



Partridge's image of Partridge, without cape and white charger since his mass meeting.

## Protest registered with CAUT over Partridge manoeuvre

A broken agreement has resulted in a strong protest to the Canadian Association of University Teachers from Toby Graff and William Goede, two faculty members whose contract non-renewals are under appeal to CAUT.

President Bruce Partridge broke an agreement with CAUT last Friday when he took Assistant Dean of Arts and Science William Gordon with him to the national executive meeting of the organization.

Early last week Partridge had asked CAUT if he could appear before them during consideration of the cases of Tikam Jain, Graff, and Goede. He also expressed a desire to bring with him Gordon and History chairman James Hendrickson, both of whom were billed by Partridge as "Authors" of the UVic Tenure Document.

CAUT replied that he could bring Arts and Science Dean John Climenhaga with him, vetoing the addition of Gordon and Hendrickson, after CAUT discovered they were not the Tenure Document authors.

Former Faculty Association president Dr. I. Pal of Economics and Political Science Assistant Professor Richard Powers were in fact the authors of the document, Powers having more to do with writing and negotiating the document than any other single individual. He was not invited to travel back to Ottawa with Partridge.

Despite Partridge's reluctant agreement with CAUT not to bring Gordon, it was Gordon and Assistant to the President J. Trevor Mathews on the plane with Partridge.

The Colonist Friday reported that Partridge was on his way back east with one other member of the administration. The statement was attributed to Jim Currie, another Partridge assistant.

Mathews also functions as Secretary to the Board of Governors.

## Math student wins B.Sc. despite credit deficiencies

The faculty of Arts and Science has granted a BSc degree to a third year Mathematics student despite a shortage of 14 units of course work.

A report to a faculty meeting last week recommended granting the degree on the grounds that the student has satisfied all other requirements and has also done some graduate work. He is reported to be an outstanding student, fully capable of graduate work.

The student, Kent Brothers, nephew of Education Minister Donald Brothers, won the Governor-General's Medal during his last year of high school.

Another student, Patrick O'Neill, will graduate from UVic this spring after only two years at UVic with an honors degree in Psychology.

O'Neill was accepted to UVic two years ago under the "mature student" provision in the calendar, since he had only a grade 9 education. Since that time he has taken 18 units of work per winter session, as well as 6 units for two summers. Psychology department head Dr. Lex Milton has arranged for O'Neill to complete an honors thesis and a special course during May and June, and O'Neill will complete his final six units in summer session.

O'Neill has already been accepted into graduate school at Yale.

The Martlet was unable to ascertain the reasons why O'Neill was not granted a degree in a like manner to Brothers, since they are both doing outstanding work. The Martlet was also unable to ascertain the reasons why Brothers was granted the degree without having attended

summer session or otherwise making some attempt to complete all degree requirements in a shorter period of time than the normal four years, as O'Neill has done.

And finally, the Martlet was unable to ascertain why Brothers couldn't have been accepted directly into graduate school at UVic on the basis of his performance and knowledge of the material, without faculty having to grant him a SBSc.

The faculty motion was the result of a report from a special committee struck by Dean Climenhaga to consider the one case.

The committee members were Dr. G. Bertram, Dr. D. Maclaurin, Dr. R. Roy and Associate Dean Dr. P. Smith.

The faculty resolution will be considered by Senate at its next meeting. The vote at the Arts and Science meeting was 19 in favour, 11 opposed and 17 abstentions.

## Dean resignation fumbled

UVic's administration began a search for a new man to take the position of Dean, Faculty of Education before the present Dean, F. T. Tyler, had officially resigned.

An ad appeared in the Jan. 19th issue of the Daily Colonist calling for applications for the post of Dean, but the Executive Assistant to the President, J. E.

Currie, said last Friday (Feb. 26) that he had yet to see an "official letter of resignation."

"Tomy knowledge there's not been an official letter," said Currie, but "It's understood that he's retiring."

Tyler, however, said that there was a letter, and that it had been "approved by by the Board of Governors".

The Dean refused to say when the letter had been sent, but did say that it had "been taken care of."

Tyler said that he was resigning as Dean because he'll be "going on a leave of absence next year," and when he returns he'll be at retirement age.

Continued on last page

## UNDISPELLED RUMOURS FOR THE TRUTH CENTRE

The Board of Governors apparently have given all those up for Senior Lectureships an extra year without prejudice to their further employment here. All except for Toby Graff that is. It seems that Partridge is sticking by his guns by saying that the Philosophy Department has no need for a Senior Lecturer. What he hasn't realized yet is the fact that the interpretation he's given to the position is improper procedure according to the tenure document. Rumour also has it that the various Deans of UVic wanted all, including Graff, to get the extra year.

In other business, we'll bet our back page that Ian McTaggart-Cowan, Dean of Graduate Studies at UBC, was to be the new Academic Vice-President and heir apparent of UVic. He's the brother of infamous Simon Fraserite President Patrick McT-C who left in a hurry after the first student unrest. It looks like Ian has changed his mind though.

By the way, why have none of the sixteen people who sat on the presidential screening committee risen to Dr. Richard Power's challenge to state whether or not they knew the meaning of Partridge's "degrees"? Rumour has it that they're too embarrassed.

A lot of faculty members are resigning from positions around here. One of them, Dr. Fields, has been chattering of Biology for years. Could his resignation have anything to do with the fact that the new Biology Building has no salt water system when 90 percent off the work will be with salt water? Could it have something to do with the controlled exhaust system that's been installed? Apparently the system is not acceptable for inflammable gases, while most of the work will result in inflammable gas by-products. Rumour also has it that Fields got no support from Partridge on these matters. Fields apparently learned his resignation had been accepted when a Colonist reporter contacted him.

One of the other people resigning is Education Dean Fred Tyler. ... There was a classified ad in the local papers advertising for a Dean of Education before the administration had even received a letter of resignation. Other people leaving include former English Department Head Roger Bishop and Classics Associate Professor John Carson.

Last week's Joint Faculties Meeting was moved up one day (to Thursday) so that Partridge could reportedly get a vote of confidence before he traipsed back to Ottawa to see CAUT. As it turned out, it wasn't in the stars. Apparently it looked like a close vote and Bruce didn't want to take the chance. The meeting was the shortest on record (four minutes) as Partridge forsook the privilege of a President's report and asked for adjournment. Perhaps he was worried that instead of the "neutrals" moving confidence in him, some ostreporous "dangerous element" would move non-confidence.

Rumour has it that some self-styled "neutrals" in the faculty and administration are trying to gather support for President Partridge through "fact-finding" meetings of a select few. In order to further elucidate these neutrals and other interested readers of the Martlet, an analysis of the present situation and some background are undoubtedly in order.

The Universities Act of B.C. gives broad and far-reaching powers to the Board of Governors, spreading over the "management, administration, and control of property, revenue, business, and affairs of the University." But there is one thing they cannot do. They cannot appoint, promote or remove a faculty member except on the recommendation of the president of the university. Clause 56 of the Act defines the duties of the president to generally supervise and direct the academic work of the university. As well, he is expected to perform various other functions as the chief executive officer of the university.

### Partridge is not qualified

Two important points are raised here. First, the president must possess the knowledge and experience that will qualify him to direct the academic work of the university. This is possible only when the president has been involved in academic decision-making processes at departmental and faculty levels for some years during his career. This kind of experience cannot be gained from engaging in the activities of The National Association of Educational Buyers or the Association of University and Business Officers. Regardless of his "worthless degrees", it is clear that Partridge does not qualify on the basis of his previous activities.

The second point concerns the sharing of power between the Board of Governors and the president on academic appointments, promotions and tenure. Neither can act without the other. This aspect of the Universities Act can only be regarded as a safeguard against arbitrary action by either the board or the president. Under the present system, the board consists of members of the community and members from the alumni, and the president is the sole representative of faculty on the board.

Notice to the faculty member of the president's recommendation concerning reappointment, promotion or tenure does not constitute the board decision, or the "university" decision, as Partridge is fond of referring to it. Yet this is how Partridge has represented his recommendation in some cases.

### Procedures must be fair

None of the above indicates that Partridge can act in the manner of "I am the LAW" regarding his recommendations. Anyone even superficially acquainted with legal and academic philosophies can appreciate the importance of this point.

In order to formulate his recommendations regarding appointment, promotion or tenure, the president must rely on the judgement of those best qualified within the discipline concerned, both within the university and outside.

He must also make sure that his advisors make an objective evaluation rather than rely on personal preferences and antipathies.

Obviously, a set of guidelines regarding fair procedures seems justified. Over the last twenty years, and under the guidance of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), most Canadian universities have developed a set of procedures relating to these matters and incorporated them into their tenure documents. The University of Victoria is no exception.

That tenure documents have become an integral part of Canadian academic life is exemplified by a recently published set of guidelines of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), an association of university presidents. Their guidelines suggest that "where such documents do not exist, to the satisfaction of governing bodies, teaching staff and students, we urge that their preparation be undertaken."

# OF CABBAGES AND KINGS AND TENURE DOCUMENTS

Since the Tenure Document is the product of human endeavour, it is unavoidably subject to flaws and errors of judgement. Given good faith on the part of the administration, however, it is reasonable to assume that the weaknesses of the Document would be used in favour of, rather than against, faculty members up for reappointment, promotion or tenure. Good faith and reasonableness are the *sine qua non* of "the encouraging degree of harmony" which, as Partridge has reportedly told the CAUT, The University of Victoria has achieved under his leadership. Whether or not these standards have been met can be determined by a discussion of the three cases that have gone to the CAUT.

### "Gentlemen's Agreement"

Clearly, it is unthinkable that the president would act concerning recommendations other than in the way prescribed by the Tenure Document. Although an over-riding power resides in the president and the board, the Tenure Document is a result of negotiations between the board and faculty, and more or less an extra-legal "gentlemen's agreement", is recognized by both to be a set of guidelines to be followed in the consideration of appointments, promotion, and tenure decisions of faculty.

### Different issues involved

One of the very few statements that Partridge has made which does not require refutation is that the three cases are different. They differ in the following manner, in the context of the Tenure Document:

- Graff: the issue of Senior Lecturer
- Goede: the issue of criteria of teaching and research in tenure decision
- Jain: the issue of natural justice regarding the charge of incompatibility

The Tenure Document says that to be eligible for the position of Senior Lecturer, a person must have a "demonstrated record of distinguished teaching or applicable related professional experience" (clause 3.6). Initial appointment may be made at this rank (clause 5.3) and, a regular full-time Lecturer may be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer where such a position has been established (clause 6.7). It is clear from the document that some lecturers may not qualify for promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor, in which case they may be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer. Two questions arise from this. First, why was the position included as one of various academic ranks, and second, how is this position to be established.

### A faculty member attempts to separate

the wheat from the chaff  
in the current non-renewal crisis.

### Part I of a series

It's been four years since what has come to be known as the "Tarleton-Schwartz Affair" threatened to turn the university upside-down over the issue of tenure and procedures regarding reappointments and promotions. That crisis, more than any other single event, led the University of Victoria to an intense re-evaluation of the Tenure Document, the result being a new document hailed as a solution to tenure problems. It's becoming increasingly apparent that the new Tenure Document is not working the way it was meant to. To blame the current controversy over the "faculty 12" on the current Tenure Document is futile; the document is only words on paper. What is important, and what is behind the current dispute, is the spirit of the document and whether President Bruce Partridge and his Deans are using the document in the interests of the university. In this article, the claim is made that they are not, that the president and his administrators are abusing the document.

One would think that the second question could be disposed of by simply saying that the position must be established in the framework of the same procedures which are the *raison d'être* of the tenure document; after all, two appointments were made to this rank at this university immediately following the agreement on the tenure document without any procedural difficulties! But unfortunately this has not been the case. The new president and the new dean of Arts and Science took the view that in order to establish the position the department concerned must be able to convince them that it has special needs for someone to teach survey or service courses. They also insist that Senior Lecturer will be required to teach 1 2/3 times the normal teaching load of an Assistant Professor in the same department and further shall not be eligible for sabbatical leave, etc. All this was entirely contrary to the criteria of eligibility for the position in the Tenure Document and the conditions under which the two Senior Lecturers referred to above were appointed. This stand taken by the administration must therefore be considered a deliberate move to impose an interpretation of the Tenure Document on the faculty that is not consistent with the Document as it now stands.

### Senior Lecturer "escape-valve"

The inclusion of the Senior Lecturer rank in the Tenure Document was in order to provide an "escape-valve" for those Lecturers who may not fulfill the normal criterion of a PhD but who may be regarded as valuable full-time academic appointees. But the administration position has the effect of creating a group of second class citizens within the university. In the name of making sure that this rank does not become the dumping ground of non-PhD's, as some people in high offices have been heard to say, the administration set out with a vengeance to debase the position of Senior Lecturer. It is probably too much to expect that the administration could have adopted a straightforward position of hiring only those who have completed their PhD. This leads us to the next question. Why have the rank at all?

### "Blue document" background

Part of the explanation for this question, and an important part, can be found in the history of this institution. The old Tenure Document of Victoria College, the so-called "blue document", defined three positions at the lower rank as Instructor I, Instructor II and Senior Instructor. There was a provision in this document for promotion to the rank of Senior Instructor from that of Instructor I, unless of course the appointment as Instructor I was to be terminated after seven years service at this rank.

A revised draft of the "blue document" prepared in early 1967 provided for the regular classification of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, and it also provided for the special position of Lecturer for those who do not possess the usual qualifications for regular appointments, or whose special experience qualifies them for appointment to this position.

Then came the Report of the President's Committee of Inquiry, the so-called "Summer Committee Report" of September 1967. The purpose of that report was to suggest changes in procedures of academic appointments so that the type of crisis that rocked this campus a few years ago could be avoided. The classification of ranks, including Senior Lecturer, given in the existing Tenure Document was taken from this report. It is clear therefore that throughout the years an opening has been kept for talented persons in this university who do not possess the normal qualifications, to be promoted from within the ranks. Appointments at this rank were made from time to time on the recommendation of the department concerned. Those who held these positions were held as equals to other faculty. There was no fear of the position being a dumping ground for non-PhD's, and no quibbling on rules for this position. But then it must be taken into consideration that we did not have a pedantic president — "A distinguished academic administrator" as he calls himself, whatever it means, with 20-odd years of experience of balance sheets and educational buying.

### Administration distorts position

Nowhere else in Canada, wherever the tenure document exists, have governing bodies tried to define the teaching load in terms of hours. But our board did, last March, over the position of Senior Lecturer. However, even at this campus there is no "official" definition of teaching loads for any of the regular professional ranks. The relevant fact is not who denied what to whom at what stage of decision-making; it is that a deliberate attempt has been made to create the present situation.

The fact is that the administration deliberately distorted the purpose and nature of the position of Senior Lecturer after some appointments to this rank had already been made which had created no problems of teaching loads and "establishment" of the position.

The fact is that the Dean of Arts and Science denied Graff promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor on the grounds that Graff has not yet finished his PhD whereas during the same period he recommended for promotion to this rank one person without a PhD and for appointment three persons without PhD's.

### Some unanswered questions

Now the question is: can this be regarded as good faith on the part of the administration, especially if the Board has already extended the contracts all other candidates for the position of Senior Lecturer except Graff?

What role is the Dean of Arts and Science playing in this crisis? And what vote did this Assistant Dean of Arts and Science play? Is it accidental that what the dean suggests to the Philosophy Department as his conditions for the "establishment" of the position later turns out to be the policy statement of the Board of Governors made (apparently) on the recommendation of the President?

What role did the past president of the Faculty Association play in this matter? Why did he not act on this issue immediately and take it to his executive as the Association president is required to do, according to the Association constitution?

Is it the case that Graff was denied promotion to Senior Lecturer because the Philosophy Department failed to prove it needed the "establishment" of the position, as the president and dean say?

What about the two recommendations from the Philosophy Department to have Graff promoted to Assistant Professor? What is the "secret" information Partridge claims to have about Graff that influenced the administrative decision not to approve these recommendations?

This article continues on Thursday with an analysis of some factors in the Goede issue.

# An administrator stands up to be counted

The following is a letter sent by Mr. Floyd Fairclough of the administration to the administrators listed below. We thought we'd give his letter the wide circulation it deserves.

January 29th, 1971.

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

TO: The following named persons

FROM: Mr. F. A. Fairclough

WITHOUT PREJUDICE (OR HOPE OF FAVOUR)

How many of us would stand idly by in a crowd of people and watch some hop-head kick the brains out of an innocent citizen? Not many, in my opinion.

As a result of the latest defamation attempt by "The Martlet" to destroy this University, I think the time has come for those of us who are in the category of "thinking people" - including Faculty, students and administrators, to get off our complacent behinds and make a stand. If you don't think this type of slander affects you personally - think again.

I'm not suggesting that the simple solution to the problem is to remove this publication, and some of its publishers, from the location they now enjoy in the S.U.B. to the gutter where they belong - but I am saying that if we don't stand up and be counted, the University is liable to get the type of President in the future that it deserves.

We have a long time to live with our own conscience, and also a responsibility to society to show leadership when dealing with persons other than gentlemen and scholars. It's not just a one man job. If you agree, we must show evidence of our conviction.

Mr. J. T. Matthews      Mr. N. I. Granewall

Mr. J. E. Currie        Mr. T. W. O'Connor

Mr. R. W. McQueen    Mr. A. J. Saunders

Mr. D. G. Davis        Mr. D. W. Halliwell

Mr. G. E. Apps         Mr. W. G. Bender

Mr. P. A. Darling      Mr. E. G. Shoffner

Mr. E. R. Lloyd        Dr. L. E. Devlin

Mr. H. R. Widdifield   Mr. M. W. Davidson

cc: Vice President J. T. Kyle

Vice President R. T. Wallace

## and 9 back Partridge

This is the response to Fairclough's letter. Notice the people signing it, and compare with the circulation list of Fairclough's letter. Apparently all administrators aren't "thinking people". That is, apparently some don't agree with Fairclough, or if they do, they aren't about to sign hokey petitions.

MEMORANDUM University of Victoria  
To Mr. W. E. Ireland, Chairman

Board of Governors

From Senior Administrative Personnel

February 2, 1971

In its seven and one half years as a University, UVIC has earned a good reputation because of the concerted efforts of students, faculty and administrators.

During those formative years, student and faculty shenanigans were infrequent but were well publicized, while Victorians rarely heard from or about the Administrative staff.

Both UVIC and its President have recently been subjected to severe and unwarranted criticism in an obvious endeavour to reduce this university to the chaotic level of some lesser institutions.

The current controversy has already done irreparable harm to the President and UVIC.

As professional administrators, we urge that you take immediate and appropriate disciplinary action to save UVIC and to prevent recurrence of the recent unprincipled and malicious acts of a few misguided students and faculty.

PAD/da

cc: President, B. J. Partridge  
Vice President R. T. Wallace  
Vice President J.T. Kyle

signed by:

Peter Darling

Shirley Baker

W.M. Bender

Edward Shoffner

Edgar Lloyd

H.R. Widdifield

Gertrude Hartman

Ron Ferry

George Apps

## THE STEERING COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

The resolution sponsored by the Steering Committee, and passed by the retiring Students Council Executive last week, is to be brought before the new R.A. at its first meeting of the year.

The main part of the resolution reads as follows: "That the twelve members of faculty whose names appear below, be granted a one year extension of their existing contracts, as of 1 July 1971, without prejudice to their further employment at the University of Victoria."

"Sponsors of the move for further ratification are promoting the resolution on the basis that it represents the only clear way of heading off some inevitable confrontation on one or more individual cases, and that it would provide proper time for mediation proceedings to be developed by the Faculty Association.

# What's happening

The following is a resume of the major developments which have occurred in the series of faculty cases now at issue in UVIC.

Three cases are presently involved in CAUT procedures. These are Jain, Goede, and Graff. The CAUT Inquiry was completed on Feb. 4th., with copies of the Report of the Inquiry Committee being submitted to the profs concerned, the University, The President of the Faculty Association, and the members across Canada of the A.F. & T. Committee of CAUT. A period of ten days was initially given for the Profs, and the University to respond to the findings of the Report, and to its recommendations.

At the request of the University, an extension of the date of response to the 22nd March was granted. The A.F. & T. Committee then considered the response of the parties together with the finds and recommendation of the Inquiry Committee, and submitted it's report, in turn, to the next regular meeting of the National Executive of CAUT held in Ottawa the 26th, 27th of February. The University, about this point requested permission for the President and others to meet the National Executive at the time it would be considering the case. CAUT agreed to this meeting with some reservations as to who it wished to appear with the President, and arranged, in addition, that Prof. Harvey of the Faculty Association of Uvic would also be present.

This final meeting took place on Saturday, and it is understood that, failing implementation of the recommendations of CAUT by the parties concerned, the report of the Inquiry will be made public within a period of a week or ten days.

There is some indication that the Administration is making a strenuous case for a very restricted interpretation of the Tenure Document. This in view of the fact that there are potentially at least six more cases which could arise, each involving the same document.

There is a set of cases, Profs Atchley, Daglish, and McDougall, all of which are still before the University Review Committee.

This procedure involves a complete examination of the previous decisions which have been made in their cases. The Review Committee has the authority, on the basis of its findings, to recommend to the President that he either alter or confirm the decisions to date. The Committee's recommendation is, however, not binding on the President.

Subsequent to the President's response to the report of the Review Committee, these cases may be further appealed to CAUT under existing grievance provisions.

McDougall's case may be reported out in the near future, but it appears that Daglish and Atchley will be in the mill for at least another three weeks. With the added time available to the President to make his decision, it is unlikely that any of these can get to CAUT Inquiry before the end of term.

A third set of Profs, Kirkby, Sward, and Wynand are not involved in grievance procedures at this time. Kirkby is quite eligible to do so, but as far as is known, has not even asked for review. Sward and Wynand as visiting profs, are not in a category for which review or grievance procedures are provided. Their problem lies within the English Department and their eligibility to apply for regular teaching appointments in the rapidly expanding Creative Writing Division.

The last set of cases involves the Senior Lecturer question and concerns Profs Thompson, Hogg, Forbes, and, again Graff.

The problem here arises over an interpretation of the terms of this position. The President has chosen a point of view radically different than that maintained by the Faculty Association.

Since the denial of promotion to this position of the four profs in December last, the Administration has waged a pitched battle within the Faculty to create polarization of a majority favorable to the President's interpretation.

The culmination of this process during the last two weeks has involved a number of extraordinary meetings. These meetings took place between the President and the Deans, and, on two occasions, included the Heads and Chairmen of every department of the University.

There is no clear indication at this stage that even among the senior administrative faculty there is the necessary support for the President's position to prevail. It is perhaps significant that, on the eve of his departure for Ottawa and CAUT, the President refrained from submitting a President's Report to a meeting of the Joint Faculties of the University last Thursday. That report and it's acceptance would have provided the basis for a vote of confidence to be offered. The report was not forthcoming, and a meeting which had been deliberately moved ahead one day, in order for or the President to appear, concluded after six minutes.

## Controversial Garvie brief would radically alter Fine Arts

A brief proposing changes in structure and priorities for various departments in the faculty of Fine Arts has been presented to the Senate academic planning committee by Dean Peter Garvie and then withdrawn again.

Recommending changes in Music, Theatre, Visual Arts and Art History, the brief is expected to create a flurry of controversy among faculty and students.

One area of expected unrest is the Theatre department, which would face at least one major structural change under the brief's recommendations.

"Some courses in young people's theatre, principally for teachers, should always be offered by the theatre department, but there is a substantial feeling that any larger development than

this is more properly dramatic education."

Some 65 percent of students enrolled in the Theatre department, however, are currently studying under the developmental drama program.

The proposed change would signify a drastic change in emphasis for the entire department.

Garvie's brief also forecasts an increased student enrollment amounting to a 50 percent increase in undergraduate bodies--- and at the same time proposes to increase faculty by one, from 10 teachers at present to an anticipated final size of 11.

The brief also recommends a change in emphasis in the Visual Arts department, calling for increased involvement of students with "applied arts" and recognition of the "growing influence of technology."

Continued from page 1

## Administrative errors mar Tyler resignation

He said that after his sabbatical leave he hopes to return to UVIC in a teaching capacity.

The Colonist ad, which appeared in the "male help wanted" column, announced an "opportunity for imaginative and competent academic administrator to work with a strong, well qualified faculty of 65, in a flexible and congenial University."

A member of UVic's Women's Liberation group, Cathy Sharky, said that in all fairness the ad should have appeared in the "female help" column as well.

Currie said that the ad had appeared in the "help wanted" section by mistake, saying that it should have been "a display ad".