

University of Toronto
Department of Physics Faculty Meeting
Minutes
January 11, 2005

Attendance: 39

Chaired by: Professor Michael Luke

Minutes by: Helen Smith

<u>Item</u>		<u>Action</u>
1.	Minutes The minutes of the November 30, 2004 meeting were approved subject to the addition of motion #2 and #5 wording from previous meeting. (Changed and re-sent Jan. 14, 2005.) Motion to approve proposed by D. Bailey, seconded by Peter Krieger; none opposed. Carried.	<i>Motion</i>
2.	<u>Agenda Items</u> Discussion of external review report A brief overview of the review and its key recommendations was presented; a reply is required and should be prepared and sent to the Dean.	M. Luke
i	Challenges: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Geophysics research group is below critical mass, should it be part of a separate department?▪ Condensed matter physics research group is too small with a narrow focus.▪ Undergraduate teaching staff retirements, labs and course content issues.	
ii	What we are already doing: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Regarding governance and constitution, an ad-hoc committee has been struck and will report at the March faculty meeting. Members are M. Luke, A. Steinberg, J. Thywissen, and R. Desai.▪ Undergraduate program issues such as PHY 110Y, PHY 138Y, UG Labs, recruitment of best students, will be addressed in a planning meeting with M. Luke, D. Bailey, the UG Curriculum committee and interested faculty.	
iii	Graduate program: <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Curriculum reform underway.▪ Application deadline has moved back to January 31st.▪ Stipend support has increased.▪ Student space has been refurbished.	
	Questions re Geophysics:	
a)	<i>Discussion of Geological Sciences was never raised at meetings with geophysics faculty at the time of review. What was the reviewers' mandate? Were they advised in advance to consider this recommendation?</i> Not as far as we know.	
b)	<i>Do you, as Chair, like the idea of splitting off the Geophysics group to Geology in general, or splitting geophysics and atmospheric to Earth Sciences?</i> Faculty recruitment of graduate students as criteria indicates a good group. This point is not in the document, so not for discussion.	
	Comments:	
c)	The issue of geophysics forming a separate institution or department arises from graduate recruitment issues. However, younger geophysics faculty have 4-5 graduate students.	
d)	Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Science institutes are the new concept, not moving the group to Geology, which is arcane. It was noted that the problem rests with the Planning Committee in the Department where Geophysics has been moved to a lower priority. The Geophysics group must justify hiring replacements for retirees, for example.	

<u>Item</u>		<u>Action</u>
e)	I did not interpret this as an indication that a split should happen. If there is no problem with graduate recruitment then Geology would gain a strong group.	
f)	Institutes are being developed, do we need another institute just so there is an Earth Sciences listing in the calendar.	
g)	Earth group withdrawal would weaken the Undergraduate Program.	
	Questions re graduate students:	
h)	<i>Is it measurably true that we are losing graduate students?</i> We are having no trouble attracting international graduate students. Students are avoiding the USA. It is my impression that we are not attracting or graduating as many graduates from Canada.	J. Drummond
	Comments:	
i)	North Western stipend pays \$21,000. We have increased stipends and fellowships. Disparity of support not addressed by motions passed in last faculty meeting, reviewers picked up on this.	
j)	Chicago and UofT support is equal dollar for dollar given the cost of living.	
k)	International students are a source of revenue; students perceive that higher costs are indicative of a better quality university. This is a UofT strategy also.	
l)	A slipping reputation mentioned in the review is a damaging comment, no basis or evidence was supplied. A hard response should be prepared to counter this perception.	
m)	Students go to UBC when they do not accept UofT offer, we would have to look at this quantitatively. The reason students go to UBC is that they do not want to live in Toronto.	
n)	UBC is making an effort to be better in some research areas i.e. cosmology.	
o)	UBC is focussing on complex systems and broader fields, therefore they are attractive in non-traditional fields.	
p)	UBC CMP group is bigger than UofT, six T-CMP faculty in traditional fields.	
q)	It was noted that UBC was on the agenda of a faculty meeting 11 years ago and there was a vote at that meeting to increase stipends.	
r)	Some recommendations of the review are not in keeping with UofT policy, such as 10 year plan versus a five year plan.	
	Comments re governance:	
s)	Is there a sense of what other departments do with their Planning Committees, we should cross-reference with 2 or 3 other science departments.	
t)	Junior faculty need to be involved in the planning process, the present structure consists of representatives from each research group.	
u)	Regarding the Planning Committee, there are intermittent problems in five year spikes, the reviewers may be suggesting a different strategy and vision. Status quo plans are hurting the department, need to break out of the box and become un-entrenched.	
v)	It was proposed to continue the discussion at the next faculty meeting on Feb. 22.	M. Luke
w)	Regarding a response to the review, there are three options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Response from the dept. immediately ▪ Prepare a response for next year, or ▪ Decanal response in collaboration with the new Chair. 	P. Sinervo
3.	Discussion of Physics Chair search process	P. Sinervo
i.	There are two issues to discuss regarding the Chair search: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategy ▪ Process and selecting 	
ii.	We worked on the ad and strategy for a senior hire. There is a strategy for outreach to possible candidates. The committee will meet on Feb. 10 th to review all candidates, develop a shortlist and interview schedule.	
iii.	There are approximately five interested candidates. Please contact Pekka Sinervo if you have suggestions for other candidates. We are looking for an outstanding researcher with some administrative experience, and a strong	Motion

Item

Action

- knowledge of the direction of science.
- iv. The format for the interview process, will be a two day visit and include the following:
1. Meeting with Dean
 2. Interview with search committee
 3. Meet with Administrative and Technical staff
 4. Meet with research groups
 5. Meet with faculty by rank
 6. Tour of dept., including UG Labs
 7. Meet with cognate Chairs
 8. Meet with UG students
 9. Meet with Graduate students and postdoctoral fellows
 10. Meet with Interim Chair and Associate Chairs
- v. It was suggested that the candidates also meet with teaching staff, the pre-tenured group and include a visit to UTM and UTSC.
- vi. There was a clear consensus that the candidates should give a research talk. The term for Chair is five years; therefore we are judging candidates on their research and teaching. The successful candidate will be a full professor; the search committee will be interested in views of members of the dept. who interact with each candidate. Contact Pekka Sinervo if anyone has any suggestions.
- vii. It was noted that Ken Bartlett of the Office of Teaching Advancement should meet the candidates as the new Chair will need to deal with UG issues and teaching.
- viii. Engineering Science should be one of the cognate departments.

Questions:

How will institutes be involved i.e. Optical Science, CITA.

Briefing material will be provided to each candidate.

4. Other business:

Development Officer, Ingrid Silm, will start on January 24th.

Move to adjourn by A. Peet; seconded by S. Morris.

Motion

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Next meeting: Tuesday, February 22nd 2005, 4:00 p.m. in MP211C