



Newsletter

OCTOBER/NOVEMBER 2004
Volume 31.2
Tony Petric, EDITOR

in this issue:

Rae Committee
Norman Shrive
Announcements
New Members
Employment Accommodation
Editorial: New Stadium
Housing

Rae Committee Comes to Hamilton

[A report prepared by Trevor Chamberlain and Ken Cruikshank who attended the Roundtable on October 20, 2004.]

Process

The Rae Committee's Hamilton roundtable was held in Convocation Hall on the afternoon of October 20, 2004. Participants were assigned to one of ten tables of eight people each, including a facilitator. The participants represented a variety of groups and organizations within the community. Of the eighty or so participants, fewer than ten were from McMaster. The session began with a welcome and introductory remarks by the chief facilitator, followed by a brief outline, by Mr. Rae, of the review process and mandate of the Committee.

Each table was initially assigned one of five consultation questions, which group members, led by the facilitator, discussed for about forty-five minutes. With ten tables, each question was thus discussed by two groups.

A recording secretary for each table was chosen (volunteered) and his/her job was to prepare a summary of the group's discussion. The recording secretary at both of our tables relied on the other members of the group to identify the key points of discussion for reporting purposes.

Each table could choose another question for a second forty-five minute session, or continue with the assigned question. Some tables chose a second question, but most continued with the first. This is not surprising in light of the range and complexity of the questions asked. Indeed, in the case of Trevor's table (which was assigned the funding question), group members had much more to say than the total of one and one-half hours allowed. Ken's table

discussed two questions, in part because the assigned question (on institutional structures) proved difficult to discuss, particularly for those outside the system and given the absence of background information in the Rae Report on past or current structures.

At the end of the afternoon, someone from each table delivered a verbal report on the findings to the larger group, so we heard views on all of the questions.

Mr. Rae's Remarks

Mr. Rae also spoke to the entire session. He noted that while the government would have to put more money into post-secondary education, students would have to pay more as well. He also noted that some students would end up paying less, with more students receiving assistance than is the case presently (augmenting student loan assistance seemed to be his preferred choice). Though acknowledging that society as a whole benefits from a well-educated population, he argued that the main beneficiary of higher education is the student. Mr. Rae also seemed to favour the view that different institutions should be allowed to do different things in the university system, though the system as a whole should be comprehensive. He also acknowledged that the opportunities for graduate education across the system should be expanded.

Generally, Mr. Rae tended to link post-secondary education with career opportunities and skill shortages. Though acknowledging that there should be room for educational opportunities that do not lead to specific careers, the economic benefits of higher education appeared to be his central argument for increased funding (both from government and students).

A number of possible funding (not necessarily mutually exclusive) models were suggested: progressive assistance (loans, tuition deferrals) to students, direct payments to students instead of to institutions; tuition deferrals ("go now, pay later"); flexibility on tuition fees (program level, institutional incentives, cost versus market demand); payments to institutions for delivery of results (e.g. retentions/graduation rates) versus student enrollment.

Mr. Rae emphasized the need to facilitate the transfer of credits, both between colleges and universities and among community colleges. He used the example, which we understand has been repeated elsewhere, of the failure of a university to permit college tourism courses to be put towards a university degree in the same field.

Mr. Rae also seemed to think that, whether it was centralized or institution-based, a mechanism for systematic program evaluation was both inevitable and a good thing. He contended that evaluation would make governments more accountable. He used the example of student:faculty ratios, which he argued was just as appropriate a performance indicator for the post-secondary system as student:teacher ratios are for the primary system. With a public evaluation system in place, governments would be held responsible for rising student:faculty ratios.

Funding: Mr. Rae's Participation

Mr. Rae sat in on most of the discussion at Trevor's table, mostly as a listener. Though he acknowledged that he considered it a given that the provincial government would have to increase its funding of post-secondary education, he did not offer any specifics. His primary interest was in eliciting opinions about the amount and structure of student tuition and the level and form of student financial assistance. He seemed particularly concerned with whether tuition levels (implying they would be higher in the future) would discourage or preclude young people from entering post-secondary programs. He suggested that tuition be graduated in some fashion as students move through university or college, with perhaps, the first two

years' tuition being deferred entirely until students begin working. He also suggested that the level of loan repayment be graduated according to post-graduation income. That is, students earning high incomes would be expected to repay a larger proportion (perhaps all) of the assistance they had received than those earning low incomes.

Group Reports

Two tables were assigned each of the five questions. Some tables only considered the assigned question, others moved on to a second question (of their own choosing) in the second half of the session. A summary of some of the points raised and reported to the larger group, though not necessarily universally supported, under each of the five topics follows:

Accessibility

- an information clearinghouse (both educational and career opportunities)
- more resources for career counselling in high school
- better accessibility for minority groups

Quality

- standards should be set by individual institutions, not centrally by government
- institutions have to be competitive according to global standards

System Design

- reduce barriers to entry and transfer by part-time students
- facilitate transfers between colleges and universities, and among both colleges and universities

Accountability

- government versus institutional oversight: an independent body favoured by one group; no consensus in Ken's group, owing to a fear among some external members and students of just another layer of bureaucracy. Both groups believed that if such a body is created, it should have representation more like what we had at the roundtable, that is including representation from individuals outside the college and university systems.

Funding

- if the emphasis is on career preparation, employers should be directly involved in funding higher education
- financial incentives to encourage specific skills (this idea was not universally supported)
- pro-rated tuition depending on income
- defer tuition and make payments income-contingent
- mix of loans and grants provided to students would change over the course of their program, but a return to a larger grant component in OSAP – one group supported higher grants and lower loans in the early years; another group supported higher grants in the later years (as reward for retention, defined not as retention in same institution or even sector, but retention in the post-secondary system as a whole)
- government responsible for providing financial access by all qualified students
- greater clarity and flexibility required in determining who qualifies for student loans
- provide tax relief for post-secondary education to lower income families
- educate parents as to their responsibility and role in supporting children

attending post-secondary institutions

- lower tuition in first two years of university, or some other system to mitigate “sticker shock”
- de-regulation of tuition fees generally opposed
- support for alternatives to enrolment (e.g. retention/completion rates) as the basis for direct funding of universities)

Observations

Clearly, one point of the roundtable exercise is to demonstrate to those participating what a difficult challenge the Rae Committee faces. The organization of the roundtables is intended to have college, university and external stakeholders encounter different views, and in this it is relatively successful. One or two ideas that might be of use to the Rae Committee emerged from the roundtable, and that is probably as much as can be expected from any method of gathering information.

Although useful, the exercise (and this would extend to the online workbook as well) is limited by the inconsistent amount of background information provided in the Rae Report and/or the experience of participants in the system. The Rae interim report and workbook are rather better at stating some problems than at explaining how those problems are currently addressed. It is odd, for example, that no effort is made to explain the past or current institutional relationship between the provincial governments and the university or college sector, or, for example, the history of or current nature of OSAP and student assistance. The workbook does focus the discussions, although, as one participant noted, the options to be discussed seem to unnecessarily narrow the broader questions being asked.



**Norman
Shrive
Professor
Emeritus
English**

Norman Shrive, Professor Emeritus, past-President of the Faculty Association, Chair of the English Department for two terms, leading figure for many years at McMaster and in the wider university world, died on September 11, 2004. A memorial gathering, “In the Memory of Frank Norman Shrive: A Life Celebrated”, organised by his son, Christopher, was held on September 27 at 3:00 p.m. in the Great Hall of the Alumni Building. The Hall was filled to capacity, as befitted the memory of this extraordinary man. Eulogies and Remembrances were given by David Dooley, Professor Emeritus, University of Toronto, academic associate and friend of many years, by Susan Hardy, friend since 1981, David McFarlane, designer, builder and owner of “Normerica” post-and-beam houses, George Stewart, co-aviator and lifelong friend, and Christopher Shrive. Graham Roebuck was Master of Ceremonies. The following paragraphs are adapted from his remarks on Norman’s career.

It is fitting that we gather in this fine building, home of the University Club, of which Norman was twice President. The day before his death he joined his regular Friday lunch and conversation group, as was his custom. He was in good form.

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak about Norman to whom I

September 11,
2004

owe a debt of gratitude I never could have paid. As chairman of the department's graduate studies he brought me here as a student in September 1965. With an expanded intake of MA candidates, Norman decided to admit one with a poor degree to compare with the others. That was to be my role. He was my mentor, soon became my friend, and when I completed my doctorate at London, Norman was there to invite me to become his colleague.

Norman was a leader in many spheres of his active and various life: in the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario, the Canadian Warplane Heritage, the Tower Poetry Society, the Hamilton Association for the Advancement of Literature, Science and Art, and several little theatre groups, to name some. And, of course, there is his long and distinguished service to the nation as a officer in the RCAF.

At one time, Norman held a large collection of pornography — in the public interest, it must be stressed — while he was Director of the Attorney General of Ontario's Committee on Obscene Literature from 1963-70. I was never allowed to inspect any of this archive — perhaps Norman thought the weakness of my first degree would leave me vulnerable to corruption.

As a scholar, Norman specialised in American and Canadian literature, but he was well able to teach everything from Anglo-Saxon to the most recent work in English, encouraging members of his department to attempt a similar range and not to retreat to the fortresses of their own special scholarly interests. After undergraduate work at McMaster, his studies took him to Harvard in 1955 on a Humanities Research Council award, and to Toronto where he wrote his MA thesis on the neglected British playwright, director and critic, Harley Granville-Barker. At Queen's University he was the first PhD in Arts, graduating in 1961 with a ground-breaking thesis on the 19th century Canadian literary nationalist, Charles Mair. This was the basis of his book on Mair published by the U of T Press in 1965. In his retirement he returned to this theme in his *The Voice of the Burdash: Charles Mair and the Divided Mind in Canadian Literature* (1995).

His work on Granville-Barker had a happy and unexpected outcome several years ago. Christopher Newton, Artistic Director of the Shaw Festival, deciding it was high time to stage the Canadian premiere of Granville-Barker, who had established Shaw's reputation, called on Norman to advise and consult. Norman and Barbara took great pleasure in the subsequent convivial relationship with the Shaw Festival.

Over the years Norman's contribution to university life was notable and generous. He was a fearless and courageous member of faculty, and outspoken member of Senate almost continuously from 1965. He chaired the Arts Research Board, was a founder member of the Military Studies Committee and, of course, President of the Faculty Association in 1971-72.

Norman's two terms as Chairman of the English Department from 1967-73 were marked by his sprezzatura style. It was the golden age of English Studies in Canada. In a period of vigorous departmental growth he steered it to prominence in the University and to an enviable nationwide reputation for teaching and scholarship. It was fitting that he was elected Chairman of the Association of Chairmen of Departments of English, serving in that office from 1969-71. He was a stern critic of academic fads and pretentiousness. Falling standards earned his reprimands from which neither status nor rank was protection. One summer, teaching summer school in Dublin, Jonathan Swift's famous epitaph in St. Patrick's Cathedral — about saeva indignatio, his savage indignation — struck Norman with special force as the apt commentary on the times.

Norman's early study of Latin stood him in good stead as a grammarian. His judgement on questions of English usage was often required for authoritative settlements of differences of opinion. He had an easy, seemingly effortless mastery of English prose, for which, one of my senior colleagues once said he would give his writing arm. For those of us who sweat and toil, whose writing "smells of the lamp," Norman's gift was enviable. On the afternoon before his death he was discussing the work he was currently engaged in, reading passages of the first chapter completed, and raising questions about how the narrative voices should be constructed for the rest of the account. It was not, as one might have guessed, autobiographical; it was the story of one of Norman's acquaintances, a valiant airman. It was an extraordinary story.

Not everything in Norman's life was easy — not by a long way — but he would not have changed a thing for a life of slothful ease. He lived it fully; to the hilt. We shall not see his like again.

*Graham Roebuck,
Professor Emeritus, English*



As Returning Officer for the by-election to fill two vacancies on the Executive of the McMaster University Faculty Association for 2004/05, I hereby report that, as there were no further nominations by the October 29, 2004 deadline, the Executive's

candidates, MARTIN HORN (Associate Professor in the Department of History, Faculty of Humanities) and ROB WILTON (Associate Professor in the School of Geography & Earth Sciences, Faculty of Science), who were proposed to the membership on October 19, 2004, are declared elected.

E. R. Mead, Returning Officer

Attention all GO Transit riders

Wondering where your bus has gone? Well, on October 31, the GO Transit bus stop in front of the McMaster Museum of Art was relocated to the traffic circle on the EAST side of the Mary Keyes residence. This new GO Transit bus stop area will have two separate platforms, one for the Hwy. 407 services to Mississauga and York University and one for the Lakeshore routes to Burlington and Toronto's Union Station. The second GO Transit bus stop on the WEST side of the Mary Keyes Residence will continue to operate.

More Committee Appointments

Many thanks to the following individuals who have volunteered to serve the Association. **Helen McDonald** (Family Medicine) and **Jean Wilson** have agreed to represent their departments on the MUFA Council. **Heather Arthur** (Nursing) and **John Weaver** (History) will represent MUFA on the newly formed Travel Advisory Group.

And apologies to **Paul Faure** (Psychology) whose name was mangled in the September 2004 Newsletter. Paul is one of MUFA's reps on the Bookstore Board.

Security of Exams

As December approaches, the campus experiences an increase in break and enters into departmental offices. The main motivation for this crime appears to be the acquisition of exams. Here are some suggestions to help prevent these types of crimes:

- **Remove all exams or drafts of exams from your office daily.**
- **Save a copy of the exam on a disk which is safely secured.**
- **Password your computer and then password or encrypt all exams or grade files.**
- **Double check that your office door is secure before leaving your office.**
- **Report lost or missing keys or access cards immediately to Security (Ext. 24281).**
- **Know the whereabouts of your keys and access cards at all time, and do not loan them out.**
- **Report any suspicious persons or activity immediately to Security (Ext. 24281). Please note their description.**
- **If people appear to be loitering around your office door, watch that they are not tampering with your lock or door.**
- **Inspect your lock nightly looking for signs of tampering.**

Security can be contacted in the following ways:
 905-525-9140, ext. 24281
 905-522-4135
 “88” from any University telephone
 “Security button” on all campus pay phones
 all campus elevator phones
 red poled emergency phones



New Members

	Pathology & Mol.	Renee	
	Med	Labiris	Medicine
	English	Yvonne	Nursing
Megan Begbie	Mod Languages &	Lawlor	Pathology & Mol
Chandrima	Ling	Brian Lichty	Med
Chakraborty	Finance & Bus	Rafik Loutfy	Chemical
Paolo Chirumbolo	Economics	Anne Milne	Engineering
Anna Danielova	Biology	Marc	Leadership &
Kim Dej	Elec & Computer	Ouellette	Learning
Timothy Field	Eng	Sandeep	English
Anita Fisher	Nursing	Raha	Pediatrics
Jonathan Geen	Religious Studies	Sumanth	Mechanical
Alina Gildiner	Health	Shankar	Engineering
Michel Grignon	Stds/Political Sci	S téfan	School of the Arts
Wolfgang Kunze	Gerontological	Sinclair	Marketing
	Stds	Peter Vilks	
	Psychiatry & Beh		
	Neuro		



For Your Information

Employment Accommodation

1. McMaster University is committed to providing equal treatment with respect to employment without discrimination because of race, ancestry, place of origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, record of offence, marital status, family status, disability, colour or ethnic origin as required by the Ontario Human Rights Code (hereinafter referred to as “the Code”). McMaster University has a legal obligation to accommodate both employees and job applicants in a manner which respects their dignity, is equitable and which enhances their ability to compete for jobs, perform their work and fully participate in employment at the University.

2. To accomplish that goal, the University will work to achieve a workplace free of barriers by providing accommodation for the needs of those individuals covered by the Code, up to the point where it causes undue hardship for the University.

WHAT IS ACCOMMODATION?

3. Employment accommodation is defined as services, adaptations or adjustments which enable persons who require accommodation to compete for jobs and perform employment activities. It is an ongoing process of identifying and removing or minimizing the adverse effects of barriers in the work environment or in the method of doing work, which prevent otherwise qualified persons covered by the Code from achieving expected outcomes of a job. The process is consultative involving employer and employee and results in specific adaptations and/or modifications in employment policies and/or practices.

4. Accommodation is:

(i) understood as any temporary or permanent measure used to remove a barrier which prevents an otherwise qualified individual from performing or fulfilling the essential duties of a job;

(ii) based on individual circumstances and can include but is not limited to recruitment, selection, training, promotion, performance appraisal, benefits provision and any other condition of employment where the need for accommodation may be identified;

(iii) based on individual circumstances and can include, but is not limited to:

(a) communication such as producing documents in other languages or alternative media formats;

(b) technical aids such as software or hardware;

(c) employment policy and practice modification such as modifying training policy so people with child or elder care obligations can attend courses during work hours if they make up the time;

(d) job redesign which is defined as restructuring the job by re-allocating or redistributing nonessential functions;

(e) human supports such as sign language interpreters, job coaches to help in the initial training and integration of persons with psychiatric or developmental disabilities;

(f) workstation or building modification such as ramps for access to buildings;

(g) work scheduling such as changing schedules so that individuals may participate in the rites associated with their religious faith.

If the investigation of individual cases identifies systemic needs, the University will address the systemic changes needed to make the University more accessible to all employees.

*[The full policy can be found in the Faculty Handbook, p. C*31 or on the MUFA web page at <http://www.mcmaster.ca/mufa/handbook/accomm.htm>]*

Editorial: What's this about a new stadium?

The plan for expansion and relocation of the stadium raises two issues: first, is it a good decision for the University, and second, why has there been no consultation with the University community including faculty, staff and students? Has it even followed proper protocol? New construction on campus affects all of us either positively by providing new facilities for our needs, or in negative ways such as through loss of parking or green space, obstructing the view from our offices, or adding to campus congestion.

Plans for the sportsplex expansion were announced last month. The current Phys Ed complex will be expanded west onto the old stadium site. A new \$12 million stadium with seating for 7000 will be built to the north of the sportsplex addition, replacing the present 2000 seat stadium.

We are left to speculate on the merits of the new structure. On the one hand, it would be a source of pride for the University to boast a world-class stadium. It would draw major sports activity to Hamilton. The availability of the new facility would extend into early spring and late fall thanks to the artificial turf.

On the other hand, an expanded stadium will take more space from an already crowded campus. If 7000 sports fans converge on campus, where will they park? The Sterling Street entrance is already overtaxed — the congestion would be annoying for both the drivers and residents. How often will this stadium be filled to capacity? Or even half-capacity? Is it necessary to locate it in the middle of campus?

What are the alternatives? If the stadium were built on West Campus, many of these problems would disappear. There is space aplenty along Cootes Drive. That location would have high visibility, easy road access, loads of parking; it would be easy to find for out-of-town visitors, and a short hop from University residences. It would be totally unobtrusive. Further-more, it would not only maintain the existing green space on the main campus, but also free up extra space for recreation, parking, and future expansion. Isn't it reasonable that buildings added to campus should be used six days a week, not six Saturdays each fall?

The campus plan shows the extinction of open space on campus thirty years from now. The proposed stadium will accelerate this plan. What's the hurry to box ourselves in? Why not save some space for future use? Once the space is lost, can it ever be recovered?

The second issue is one of consultation. Plans for new construction should be shared with the members of the University, not imposed on us. If the old adage applies that two heads are better than one, why not the collective wisdom of a thousand heads? Some of our opinions

may indeed offer a better solution. Isn't it better to consult beforehand than to go it alone?

Most of us feel we have a stake in the University. We gladly contribute our time and energy to showcase the University and attract the best students. The campus is more than just a place of work for most of us; it is a part of our lives, and many of us take a personal interest in the appearance of our campus, and pride in the achievements of our University. Naturally we feel we should have some say in how things are done, especially when it comes to permanent changes that are indeed cast in stone.

The history of the proposed stadium is intertwined with Hamilton's bid for the Commonwealth Games. The issue was no doubt discussed by many committees both before and after Hamilton lost the bid. Now we have been informed of a plan to proceed with a new stadium which apparently has been approved by the Board of Governors, but which no one has explained to the University community. Every senior administrator I've spoken with contends that the decision followed wide consultation, but no one is aware of the details, who did what, how did we get to this point, why are we doing it, can it be justified? No one is able to confirm that it passed the approval of the University Planning Committee (UPC), Planning & Building Committee of the Board, etc. For a \$12 million project that has an impact on the whole University, it certainly ought to have been brought to the public forum for comment. The Administration intends to go full speed ahead, but doesn't seem to understand either the background or the consequences of the decision. It appears to be one of those issues that's hung around long enough without anyone being responsible for it from start to finish. Perhaps that's why it's been pushed through without open review.

Naturally we expect the administrators to lead, but we also expect to be involved in decisions before a major proposal becomes a plan of action. This is definitely a case where consultation would be in order. It's not a question of trying to delay, it's a matter of doing it right.

Tony Petric

LTRC Helping Faculty Teach With Technology

<http://www.ltrc.mcmaster.ca>

The Learning Technologies Resource Centre (LTRC) offers technical advice and assistance in teaching and learning in a variety of ways:

- Consultation
- Project Planning/Management
- WebCT or LearnLink
- Training / Workshops
- On-line Classroom Directory
- Equipment Bookings
- Laptop Configuration
- Emerging Technologies

Contact Us:

Learning Technologies Resource Centre
Phone: 905-525-9140 x 22911
E-mail: ltrc@mcmaster.ca
<http://www.ltrc.mcmaster.ca>

Classroom Audio Visual Services
Phone: 905-525-9140 x 22761
E-mail: equipbkg@mcmaster.ca
<http://www.ltrc.mcmaster.ca/class>



Housing

For Rent

One bedroom, bright, newly re-decorated, furnished with essentials, quiet, private entry basement apartment in home of retired academic. Garage parking. Country setting. Campus 15 minutes by car, 30 minutes by bicycle on adjacent trail. Suit single graduate student, post-doc, or junior faculty. No pets. No smoking. \$675 monthly all inclusive, minimum 6-month lease, renewal/extension negotiable. Available July 1, 2005. Telephone: 905-648-5675.

For Rent

Large, newly finished basement, 2000 sq ft of space, 3 bedrooms, 2 baths, kitchen, family and laundry room in a modern bungalow on a large, private lot surrounded by conservation area in Dundas. House is located next to Bruce Trail and close to Rail Trail and 10 minutes to McMaster by car. Ideally suited to a faculty member on a sabbatical leave, couple, nature lovers, keen on hiking and cycling. Must be a non-smoker. No pets. Available January 1, 2005 with an open term (minimum 6 months). \$1300 monthly, all inclusive. Contact 905-628-9194.

November 30, 2004

pdk