

**To:** Academic Programs Committee of University Council  
c/o Cathie Fornssler  
Planning and Priorities Committee of University Council  
c/o Sandra Calver  
Janusz Kozinski, Dean  
College of Engineering

**From:** Richard Evitts, Head  
for In Scope Members, Department of Chemical Engineering

**Date:** June 10, 2010

**Re:** College of Engineering – Department Restructuring

The purpose of this memorandum is to illustrate the views of the Faculty Members of the Department of Chemical Engineering on the merger of the Chemical Engineering and Agricultural and Bioresource Engineering Departments. As a supplement to my memorandum dated June 2 that reflected my personal views on the restructuring, this memorandum is being written on behalf of all in scope Chemical Engineering Faculty Members. Most of my colleagues agree with me that the principle of a merger between the two departments warrants consideration and they can see the potential development of synergies and collaborations between the two academic units. However, these colleagues, along with those who are opposed to the merger, feel that an appropriate process has not been followed. In particular all members do not see a well defined plan beyond the July 1, 2010 merger date and would prefer to spend another year to initiate and complete the planning process at the department level before an official merger.

The Department has met on several occasions including the March 24 meeting where we voted on changing our name to Chemical and Biological Engineering. A majority of faculty members agreed to the principle of changing our name, but many were only in favour of this change taking place providing that sufficient resources are given to the new Department to offer a Biological Engineering program (see attachment on vote).

The in scope members of the Department also met on June 1 and 7, 2010, to consider the merger. I have attached the minutes of these meetings, as requested by the members of the Department, but have replaced the names of faculty members with “Prof 1”, “Prof 2”, etc. At the June 1 meeting, where 8 members were present, a motion was presented to not support the merger intended to take place on July 1, 2010. The motion passed unanimously (7-0 excluding Department Head, who did not vote as per normal protocol). The concerns of the faculty members can be read in the minutes. At the June 7 meeting, which took place after the College’s financial restructuring announcement, similar

concerns were voiced. Again, I have attached the minutes of this meeting. I have also attached an email message on this merger from a Departmental faculty member sent as part of our discussion on the matter to all other in scope Department members.

If you need further clarification on the viewpoint of the in scope members of the Department of Chemical Engineering on this matter please contact the Department Head of Chemical Engineering to arrange a meeting with all Faculty Members to discuss this with you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. W. A.', written in a cursive style.

Signed on behalf of in scope Chemical Engineering Faculty Members

**Notice of Motion for March 24: that the department recommend the college and university approve a change of name from Department of Chemical Engineering to Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering.**

**Amendment to the Motion: that the name change to Chemical and Biological Engineering take effect July 1, 2011, subject to provision of sufficient faculty, staff, lab space, and funding from the existing Agricultural and Bioresource Engineering Program.**

**Votes on original motion (based on time vote received) unless otherwise stated**

1. I voted "yes" to the amended motion.
2. I am in favor of the name changing of new department of Chemical and biological engineering. Basically it is a Yes vote.
3. . . .on the Department Name Change, my vote for the original motion is "Yes". Should there be a need to vote on the amended motion my vote would be "No".
4. (a) Hello Richard, please change my vote to "OPPOSED".
5. I vote for the motion (not for the amendment...).
6. Richard, I vote in favour of the amended motion.

**Votes on amended motion unless otherwise stated**

7. My vote is: yes.
- 4 (b) Good Morning Richard, I have decided to vote and my vote is "FOR" the amended motion. My fingers are crossed that this will be a positive change in direction for chemical engineering.
8. Richard, I support the motion
9. Richard, regarding the motion below, my vote is NOT in favor.
10. Hi Richard, I will vote No to the amended motion.
11. I oppose the name change

## **Department of Chemical Engineering**

### **ChE 2010.6 MINUTES OF MEETING**

**June 1, 2010, 2:00 p.m. – 1C102 Engineering**

#### **1. Proposed Department Merge**

- The Dean presented the case for the department merger to the Academic Programs Committee of Council. They were receptive to one department with two programs, but requested letters from the two departments and College of Agriculture and Bioresources indicating support of the proposed merger. Email responses from Prof 1 and Prof 2 were received prior to the meeting. Prof 1 felt no administrative plan was in place. The College believes a plan cannot be created until the new department is in place. Prof 2 was opposed to the process, which should be slowed down. He believes there is merit to a merger if done correctly and if it came into effect July 1, 2011. Faculty members were also concerned with the process and believe the Dean's Office is now requesting rubber stamp approval. Concerns with accreditation, resources, and faculty and staff were never answered by the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office indicated new letters of offer would be issued July 1, and faculty must request where they would be housed within the College. The Dean will meet with AP Committee of Council June 2. Agreement within the department must be found to determine what would be stated in the letter to Council. The College will release their plan Thursday, but does not include information about a plan for the new department. With no departmental plan, difficulties are foreseen in implementing the College's plan. A letter must be ready for council by 10:00 a.m. June 2. Faculty members were uncomfortable supporting an unknown. The Dean also requested the letter be sent directly to him. Faculty members felt the letter should be sent to C. Fornssler with a cc to the Dean.
- The letter of support will outline concerns with accreditation and lack of resources. The name change to a program automatically requires a new accreditation visit. With an Ag/Bio Department housed in Chemical Engineering, new students would enter the Biological Engineering program. The College does not plan to eliminate the Ag/Bio program, but there is a general feeling in the College the program will not survive. The Biological Engineering program proposed by ABE is an effort to revive the program and attract more students. The departments also did not receive enough consultation from the Dean's Office. Generally department members oppose the merge as it could weaken the department. The department head will summarize the different views into one document to be submitted to the Academic Programs Committee. It is important the Academic Program Committee listens to concerns expressed by both departments.

**Motion (Prof 3/Prof 4):** Chemical Engineering does not support the merger of Chemical Engineering and Agricultural and Bioresource Engineering. In favour – 7  
Opposed – 0. Carried.

- All concerns should be sent by email to the department head by 5:00 p.m. today. He will compile a letter listing everyone's opinions in favour and opposed to the Dean's Office proposed merger. The final draft will be circulated to faculty members for approval. The letter will be sent to C. Fornssler (Academic Programs Committee of Council) with a cc to the Dean.

## 2. **Other Business**

- The College is seeking feedback on promotion and tenure standards. A sheet was circulated for information.

- The University's Employee Picnic will take place June 16 from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. in the bowl.

Meeting adjourned 3:30 p.m.

**Department of Chemical Engineering**

**ChE 2010.6  
MINUTES OF MEETING**

**June 7, 2010, 9:00 a.m. – 1C70 Engineering**

**1. Proposed Department Merge**

- The Academic Programs Committee requested, in addition to the memo with the Department Head's views, a letter on behalf of the department with everyone's views on the proposed merge. The letter will include the Minutes from the meeting of June 1 with references to individual names removed. Individual email comments from faculty will also be included without names. Specific references will be made to the College's lack of a plan including how to deal with graduate students currently in the programs. The College planned the cutbacks but has no plan for the future. The College will renew the two term technical positions for a short term. The March motion recommending a name change will be included and the Dean's refusal to acknowledge the motion. The merger proposal will go to council June 17 and faculty members can attend and speak in favour or against the proposal. Faculty members agreed the letter will be sent directly to the Academic Programs Committee c/o Cathie Fornssler.
  
- The departments need to establish task forces to create joint plans for implementation July 1, 2010 in the event Council approves the proposal. The College's constitution and CRC will also need to be changed.

Meeting adjourned 9:45 a.m.

## Letter from a CHE Faculty Member 1 Regarding Merger

I wanted to communicate my thoughts on this letter that is being requested from our department.

My overarching comment is the following: if we are uneasy about this and want to slow down the merger, this is our last chance. We have given up our power position consistently. If we feel that there are too many details yet to be worked out for July 1 of this year, then this letter needs to communicate clearly that we DO NOT support the July 1 2010 merger.

In terms of my own position, I do not support the merger as of July 1 and as you know this has been my consistent position since all this began. There is not enough time and there is no coherent plan. Given retirements and sabbaticals and administrative commitments by many of us, the expectation is quite simply unreasonable from a human and an academic perspective. There is the potential for long term damage to our program through a reduced reputation emanating from unhappy students by forcing this through now.

Some specific comments that should be in the letter to Council from our department...

1. No administrative plan is in place – who will do what administratively between Jean, Kelly and whoever is in Ag & Bio, given that there will be cuts in positions? We acknowledge that (apparently) resources have been committed by Central Admin to aid in the transition, but how (if) these will be doled out and for what purpose has yet to be even discussed at a most basic level. Remember, July 1 is only 1 MONTH AWAY.
2. We as faculty do not know how this merger affects us professionally. Will letters of offer be re-issued? Will we be teaching service courses in the College of Ag? Will some of us even become redundant? We simply do not know and have been left in the dark in spite of numerous requests for clarification. It is not reasonable for the faculty on the ground who will be left to implement this to say yes blindly. We simply should not be expected to accept that and as academics who are hired and get paid to think and question, we must ask these questions and expect the answers to be clearly given.
3. Graduate students – how are these managed jointly between the departments, including Thorvaldson Fund money? What admin support in terms of Graduate admissions will be forthcoming for a larger, merged department in the face of net resource cuts.
4. “Majority vote of Engineering Assembly” was 26-20 or 56.5% in favor. If the question is asked around our table this afternoon, what would our department vote – the department that is the most affected? Let’s do that vote and put it in the letter. For the record, I vote no for the July 1 merger. What about the 44.5% of the Assembly who voted “no”. How are their voices heard and what are their concerns? This is not a landslide vote in favor. Was this communicated to the Academic Programs Committee? I did not see it in the letter from Cathie Fornssler.
5. On the topic of voting, the vote that we held in our department was confounded due to interference from the Dean. To say that due process was followed is disingenuous. As an autonomous department, our efforts to come up with a process and hold a democratic

vote were manipulate and then the wording of the outcome was further manipulated to make it seem like there was full-fledged department support.

6. Accreditation – the last I knew there was a last-minute meeting of our College Committee to look at accreditation implications. Has a quantitative assessment been carried out? I don't see how it could be. With a return visit from the CEAB in February, we are taking an unnecessary risk.

All of us will have to come to our own decision. I am expressing my views here in light of my absence this afternoon. You can take or leave whatever you like from this email, but it would not be in my nature to not express as clearly as possible the significant concerns that I have about all of this one last time.