THE COMMUNICATOR
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY'S EMPLOYEE NEWSLETTER

February 1998

You can perform a full-text keyword search on this issue or on all on-line issues of the *Communicator*.

| Memorial Home Page | *Communicator* Home Page | Division of University Relations Home Page

THE COMMUNICATOR
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY'S EMPLOYEE NEWSLETTER

News Stories

Party gathered employees from across the campus

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

Memorial University is well on its way to creating a new annual tradition at Christmas time. This year approximately 200 Memorial employees drawn from all across the campus came together for the second annual university-wide Christmas party, held in Corte Real on Dec. 11. In addition to ringing in the holiday season, the party raised $785 for the Gary Bourne Scholarship Fund. There was music and dancing, but best of all, many people from around the university B many faculty and staff who work together, but seldom see each other face-to-face - got to meet.

Harold Squires, Budgets and Audits, was the co-ordinator of the event. "The Christmas party came about because a couple of years ago there was no Arts Building party," Mr. Squires told *The Communicator*. "People were either too busy or expected others to look after it, and the end result was that there was no party. After talking to a number of people, they all said if you start the ball rolling we'll help out. So I looked around and saw that rather than keeping it as an Arts Building party, we could turn it into a campus-wide event with help from people all across the university.

"It was the first time we got people from so many different departments involved in this party. We even had people selling tickets at the other campus sites such as the Marine Institute and the Ocean Sciences Centre."

Several individuals and organizations deserve special mention for their help in putting off the party: Jim and Elizabeth Cooper for their donation of the coffee basket, which was won by Sharon Holloway of Facilities Management; Johnson's Insurance for their donation towards the cost of the food; Molson=s Brewery for their donation of prizes; students and staff of Burton=s Pond apartments for use of their facilities, and Tony Peckham of Student Housing for the music. The winner of the $50 door prize was Mary Clarke of Human Resources.

The following people helped with the Dec. 11 Christmas party, a campus-wide effort:

Christine Burke, Faculty of Business
Mike Callahan, Computing and Communications
Lori Cook, The Opportunity Fund
Jim Cooper, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science
Stephanie Dalton, School of Nursing
Bruce Faulkner, Comptroller's Office

Mary Halliday, Marine Institute
Gerard Hayes, Student Housing
Judy Jewison , Office of the Registrar
Doreen Kane , QE II Library
Catherine Mcgrath, Office of Recruitment and Promotion
Roxanne Millan, Faculty of Arts
Karen Morgan, Human Resources
Peter Morris, Division of University Relations
Ann Noseworthy, Aquarena
Lynda Parsons, Alumni Affairs and Development
Paul Penney, School of Graduate Studies
Bernadette Power, Faculty of Education
Gary Peddigrew, Faculty of Medicine
Carm Porter, School of Continuing Education
Dave Royle, Budgets and Audits
Trevor Smith, Faculty Of Science
Pat Squires, Biology
Glenn Taylor, Printing Services
Donna Vey, School of Physical Education and Athletics
Delores Wheeler, Ocean Sciences Centre
Cynthia Whelan, Facilities Management
Wayne Yetman, Counselling Centre

Know your PA for 1997

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

The 1997 federal budget contained proposed changes to Canada's retirement savings system which will affect the 1997 Pension Adjustment (PA) calculation. The PA that is reported on a pension plan member's T-4 is a reflection of the value of the benefit earned during the year, and is used by Revenue Canada to determine an individual's room to contribute to a registered retirement savings plan (RRSP). For example, the PA calculated for 1997 must be deducted from 18 per cent of 1997 earned income (18 per cent to a maximum of $13,500) to determine the RRSP contribution limit for 1998.

In a special bulletin, issued on Dec. 23, 1997, Revenue Canada recommended that these proposed changes be put in place for calculating 1997 PAs. Specifically, the $1,000 offset amount that lowers the PA calculation, for a defined-benefit plan, will be reduced to $600 for 1997 and subsequent years. This will result in higher PAs for pension plan members, thereby reducing their RRSP room generated in a given year by $400.

Also, the special PA rules applied to the PA calculation for plan members who terminate employment before becoming entitled to a pension will be eliminated. Previously, these rules allowed the PA for a non-vested member to be calculated as the lesser of contributions paid in the year of termination or the PA calculated in the usual manner. For 1997 and subsequent years, the PA calculation for a non-vested termination will be the same as for an active employee or a vested termination.

If you have any questions on how these changes affect you, please contact Glen Roberts in the Benefits and Pensions Office at 737-4621.

Pension contribution rate increases

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

By now, employees will have seen an increase in their payroll deduction for contributions to the Memorial University Pension Plan, beginning the first pay period in 1998. This pension contribution rate increase was one of several amendments to the Memorial University Pensions Act enacted by the Provincial Legislature on Dec. 19, 1997.

Why the increase?
There are two reasons for the pension contribution rate increase, but, by far, the most significant factor has to do with the way the pension contribution formula is integrated with the Canada Pension Plan (CPP). Until now, the contribution rate to the Memorial university pension plan was 6 per cent of pensionable earnings minus the actual required contributions to the Canada Pension Plan. This formula worked well from the inception of the Canada Pension Plan in 1966 through to 1986 when the CPP rates remained constant at 1.8 per cent. In 1987, however, CPP rates began to increase and have reached 3.2 per cent for 1998. The gradual increase in CPP rates has meant a continual erosion of net contributions to the Memorial University Pension Fund over the past 11 years. In fact, the past four actuarial valuation reports of the Memorial University Pension Plan (in 1997, 1996, 1995 and 1993) showed that the rate of contribution, for both employees and the university, was not sufficient to fund the current service benefits being earned by plan members.

The contribution rate increase will effectively restore net contributions to the university pension plan in response to increasing CPP rates, thereby appropriately funding benefits being earned under the plan.

In addition, a portion of the contribution rate increase (approximately half a percent) was necessary to fund a number of benefit improvements to plan members. These benefit improvements include a reduction in the vesting period from ten to five years of pensionable service, an increase in survivor benefits from 55 per cent to 60 per cent, and an increase in the maximum pension accrual from a fixed $1,715 per year of pensionable service to coincide with the Revenue Canada maximum (currently $1,722.22 per year).

Decision-making process
The recommendation to increase the pension contribution rate arose from the University Pensions Committee. It was the result of a collaborative effort of union/employee group representatives, the university administration and the Board of Regents working together to protect the financial position of the Memorial University Pension Fund. The recommendation of the University Pensions Committee was accepted by the Board of Regents and submitted to the provincial government in October 1995. Authority was granted by the provincial legislature on December 19, 1997.

Comparison of formula - old and new
Under the amended contribution formula, employees will pay pension premiums, as follows:

- **6.565 per cent** of pensionable earnings up to and including the year's basic exemption (YBE) under the Canada Pension Plan. The YBE is that portion of earnings upon which no CPP contributions are required and is set annually by the federal government. For 1998, the YBE is $3,500 so **employees will contribute 6.565 per cent on their first $3,500 of earnings for the year.**

- **4.765 per cent** of pensionable earnings in excess of the YBE up to and including the Year's Maximum Pensionable Earnings (YMPE) under the Canada Pension Plan. The YMPE is the maximum upon which CPP contributions are required and is set annually by the federal government. For 1998, the YMPE is $36,900 so **employees will contribute 4.765 per cent on their next $33,400 of earnings in 1998 (difference between $3,500 and $36,900).**

- **6.565 per cent** of pensionable earnings in excess of the YMPE ($36,900). **On all earnings in excess of $36,900, employees will contribute 6.565 per cent.**

Based on the differing pension contribution rate at various earnings levels (as identified above), the pension deduction each pay period will not be even over the year.

While the new contribution formula may appear more complicated than before, contributions to the Memorial University Pension Plan were previously being made in much the same fashion as they are today. The illustration which follows shows the status up to 1986, how the level of net contributions to the fund had deteriorated by 1997, and the new contribution formula:

Rate Comparison

	1966-1986*	1997*	1998
Earnings up to the basic exemption under CPP	6.0%	6.0%	6.565%
Earnings covered by CPP	4.2%	3.075%	4.765%
Earnings above the CPP maximum	6.0%	6.0%	6.565%

**6% less actual contributions*

Until now, with the contribution rate to the Memorial University Pension Plan being 6 per cent less the actual amount of CPP contributions, employees always saw a total deduction of 6 per cent. As the CPP contribution rate increased, the amount being contributed to the Memorial University Pension Plan (on earnings covered by CPP) decreased. In 1997, the amount being contributed to the university pension plan dipped to 3.075 per cent on that portion of earnings covered by CPP. Without corrective action, and given projections for the rate of increase in CPP to approximately 5 per cent by 2003, only 1 per cent would be contributed to the University Pension Plan on earnings covered by CPP.

In addition to the contribution formula identified above, employees are required to pay CPP contributions on applicable earnings, $33,400 in 1998 at a rate of 3.2 per cent (up from 2.925 per cent in 1997).

The following illustrations show the pension premiums payable both under the revised contribution formula and under the formula in effect to the end of 1997.

Example 1

Annual salary $27,000	YMPE $36,900	YBE $3,500	CPP rate 3.2%
MUN Pension 1998:	NEW FORMULA		OLD FORMULA
6.565% x $3,500	$ 229.78	$27,000 x 6%	$ 1,620.00
4.765% x $23,500	1,119.78	Less CPP	752.00
	$ 1,349.56		$ 868.00
CPP 1998:			
23,500 x 3.2%	$ 752.00	$23,500 x 3.2%	$ 752.00

Example 2

Annual salary $65,000	YMPE $36,900	YBE $3,500	CPP rate 3.2%
MUN Pension 1998:	NEW FORMULA		OLD FORMULA
6.565% x $3,500	$ 229.78	$65,000 x 6%	$ 3,900.00
4.765% x $33,400	1,591.51	Less CPP	1,068.80
6.565% x $28,100	$ 1,844.77		$ 2,831.20
	$ 3,666.06		
CPP 1998:			
33,400 x 3.2%	$1,068.80	33,400 x 3.2%	$1,068.80

While it is recognized that the level of contribution rate increase to employees is significant, this action was necessary to protect the level of contributions being made to the Memorial University Pension Fund. In addition, the university's matching portion of the contribution increase creates an additional cost to the university's operating budget of approximately $1.2 million annually.

Further, as a point of comparison, the revised contribution rate under the Memorial University Pension Plan is still marginally less than that of the Newfoundland Public Service Pension Plan, which offers similar benefits to plan members.

Further details on the recent amendments to the Memorial University Pensions Act will be released shortly in a Notice to Plan Members. In the meantime, employees who wish additional information are encouraged to contact the Benefits and Pensions Office at 737-7406.

1998 tax rates

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

Canada/Quebec Pension Plan	1998	1997
Year's maximum pensionable earnings	$36,900.00	$35,800.00
Year's basic exemption Annual	$3,500.00	$3,500.00
Maximum contributory earnings	$33,400.00	$32,300.00
Contribution rate (employee)	3.2%	3.0%
Maximum contribution (employee)	$1,068.80	$969.00

Employment Insurance	1998	1997
Maximum annual insurable earnings	$39,000.00	$39,000.00
Premium rate (employee)	2.7%	2.9%
Annual maximum premium (employee)	$1,053.00	$1,131.00

The rates above came into effect with the Jan. 1, 1998, payroll. Employees who were at the maximum pensionable earnings for Canada Pension Plan (CPP) will see their 1998 contribution increase by $99.80 to $1,068.80. At the same time, the maximum premium for 1998 Employment Insurance has dropped $78 from $1,131.

Employees who had reached the maximum CPP and EI premiums in 1997 will also notice that with this first pay of 1998, these deductions have started again and will continue until their maximum contributions have been reached.

Supplementary pension arrangements for all eligible employees

---

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

[Editor's note: In 1996, Memorial University created a supplementary pension arrangement to address the problem of those members of the MUN Pension Plan who contribute premiums based on their entire salary but who are unfairly affected by benefit restrictions under the Income Tax Act. At the time of establishment, there were 15 employees, including 11 faculty members, whose salaries had reached the maximum to restrict pensions paid from the MUN plan. The following article, reprinted from Vision, the newsletter of Morneau, Sobeco, Coopers & Lybrand, one of the largest human resource and actuarial consulting firms in Canada, explores the growing trend toward organizations and companies establishing such plans.]

Even though the acronym SERP has only recently found its way into the vocabulary of pension practitioners, it is already becoming a misnomer.

SERP used to stand for Supplementary Executive Retirement Plan. It is considered Asupplementary@ because it tops up the pension provided by a registered pension plan (RPP). SERPs are needed because an RPP is restricted under the Income Tax Act in the amount of pension it can provide.

Here is where the word Aexecutive@ comes in. When the first SERPs were established in the 1970s, RPPs could provide pension on a person's earning up to a limit of $85,750. Back then, only the top executives in the larger corporations would have earned that much. To put this pensionable earnings limit into perspective, a new Buick in the early 1970s would have cost about $6,000. Today, that Buick will run closer to $30,000. As for the pensionable earnings limit, the federal government has seen fit to raise it over the last two decades from $85,750 all the way up to $86,111. And that's where it will stay until the next millennium. The best we have been told to expect is for the limit to start rising in 2004, in line with future annual increases in the average Canadian wage.

While $86,111 is a good salary for most Canadians, there are many middle managers, professional staff and sales people who are earning more. *[Editor's note: In the case of Memorial University, employees eligible for this kind of salary include faculty, some staff members and some administrators.]* As more non-executives find their pensions capped, a shift in thinking is called for. To signal this shift, let us start by thinking of SERP as standing for Supplementary EMPLOYEE Retirement Plan.

This article looks at how SERPs will likely evolve as a result of increasing participation by non-executive employees and cites some statistics that are based on a survey Morneau, Sobeco, Coopers &

Lybrand recently completed. There were 66 respondents to that survey from organizations with an average size of 1,200 employees.

Prevalence

Logically, SERPs should exist in any organization where employees are capped by the pension limit applicable to RPPs. While coverage is increasing, SERPs are still a long way from being universal, especially among small to mid-sized employers. Only 45 per cent of our survey respondents currently sponsor SERPs.

But why is coverage not higher? If the RPP is a defined benefit plan *[Editor's note: as is the case with the MUN plan]*, the current maximum pension limits under the plan are a natural form of cost containment. The path of least resistance is to continue capping pension at these limits. Positive action is required to convince senior management (or a parent company) that providing a SERP is not an extra benefit for higher paid employees -- it is merely a means of providing them the same pension formula that lower paid employees enjoy as a matter of course.

Participation in SERPs used to be based on position (e.g. executive, senior management). Our survey showed this is still the case in the majority of SERPs. *[Editor's note: MUN extends SERP to all employees whose salary falls over the Revenue Canada limit.]* Still, we expect that participation will increasingly become automatic as employees reach the threshold earnings level at which a SERP would become necessary. In other words, eligibility will become based on income rather than on position.

Our survey also showed that almost half the employers currently required SERP participants to contribute to the underlying RPP. *[Editor's note: At MUN, SERP participants already contribute premiums to the full value of the pension and any supplement to which they are entitled.]*

Watch that meter!

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

Effective Feb. 1, 1998, fines for parking offenses on campus are higher. Among the changes, fines for expired meters will increase from $10 to $12, parking without a valid permit will now cost $20, up from $10, and the fine for parking in a space designated for disabled persons jumps from $25 to $50, according to Maurice Gillingham, assistant manager of Campus Enforcement and Patrol.

There are three reasons for the increased fines, Mr. Gillingham said. Firstly, the cost of issuing a ticket has increased. The provincial Department of Justice now charges Memorial $7 for every ticket processed, up from $5.

As well, the old fines were not deterring illegal parking, Mr. Gillingham said. Many people would park illegally and take the chance on getting a ticket. He said CEP hopes the increases will lead to fewer violations.

Finally, ticket prices were increased to keep pace with changes introduced by the City of St. John=s in 1997 even though parking fines on the St. John=s campus are still lower than city fines.

For a complete list of new fines contact Maurice Gillingham, Facilities Management, 737-2046

CAUBO awards coming up

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

The Canadian Association of University Business Officers Quality and Productivity Awards deadline is approaching. CAUBO promotes the professional and effective management of the administrative, financial and business affairs of higher education. This annual awards program is designed to recognize, reward, and share university achievements in improving the quality and reducing the cost of higher education programs and services. Academic initiatives will be considered on the grounds of increased productivity and effectiveness. Increased quality of instruction alone will not be considered, since it is beyond the scope of the CAUBO mandate, and other venues exist for its recognition.

In addition to the quality and productivity awards, CAUBO is also accepting nominations for the Ken Clements Award, which honors the extraordinary contribution of Ken Clements in his 23 years as executive director of CAUBO. The award recognizes a university administrator who has made outstanding contributions to the activities of the organization. Deadline for the Ken Clements Award is March 20, 1998, and the deadline for the Quality and Productivity Awards is March 27, 1998. For further information about these awards, and for application forms, please contact the Office of the Vice-President (administration and finance) at 737-8217.

Change in worker's compensation legislation

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

As of January 1998, the income replacement rate for workers' compensation benefits has changed from 75 per cent to 80 per cent of an employee's net income. Anyone receiving benefits for less than 39 weeks will increase to 80 per cent and anyone having a claim accepted after Dec. 31, 1997, will start receiving 80 per cent of net income. As advised by the Workers' Compensation Commission, the approximate method for calculating the injured worker's benefit is as follows:

Gross Income
- EI, CPP, Income Tax
= **Net Income**
x Income Replacement Rate (80%)
= Weekly Worker's Compensation Rate
- Other deductible Benefits
= **Take Home Pay**

If there are any questions regarding any worker's compensation issue, please contact Monty Green, manager, employer and employee relations, 737-7405, or Barbara Brenton, leave management officer, at 737-7408.

---

27 paydays in 1998

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

Biweekly salaries are determined by dividing your annual salary by 26. A year (365 days), is actually longer than 26 pay periods (364 days), so every 5.33 years (considering leap years) there are 27 pay periods in a calendar year. When this occurs income tax must be withheld based on an expected annual income for 27 payrolls.

For example, if your salary is $25,000 per year, in 1998 you will actually receive $25,961.58 based on $961.54 per pay period. This results in a slight increase in your income tax paid during a 27-pay period year versus a 26-pay period year. In the example, tax on $961.54 for 26 pay periods would be $191.40 versus $195.70 for 27 pay periods. The extra tax is necessary to cover the tax on the additional income for the year. If income tax was not paid based on 27 pays, employees would have to pay additional tax at the time their tax return was filed.

MUN is moving into the new year with community support and new direction

---

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

It's been quite an eventful number of weeks since I last had the opportunity to address you in this forum. I certainly hope you and your families had a wonderful Christmas season and enjoyed our extended break. Recent positive developments with *The Opportunity Fund* have put us much closer to our ultimate goal. We also turned the page in the Faculty of Science with the resolution of the status of the former dean.

The Opportunity Fund

In one week alone in January we received $1 million in pledges towards *The Opportunity Fund*. To call this fantastic would be an understatement. The pledges all came from corporations, with over 50 per cent from Newfoundland-based businesses. This latest news means the pledges, including the government matching contribution, now stand at $40 million. We still have a way to go to get to the $50 million goal, but this is a sure sign that the message is out there and being received positively in our community. This is important as we are concentrating on Newfoundland companies and individuals in the stretch drive.

In fact, the high level of public support for *The Opportunity Fund* and for many other initiatives of Memorial University is particularly reassuring. We're doing something right. Actually we're doing many things right. The fact that the Newfoundland and Labrador public has such a high degree of faith and confidence in Memorial University is a credit to you, the people on our staff and faculty, and your dedication to our students and our community.

Dean of science

In the case of the dean of science issue, a number of misperceptions have been fuelled by media statements from the former dean, and from other individuals and groups who have chosen to become involved in the issue. It's important that students, faculty and staff know exactly what transpired. Complicating the university's efforts to fully explain its position in the matter have been media reports based on selective interpretations of what actually happened. Please note the following facts:

- In July 1997, Dr. Alan Law was informed that the senior administration and the Board of Regents, specifically the executive committee of the board, had lost confidence in his ability to lead the Faculty of Science, and he was told why. This didn't occur suddenly or because of any single matter. The problem had been building for several months and involved a number of issues.

- In such circumstances, it is common for people in executive positions (and the position of dean of science is an executive position) to offer their resignations in return for appropriate consideration.

- Dr. Law could have relinquished his position as dean, which had two years to run. The university would have continued his stipend as dean during that period. In those circumstances, Dr. Law would have continued as a tenured full professor until normal retirement age.

- Dr. Law initially took the view that it was best to leave altogether. We offered an arrangement whereby Dr. Law would be granted approximately two years salary should he wish to leave Memorial. This offer was, in my view, reasonable in the circumstances and certainly in keeping with practice in other organizations including the private sector and government. Dr. Law asked for substantially more than that to settle the matter and move out. We refused to pay substantially more. At that point, the die was cast and we followed through by setting a termination date for his duties as dean (he was still free to continue as a tenured full professor).

- Dr. Law asked for a hearing by the Board of Regents. In retrospect that should have been done. If it had been done, in my view it would not have altered the substantive conclusion based on the facts. However, this was not done and Dr. Law sued the university, with the faculty union (MUNFA) picking up some or all of his expenses.

- The suit could have been settled by reinstating Dr. Law as dean and by providing the hearing that had been previously requested. The university was prepared to do this and accept whatever the outcome.

- Both parties continued discussions toward an out-of-court settlement, and that is what ultimately happened. The settlement added approximately six months salary to what was offered last July. Dr. Law's resignation was part of that settlement. Considering a four-year scenario (to Dr. Law's normal retirement age) and the cost of replacement as a faculty member by a recent graduate, the settlement is cost-neutral.

When such difficult issues arise between employers and senior managers, not acting to correct the problem would be irresponsible. This began as a negotiated settlement and concluded as a negotiated settlement. The Board of Regents achieved what it needed and Dr. Law appears to have achieved what he wanted. Since no hearing took place, in or out of court, the substantive issues which led to the loss of confidence were never discussed in public. But they didn't go away because of the settlement and would be of continued concern had not the former dean resigned as part of the settlement.

I have been asked by the Board of Regents to investigate processes for disciplining or dismissing senior academic administrators in other universities, with a view to establishing formal procedures at Memorial, should this unusual circumstance ever recur. I expect to be able to report to the board in May.

It's now time to close this unfortunate chapter, and move on with finding a new dean of science who can establish the leadership that the Faculty of Science must have.

Budget

We are well on the way in our preparations for the next budgetary cycle. Given the known cuts to our operating budget (our grant from government in April 1998 will be $18 million less than it was in April 1994), we cannot maintain the level of programming and services we now offer. As we enter the last year in our three-year budget, we have informed government of this fact. We understand that the funding problem in post-secondary education is a national issue. Solutions will have to begin at the federal level and flow through provincial governments to universities and other post-secondary educational institutions. Commitments to stable and perhaps even increased government grants are necessary if we are to just maintain what exists.

A. W. May
PRESIDENT AND VICE-CHANCELLOR

THE COMMUNICATOR
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY'S EMPLOYEE NEWSLETTER

Career Scene

(*The Communicator*, February 1998)

The following career changes have received approval since the last issue of *The Communicator*. They are provided by Human Resources and are up to date at the time of publication.

ACADEMIC

Appointments

Dr. Roberta Hammett, Education, assistant professor

Dr. Kam Hon Chu, Economics, assistant professor

Dr. Christopher W. Marshall, Classics, assistant professor

Dr. Paul Sylvester, Earth Sciences, associate professor

Dr. Peter Trnka, Philosophy, assistant professor

Term Appointments

Marilyn Jacobs, Nursing, lecturer

Dr. Theodoros Nicoleris, Mathematics and Statistics, assistant professor

Appointments, Other

Dr. John Ashton, Sir Wilfred Grenfell College, acting head of social science

Dr. Christopher Loomis, Pharmacy, director

Dr. Carole Orchard, Nursing, associate professor and director

The Rev. Davis Shulist, University Chaplain for Roman Catholic Church

Shirley Solberg, acting director, school of nursing

Cross-Appointments

Dr. Don Deibel, Ocean Sciences Centre to Biology

Dr. Radu Popescu, C-CORE to Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science

Tenures

Judy Cumby, Business Administration

Dr. Dale Domain, Business Administration

Dr. Michael Doyle, Counselling Centre

Dr. Ivan Emke, Sir Wilfred Grenfell College

Dr. Herbert MacKenzie, Business Administration

Dr. Jeffrey Parsons, Business Administration

Dr. Barbara Roebothan, Biochemistry

Dr. Henry Schulz, Education

Dr. Bruce Sheppard, Education

Dr. Alasdair Turnbull, Business Administration

Dr. James Wyse, Business Administration

Dr. JoAnne Zamparo, Social Work

Promotions

Dr. Howard Heys, Engineering and Applied Science, associate professor

ADMINISTRATIVE

Appointments

Harvey Best, Labrador Institute, director

Contract to Permanent Appointments

Shawn Auchinleck, Facilities Management, campus enforcement and patrol II

Mike Fewer, Facilities Management, campus enforcement and patrol II

Charles Jerrett, Facilities Management, maintenance plumber

Daniel MacInnis, Facilities Management, maintenance carpenter

Rosemary Maher, Comptroller's Office, duplicating equipment operator I

Margaret Michalak, Facilities Management, draftsman II

Ronald Murphy, Facilities Management, maintenance carpenter

Susan Murphy, Social Work, field administrator

Robert Ralph, Facilities Management, maintenance electrician

Edmund Regular, Facilities Management, maintenance plumber

Geoff Sparkes, Facilities Management, plant stores clerk

Joseph Wall, Facilities Management, maintenance electrician

THE COMMUNICATOR
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY'S EMPLOYEE NEWSLETTER

Safety Notes

- Don't get burned!
- Ensure glove fits the job!
- Use heaters wisely

Don't get burned!

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

A recent incident in a university laboratory resulted in chemical burns to the hands and face of a worker who was tightening the cap on a plastic bottle containing acetic acid. The bottle had become brittle and shattered in the worker=s hands. Fortunately, due to the prompt action of co-workers, the worker did not suffer any long term effects from the incident.

The acid was still in its original polyethylene container and had been stored for an extended period. Laboratory personnel are advised not to store hazardous materials in plastic bottles for extended periods. Old plastic containers of acids and other corrosive chemicals should be examined carefully for signs of deterioration and, where possible, transferred to a more suitable container.

Laboratory workers are cautioned to use appropriate personal protection, such as proper gloves and safety glasses, when handling any hazardous chemical.

Ensure glove fits the job!

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

Latex or vinyl examination gloves are inappropriate for handling hazardous chemicals and solvents. They are not intended to give protection from chemicals. Improper use of latex gloves contributed to the death of a chemistry professor at an American college last year. The chemical she was working with penetrated her gloves, and resulted in severe mercury poisoning. Investigators determined that dimethyl mercury readily soaks through latex gloves and is absorbed through the skin.

This tragedy stresses the importance of selecting the proper glove for the chemical used. No one glove type will protect against all chemical hazards. Use chemical permeation charts provided by glove manufacturers when you select gloves for chemical use. Contact Safety and Environmental Services at 737-4320 for help.

Use heaters wisely

(*The Communicator* - February 1998)

What to do about those drafty areas in the office? Possibly the simplest and easiest solution would be to bring your own personal electric heater and sit it in the corner or under the desk - right? This is not advisable, and the safety office discourages the practice.

The use of private electric heaters has led to a number of fire or electrical hazards. While the majority of the campus community are very safety conscious, safety personnel have on occasion encountered situations where unprotected open-element heating devices have been placed close to paper, books and other combustibles and left unattended. Minor fires have resulted from defective cords, etc.

Some of these heaters were quite old and did not meet current safety standards. In most cases, the owners were not aware of the dangers and there was no intent to use inappropriate or unsafe appliances. Another concern is that portable heaters plugged into regular electrical circuits with other devices or equipment can place excessive stress on electrical systems in the building.

If your area is cold or drafty, contact the Facilities Management work control centre and request an investigation of the area, including the heating system. The problem may be solved by a simple readjustment of the heating system or by effecting other draft stopping measures. If supplementary heat is necessary, it will be installed by qualified electricians.

With the cooperation and assistance of the campus community, we can continue to keep our facilities as safe and comfortable as reasonably possible.
