internationally and this year the UM has the distinction of 2 students as recipients from the Prairie division. One, Ms. Jodi Reimer, is an Arts student majoring in mathematics and minoring in religion. As reported in September, Arts students comprised the highest single turnout for the Rhodes info reception in September, 2010. This turnout translated into the majority of applicants in this year’s competition coming from Arts as well as 2 Arts students recognized among the four UM finalists who were interviewed by the Prairie Rhodes Committee. Only 3 offers are allocated to Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba combined. So, having two recipients from UM in one year is outstanding.

B. Ferguson – B. Ferguson did not do an update due to time constraints caused by the lengthy discussion on annual performance appraisals.

4.2 **Dean’s Update** - Dean Sigurdson did not do an update due to time constraints caused by the lengthy discussion on annual performance appraisals.

5. **Reports of the Standing Committees**

5.1 **Report of the Endowment Fund Committee**

The report to Faculty Council was presented for information only.
7. Question Period

There were no questions.

8. Adjournment

*MOTION*: That the meeting be adjourned at 4:30 *(B. O’Kell)*