

Ross may refer YUFA's threat to court

By JOHN ADAMS

University president Murray Ross hinted Monday he may refer a threat by the faculty association last week to withhold final student grades to the university disciplinary courts.

Last Friday, 70 members of the association voted almost unanimously to ask the 600 York professors and lecturers to withhold final grades, unless a salary and benefits settlements is reached with the board of governors by next Tuesday.

Instead, the 488-member association, which represents 80 per cent of the teaching staff will set up an unofficial information service for the 8,500 fulltime and 7,500 parttime students.

The association meets today at noon in S166 in the Ministry of Love to review the progress of negotiations during the week.

Ross' thinly-veiled threat of prosecution was his response to what he described as "something entirely new in university history." No university court system existed officially until Ross said last week he was implementing the Laskin report on rights and responsibilities as "an interim measure", until discussion of the report is completed.

Ross' decision has been questioned because the report, released last November, recommended it should not be adopted in whole or in part without discussion throughout the university. The Duff-Berdahl committee of the senate is making a clause-by-clause review of the report now.

Ross apparently failed to realize that his courts system already jeopardized by the withdrawal of several student judges in protest against his implementation of the Laskin report, will be unworkable if the faculty association also withdraws its five nominees for judgeships. Faculty sources have said they want to do this.

Ross also apparently is unaware that, although he has exclusive legal authority over student conduct by Article 13 (2) (c) of The York University Act, he has no legal authority by the act over faculty conduct.

The faculty association decision came five months after its salary and benefits demands were submitted to the board, official spokesman Theodore Olson said last week.

The assistant professor and acting chairman of the arts faculty social science division, charged that salary levels for

York professors were among the lowest in Ontario, ranking higher only than those at Brock and Trent universities.

"We have not put the students in this bind," he said. "It's the board's fault. We have received no concrete offers from the board, despite a meeting in January and another on March 13."

He said the governors told the faculty negotiating committee they lacked sufficient budget information to negotiate.

The association is seeking a 20 per cent increase for all of the teaching staff. The increase is needed, it says, to cope with inflation to provide salaries comparable with similar professions, to permit raises for merit and to experience and correct salary inequities among present faculty members.

In addition, the association wants special housing allowance for junior faculty, portable pensions within Ontario, and eligibility for sabbatical leave after

five years here, instead of the present seven-year requirement.

The closed faculty meeting narrowly rejected a motion calling for a halt to teaching after this Wednesday to protest the board's inaction, Olson said. Formal classes end on April 3 for most students.

An "overture" on salaries made Friday by Ross, in a letter specially-delivered to all the faculty, was "unanimously rejected" at the meeting, Olson said.

He charged the letter "tried to go right over the heads of the faculty association. We don't know what the administration intends by it. I suppose it is some kind of quasi-offer."

In the letter, Ross argued that any salary settlement must be contingent upon the provincial budget which sets a basic value for the university's operating grants formula. He stated the budget is not expected until late March or early April.

If the basic value is increased by 4.5 per

cent, Ross wrote, the faculty might expect a 10 per cent salary increase. If it is 5.5 per cent, they might expect 12 per cent.

A member of the association executive, who asked not to be identified, said, "The Ross letter is irrelevant. It is also meaningless, because he says the increase may be used to hire new professors, not to pay the present staff more."

Olson said his association is preparing a detailed statement of its demands and the university budget for distribution to all faculty members next week.

"It will explain why we think the full amounts we seek are within the ability of the university to pay," he said.

The faculty negotiating committee has reviewed the university budget, although it took the university administration from last July until February to produce it, he said.

Other association sources said the budget was only produced after a threat to censure the vice-president (finance), Bruce Parkes, despite a board agreement last year to permit the faculty association access to the budget.

"We are prepared for serious, continuous negotiations," Olson said. "We have not found a corresponding attitude on the board."

University of Toronto professor Charles Hanley, executive vice-chairman of the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Association, spoke at the meeting and defended the York association's demands for a 20 per cent increase.

He said afterwards his group's salary formula contains four anti-inflationary factors, built in well before any government wars on inflation.

The formula freezes 1969-70 salaries at their present levels, although in 1968-69, mid-year increases of 4-8 per cent were common.

Claims for loss of purchasing power in 1969-70 are not retroactive, but only apply to 1970-71 salaries. "We are deferring for 12 months our claims for losses due to inflation," he said.

Benefits from increased national productivity, as measured by the Gross National Product, are similarly deferred 12 months. "We are only trying to get our share a year after the improvement," he said.

"Finally, we are holding the line on increases until July. Businesses have only offered the federal Prices and Incomes Commission a two month lag price freeze."



STROUD GOT IT

York president Murray G. Ross presents the Yeoman of the Year Award to hockey captain Murray Stroud at the Men's Athletic Committee banquet last Wednesday.

Excalibur - Tim Clark

Nat. Sci. students win in bid for optional final

By BOB WALLER

Natural Science 176A students effected an eleventh-hour compromise last week in their bid to provide an option to the compulsory final exam.

In a meeting between the NS176A negotiating committee and the first year general education interdisciplinary committee on Thursday afternoon, the students agreed to scrap their demand for the option of a pass/fail grade with no final exam in favor of a final letter grade based on the previous term work, pending "satisfactory" completion of a course critique.

The meeting of the general education committee was asked by arts dean John Saywell the day before to deal with the NS176A dispute with a view to deciding on what action it should recommend the arts faculty exam board take on final standing if any students in the course refused to write the compulsory final.

However, during the meeting, science professor C.A. Hooker and three members of the negotiating committee worked out the final compromise, one which Hooker felt would be acceptable to course director James A. Burt.

The compromise met support from the general education committee, a multi-faculty group, who earlier had shown considerable hesitation and confusion about developing a recommendation which would in any way endorse the pass/fail option.

Fine arts assistant dean J.G. Green said that "if there is any change from existing regulations, it would have to affect all first courses.

"If Natural Science 176A goes open, I'll have 250 students in Humanities 175 charging down Burton aisles at me asking for the same thing," he said.

Burt was called to the meeting after about two hours of discussion to find out his opinion on the suggested compromise. Although he maintained his original position against changing the evaluation system at this late date, he was convinced to acquiesce to the compromise on the condition that it would be specified that the non-graded critique be of high academic quality.

The question of the final evaluation in Natural Science 176A was discussed at a meeting of the General Education Committee on Thursday, March 19. As a result of this meeting, the course director and students of NS176A agree that students shall have the opportunity of either:

(i) writing the final examination and earning a course grade in the normal course of events, or

(ii) writing a critique of the course which shall be evaluated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory, having as their final grade, the grade earned in the course without the final examination, provided that the critique is evaluated as satisfactory failing which a supplemental examination will be levied. (It should be noted that the grade assigned to students in this category will be an average of the grade for the first term examination and that for either a term essay or an oral research project/book oral research project).

The course director and students of NS176A recognize that the objective of the ungraded option is to offer a useful critique of the present course. As such it is expected:

The general education committee then struck an action committee of philosophy chairman John Yolton, Hooker and the students to define the critique. If the next day (Friday) the sub-committee's definition was satisfactory to Burt, the compromise would go into effect.

The compromise was effected and the NS176A class was informed of this at the end of their Monday lecture.

At that time Burt warned: "The second option is not easy and the exam is not a snap exam. It will

require studying. The essay/critique is similar to an exam. I suggest strongly if you are a marginal or average student it is not easier and will not have the built-in safeguards of the final exam."

Earlier, Burt and the science curriculum committee had refused to change the form of final evaluation to accommodate the demands of the students.

The science faculty argued that they would not change anything without Burt's approval and Burt argued that "it's a good suggestion

but at this point in the game, there is no way to accept it."

The rejection by science on Wednesday last week followed two days of complex meetings between the NS176A negotiating committee and Saywell, science dean Harold I. Schiff and Burt.

At one point after a meeting with Schiff, the original demands were rejected for a time in favor of an optional letter-graded critique. The students later reverted to a modification of their first set of demands.

Preceding last week's conciliation talks, the Science, Technology and Society course had labored through almost four months of wrangles over course organization, content and finally the validity of a final exam.

On Friday, March 13, about 40 students walked out of a lecture in protest after Council of the York Student Federation academic affairs commissioner Joe Polonsky initiated in-lecture discussion on the course's problems.

Representatives of the students who walked out went immediately to see Saywell about the course but as he wasn't in talked to arts associate dean W.W. Piepenberg and arranged a meeting for the following Tuesday with Saywell.

When the student negotiating committee attempted to gain time in the Monday lecture to explain about the meeting the next day with Saywell, Burt refused. The class was then disrupted and Burt left.

About 80 students remained to discuss the course and endorsed the pass/fail option demand to be taken to Saywell next day.

Course proposal for NS176A

(i) that the critique will display clear evidence of a thoughtful and critical analysis of the field (namely, science, technology and society and the relations between them)

(ii) that the critique will make clear during its progress, that the writer understands or has made a determined effort to understand, the material offered in the course, in particular the essential nature of science and technology and the relations between them, with some detail drawn from the second term's work by way of illustrating his point of view

(iii) that the critique is aimed at providing a viable alternative course which would, in the writer's mind, cover the matter more adequately. Suggested syllabus and areas of accompanying reading would normally be part of his task.

Disagreements, if any, between students and course director as to the merits of the critiques offered will be referred to a committee of the Natural Science Division and the students involved will, where appropriate be consulted.

The date of submission of the critique was not discussed but the Natural Science Division feels the most logical date to be the day of the written examination.