

the FABric

UNIVERSITY OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FACULTY ASSOCIATION

April 2009

Vol. 4, No. 3

For Our Own Good

The writer, critic and lecturer Elizabeth Janeway once wrote “reject the chance to act for your own good and the world will still trundle on, but it will do so according to the demands of other people.” Presumably, if the demands of other people are perfectly enlightened and universally shared, we can all contentedly trundle upon the path of disengagement. But such is seldom (if ever) the case. At the least, there is room for debate.

In context, Janeway’s comment was both a claim on the individual to be active in shaping one’s life, and also a call to communities to assert actively their shared interests, their collective sense of “own good.” In these times of heightened rhetorics about a need for constraint and the excessive demands of working people and the unions that represent them on corporate, institutional or public purses, Janeway’s nearly thirty-year-old advisory remains potentially relevant to today’s workers on car assembly lines, to journalists with the CBC, or to university professors, librarians and clinical instructors.

Amidst such rhetorics that suggest “nothing is sacrosanct,” there are other ways of viewing the world, ones where hard-working people are deeply valued and their contributions are respected and defended. The UPEI Faculty Association provides the key vehicle through which to advance and defend our collective interests and demonstrate our mutual respect. Now, more than ever, the FA needs our engagement and support. Don’t trundle, step sharply to the upcoming AGM.

In This Edition ...

- ▶ The State of the Union
- ▶ Reports from UPEIFA Committees
- ▶ Update Concerning Sessionals’ Rights
- ▶ Collective Agreement Dates to Remember
- ▶ Letters to the Editor
- ▶ Dear FAbby
- ▶ Getting to Know... H. Wade MacLauchlan

The State of the Union: The President’s Report

*by David Seeler,
President, UPEIFA*



Another academic year has come to an end. It is hard to believe just how quickly this occurs. Please take the time to review the activities of the Association which are reported in this issue in preparation for the Annual General Meeting. The

Annual General meeting will be held on Friday, April 17th at 2:00 PM in Lecture Theatre A in the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine. I do hope that each of you take the time to attend this important meeting.

As you know, we are now moving into a pre-negotiation year which will significantly

increase the activity levels of the Association and its Members and the next Executive will be looking for your support.

Recently we had reported that the Human Rights Commission had agreed to hold its hearing in respect to our Members' complaint about the Employer's mandatory retirement policy. Perhaps our expectations were too high. The HRC has now advised us that they will not hold the hearing in July, and now it is clear it will not be held before October of this year. Clearly this is an unacceptable situation for our Members but we are held captive by the Commission's process. The original complaints were filed in the fall of 2005.

Bargaining Unit 2 is still in negotiations. Currently they are awaiting the outcome of the negotiations surrounding pensions, which four of the five Bargaining Units on Campus are engaged in with the Employer. It is hard to tell how long that process will take. You can read about the pension issues being discussed on the UPEIFA website (www.upeifa.org/).

In September I mentioned the newly formed Atlantic Canada Council of Faculty Associations (ACCFA) and the fact that the UPEIFA hosted its inaugural meeting. The current Executive of ACCFA is now planning for a general meeting to be held at St. Mary's University this summer. It is the organization's hope that representatives of all Faculty Associations in the Atlantic region will be present. The intent is to discuss issues of common concern including federal transfer payments to provinces, Associations' pension plans, and Tri-Council funding to institutions. I believe that this type of cooperation between Associations will place us in a better position to understand the external and internal forces that impact our Members on a day today basis.

As the year draws to a close I would like to take the opportunity to thank Members of the Executive who provided guidance over the past year. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Susan Gallant who manages the business aspect of the office for the Association. Similarly I would like to thank each of our Members who have kindly donated their time to participate in the Association at all levels as part of their University Service commitment. Without that help we would

not be able to accomplish as much as we have been able to. In this issue of the *Fabric* there is a call for Members to step forward and participate in the business of the Association - and I would encourage you to consider doing so. This will be a significant year as we move into 2010. Your help would be greatly appreciated.

Did You Know...?

The Professional and Travel Reimbursement amount increases to \$1,200 effective July 1, 2009.

Reports From FA Committees

Report from the BU #1 Joint Committee

by David Seeler, Co-Chair

The Joint Committee has the mandate to review issues which arise from the day-to-day application of the Collective Agreement and to enhance the Association's working relationship with the Employer. The complete terms of reference for the Committee may be found in the Collective Agreement (Article A-14).

This year the Association's Members on the Committee were Jim Sentance (Dept. of Economics) and David Seeler (Dept. of Companion Animals). The Employer's representatives were Rosemary Herbert and Peggy Leahey.

Overall the Committee had few issues to deal with this year. We did reassess the Course and Tutorial Roster Principles used to develop and maintain the Sessional Rosters and Seniority List. The Committee determined that changes to the previously agreed to principles were not required. The Committee also agreed to recommend that the Canada Research Chair Process would be used for the new PEI Industry Research Chairs Program and both the Association and the Employer accepted that recommendation. Finally the Committee was asked to look at how vacation benefits might be applied to the new full time Clinical Nursing Instructor Positions which are required to support the extended Nursing

Programme. The Committee eventually recommended that these individuals be granted vacation in lieu of vacation pay. A Memorandum of Understanding between the Association and Employer was signed to that effect shortly thereafter.

Report from the Communications Committee
by Betty Jeffery, Chair

The UPEIFA website and the *Fabric* are the two most visible products of the Communications Committee. This year we changed website host providers, and while a substantial amount of work was involved, the change-over was invisible to viewers of the site. A few new features were instituted in the *Fabric*, including an interview series. Among other activities of the Committee was the revision of the Guide for New Members, the production of a FA Banner, and the development of a position description for the Website Coordinator. An issue of *Grievances-At-A-Glance* was also produced. A review of the Standard Information Package is underway, and the Committee will also be undertaking the triennial review of the "Personal Information and Privacy Policy".

Eight new Communication Reps, i.e., Ann Braithwaite, Rick Cawthorn, Joanne Currie, Sandra McConkey, Gerry Mahar, Jane Magrath, Antonio Sorge, and Yingwei Wang joined 17 returning Reps. The names of all the Reps (along with the departments for which they serve in this role) are posted on the website.

Joining me on the 2008/09 Communications Committee were Sandy McAuley (Website Coordinator), Sharon Myers (the *Fabric* Editor), Fiona Papps, Marva Sweeney-Nixon, and Balaji Ramanathan. I extend my thanks to them, the Communication Reps, and Office Manager Susan Gallant. Sandy McAuley, who has served in the role of Website Coordinator for three years, deserves special acknowledgement as he steps down from that role.

Report from the Equity Committee
by Nola Etkin, Chair

The Equity Committee was established as an Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Association in 2007.

The focus of the Committee goes beyond traditional definitions of equity, and we have discussed issues of equity that cross boundaries of academic disciplines and affect FA members in all circumstances.

The Committee is currently working on establishing its Mandate and Terms of Reference in order that next year's Committee will be in a position to begin its work with a clear focus. FA Members who are interested in equity issues in the broadest sense are encouraged to consider joining the Committee.

Report from the Regularization Committee
by David Seeler, Chair

This year found the Committee working hard to develop a survey for contract teaching staff at UPEI. The survey was recently conducted and the results are in the process of being analyzed. The intent is to use this feedback from our Members so that the Committee can tailor its recommendations to Executive in regards to moving part-time Members to more permanent positions based on Members' employment needs. These recommendations will eventually be considered by the Executive Committee as it prepares for the next round of negotiations.

Report from the Awards and Scholarships Committee
by Jane Magrath, Chair

This committee is responsible for raising funds for the FA student scholarships, overseeing the Hessian Teaching Awards and the Scholarly Merit Awards committees, organizing the FA Recognition night, and participating in the Convocation Awards Luncheon. This year has been, primarily, a planning year, and decisions have been made to use next year to establish formal terms of reference for this committee, the Hessian Committee, and the Scholarly Awards Committee. We are also in the process of getting a teaching award specifically for Sessional Instructors up and running. Thanks, this year, go out to members John Burka, Stacey MacKinnon, Colleen MacQuarrie, and Shannon Murray. Thanks also to Fred Kibenge (Chair, Scholarly Awards Committee) and Andrew Zinck (Chair, Hessian Awards Committee) for their hard work

and good cheer.

Did You Know...?

The UPEIFA sponsors the Convocation luncheon each May?

Arbitration Rulings Have Significant Benefits for Sessionals

A recent Arbitration Ruling on the Employer's failure to follow the sessional hiring process has a significant impact on the rights of Sessional Instructors. The grievance arose when a Sessional Member was verbally offered a course, and then was subsequently told that they could not teach the course. The Association's position is that once a Department has decided that a Faculty Member is not available to teach the course, and the Dean, in consultation with the Chair, determines that a Sessional Instructor is required, then Article G 1.3 must be followed in its entirety. The Association also argued that verbal offers are a part of the hiring process, and once a course is offered to a Sessional Instructor the offer can not be rescinded except according to the provisions laid out within the Collective Agreement. The Employer did not agree with the Association's position, and this grievance proceeded to arbitration. During the closing arguments the Employer's counsel suggested that: 1) the decision not to offer the course to the Member was taken at the Department level and since the Employer was not present the issue was not arbitrable; 2) Section G 1.3 of the Collective Agreement imposes no time limits as to when an employment decision must be made and that the commitment of the Employer does not arise until the Dean of the Faculty forwards the recommendation to the President; 3) a verbal offer from a Chair is not enforceable; and 4) nothing in the Collective agreement prevents the Employer who, having posted a course for sessional instructors, from subsequently assigning it to an available Faculty Member. The Association argued that Article G 1.3 creates a process whereby once the course is posted, a Sessional

Instructor must be recommended, should (s)he meet the qualifying criteria.

In his decision the Arbitrator commented that "as the meaningful decision for the assignment of a sessional is made by the Department, the obligation must therefore be said to arise at that point and not, as the employer argued, when the Dean recommends the applicant to the President, nor when a formal contract is issued shortly before or just after the commencement of classes." He went on to state that jurisprudence allows an employer to retract a hiring decision if it is done "in good faith and for valid business reasons in all the circumstances." The Arbitrator concluded that the employer did not have a "valid, sound, practical reason" to retract the hiring decision. He also rejected the notion that the issue was not arbitrable, finding strongly in favour of the Association. The Employer was directed to: 1) compensate the Member for the loss of the stipend; and 2) credit the Member with the appropriate number of hours on the relevant seniority list.

Article G1.3 of the Collective Agreement for Bargaining Unit #1 was also the focus of an earlier Arbitration Ruling. In that case, it was Article G1.3b) in dispute and specifically its relation to Article G1.5. When there are two or more individuals with the Right of Recall for a particular course, the course shall be offered to the most qualified individual, with the qualifications defined in G1.5. If the individuals are judged to be equally qualified, the course shall be offered to the individual with the greatest seniority. In this grievance, the UPEIFA argued that the Employer's decision was not in accordance with the quite specific provisions about qualifications in the Collective Agreement (Article G1.5). This grievance was ultimately settled by an arbitrator who ruled strongly in favour of the Association. The following items are identified as critical to the Sessional Instructor hiring process and were featured prominently in the Arbitrator's ruling.

As with all Sessional Instructor appointments, when assessing the qualifications of two or more individuals with the Right of Recall to determine the most qualified individual as per Article G1.3b), the Employer has an obligation to assess

both the specific qualifications of academic credentials and teaching competence as defined in Article G1.5 of the Collective Agreement for each individual. Note also that the Collective Agreement does not state that "the course shall be offered to the member most qualified in the opinion of the Chair or Dean." It states, instead, that "the course shall be offered to the most qualified member (as defined in G1.5)."

With respect to evaluation of academic credentials, it must be noted that these must bear a reasonable relationship to the work to be done. Article G1.5 stresses, in several instances, qualifications with a relevance to "the subject matter of the course," not the discipline in which the course resides. As to evaluation of teaching competence, the Employer is obligated to consider all the factors listed in Article G1.5. To this end, the Employer has a duty to advise all individuals being considered of the criteria by which they will be judged, as defined in Article G1.5, and to invite each to submit material relevant to each factor as each individual sees fit.

These two Arbitration Rulings strongly affirm rights contained within the Collective Agreement for Sessionals. While these violations of the Collective Agreement were brought to the attention of the Union by individual Members, the subsequent arbitration rulings have significant benefits for all Sessional Instructors.

Remember, whenever you think that your Collective Agreement rights have been violated, get in touch with the Chief Grievance Officer.

Agenda for UPEIFA Annual General Meeting

1. Approval of Agenda
2. President's Report
3. Grievance Report
4. Treasurer's Report
5. CAUT Report
6. 2009-2010 Elections
7. Other Business
8. Adjourn

UPEIFA Annual General Meeting

The Annual General Meeting of the UPEI Faculty Association is being held on Friday, April 17, 2009 from 2:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. in Lecture Theatre "A" of the Atlantic Veterinary College.

Nominations are being sought to fill the following Executive Committee and other Association Committee positions:

Executive Committee

President
Vice-President
Secretary-Treasurer
four (4) Members-at-Large

Other Association Committees

Awards and Scholarships Committee
Communications Committee
Equity Committee
Finance Committee
Social Committee

All members of both Bargaining Units are eligible. At least one (1) Member-at-Large must be elected from each bargaining unit.

Nominations, in writing, to be forwarded to the Returning Officer, Derek Lawther, Physics, dlawther@upei.ca, 566 -0338.

Nominations will also be accepted from the floor at the Annual General Meeting.

**Following the AGM, there will be a
celebratory FA time, 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., Main
Building, Faculty Lounge.**

Collective Agreement Dates to Remember, April, 2009 - September, 2009

The collective agreement for Bargaining Unit #1 is outlined in what has become known as the "Red Book" (a copy of the Collective Agreement is also available on-line from the UPEIFA website, www.upeifa.org.) Dates important for the time period covered by this edition of *the FAbriC* through to the subsequent edition to be published in September are outlined as follows. Important dates from the "Red Book" are listed in chronological order on the UPEIFA website. You will also find there lists of dates related specifically to tenure/permanency and promotion.

April 15:

E2.10.9 Full URC reviews sub-committee decisions [re: promotion] to ensure consistency prior to **April 15**.

E2.10.10 URC reports recommendations [on promotion] to President prior to **April 15**.

May 1:

E2.10.1 f) iii) Newly elected members of the URC begin their terms on **May 1**.

H3.7 Members engaged in external employment shall, by **May 1** each year, inform their Department Chair and Dean, or University Librarian, as appropriate, of the nature and time devoted to these activities conducted in the previous calendar year.

Prior to May Board meeting:

E2.11.1 The President makes recommendation [on promotion] to Board **prior to the May meeting of the Board**.

Following May Board meeting:

E2.11.1 **Following the May meeting of the Board** the President will notify the candidate [for promotion] in writing, of the Board's decision.

May 30:

E2.6.2/E2.8.1 The DRC must complete its meetings on all tenure applications and combined tenure/promotion applications and make recommendations to the URC by **May 30**.

E7.8.9/E7.10.1 The Librarian Review Committee

must complete its meetings on all permanency applications and make recommendations to the URC by **May 30**.

May 31:

E1.4.3/E6.1 By **May 31** each year, non-tenured Faculty Members and term and probationary Librarians shall provide to their Chair or Dean or University Librarian, as appropriate: a current curriculum vitae and a concise, written report of their activities for the past year.

E1.4.3/E6.2: By **May 31** every third (3rd) year, tenured Faculty Members and permanent Librarians shall provide to their Chair or Dean or University Librarian, as appropriate: a current curriculum vitae and a concise written report of their activities for the past three (3) years.

June 1:

B3.1 b) ...Department Chair to assume duties on **June 1**.

June 15:

E2.5.3.1 Applications for promotion shall be made in a letter to the Department Chair no later than **June 15** of the year in which consideration is initiated.

June 30:

E1.4.4/E6.5 By **June 30** of the year in which the report [of activities] is received, the Chair or University Librarian, as appropriate, shall meet individually with the Member to discuss the report and directions that might be taken by the Member and the Department/Library for continued professional development.

July 1:

E2.5.3.1 The Chair shall advise the Department, the Dean and the Vice-President, Academic Development of any application for promotion or accelerated promotion by **July 1**.

August 1:

E2.4.3.3/E7.8.12.3 The decisions regarding deferral [of tenure/permanency] must be made prior to **August 1** in the year in which the candidate's consideration is to come before the URC.

G1.6.1 c) By...**August 1**...of each year, the Chair, or the Dean, in the case where there is no Chair,

of each academic unit shall update the seniority of each member of the Sessional Roster of that academic unit.

September 1:

E2.9.4/E7.11.4 The Dean/University Librarian includes letter in candidate's [tenure/permanency] file and forwards the complete file to the Chair of the URC before **September 1**.

September 15:

C2.14 Applications for sabbatical leave shall be sent to the Dean or to the University Librarian with a copy to the Department Chair, as appropriate, by **September 15** of the year prior to the contract leave for which the leave is planned.

Letters to the Editor

JUST WHAT WAS THE EXECUTIVE'S POINT?

In its accompanying response to my letter in the previous issue of the *Fabric*, the Executive writes that it "welcomes constructive proposals for further ways to inform and engage members." Yet my proposal for resolving misunderstandings concerning our Association's rules and policies is greeted with silence.

Presumably to fill that silence, the Executive offered a summary of the events that led to my making that proposal in the first place. Since that summary challenges nothing I stated in my letter, its point is difficult to decipher.

Perhaps the Executive was suggesting my allegation against an officer of the Association was handled in a manner that makes it unnecessary to explain the reasons for its "findings" to the member who made the allegation.

After seeking and receiving a legal opinion supporting its conclusion, the Executive should have been eager to impart the probity of its judgement. This would have been particularly fitting, as I had reported a conflicting legal opinion when first making my allegation. Instead, I became aware that the Executive had pursued

legal advice by reading the *Fabric*.

Having appointed itself final arbiter for intra-Association disputes, even when this gives rise to obvious conflicts of interest, one would expect the Executive to be concerned about appearing Kafkaesque. Apparently, it isn't.

Members of the Association, including those on the Executive, are right to be annoyed with the concealed logic behind some of the University administration's decisions. Are we not hypocrites if we have lower expectations for decisions made by the elected officers of our own association?

Glen Melanson

Dear FAbby

Q: Do I have to submit my report of activities before the May 31 deadline? I am being pressured by my Chair to do so.

A: No (see Article E1.4.3)

Getting to Know ...

H. Wade MacLauchlan, President and Vice-Chancellor, UPEI

In early March, I invited Wade MacLauchlan, President and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Prince Edward Island, to participate in an interview for the *Fabric*. President MacLauchlan was offered the choice of sitting down for an in-person interview or responding in writing to a series of submitted questions. He chose the latter approach. What follows are the questions submitted to him and the responses he provided. The material is unedited, and it is worth noting that the President responded to all questions presented to him.

Sharon Myers

When you were first appointed in 1999, and again last spring when your term was extended to 2011,

you described the presidency of UPEI as your "dream job." What is it about this position that you find so compelling? On those days that are less "dreamy" than others, what is it you find dissatisfying or frustrating?

UPEI enjoys a special intimacy with Prince Edward Island. In my dealings with universities across Canada, they are envious of UPEI's essential character as the provincial university. As UPEI President, there are endless opportunities, shared with colleagues and the entire University, to partner with community. Within UPEI, there are many advantages of scale, to know each other, to work together, and to respect and celebrate our collective achievements. It is this advantage of scale that makes it a 'dream job' to be President of UPEI.

The most frustrating aspect of my job, and I expect that I share this with many colleagues, is the scarcity of time. The combination of things that must be done and things that I love to do, together with the ever-present demands of communications technology, is such that one is regularly wishing for more time.

You were once a regular faculty member – at Dalhousie and the University of New Brunswick – carrying teaching, research and service duties. Is there anything you miss – sincerely miss – about that stage in your career? Could you ever imagine yourself returning to it?

The first thing that comes to mind is the bicycle races - very competitive races - through the corridors of Dalhousie Law School in the 1980s. It would be hard to go back to that now, not because I am a university president but because we have all become more serious (or busy). I miss the time to write on a sustained basis. I can imagine myself returning to sustained writing.

If, 50 or 100 years from now, your legacy as President of UPEI emphasized the construction and expansion of the campus' built infrastructure – buildings, sports fields, landscaping – and closer cooperation with the state and private sector, particularly concerning the development of the bio-resource sector, would this satisfy you? Would you see this as a misrepresentation of your legacy in any way?

I don't like the idea that anything will be 'my' legacy. That's the first misrepresentation. Universities are complex institutions, made up of many personalities, initiatives, talents, forces, opportunities and challenges. Every institution has its own history and path of development, and we pursue and rediscover or extend that path on a daily, weekly and monthly basis. The faculty colleague who publishes a new and significant piece of research, the student who overcomes a learning disability, the staff colleague who extends a helping hand or finds a new solution to an old problem – these are all examples of the multitude of contributions to UPEI's legacy.

As for what we have achieved together over the past decade and what will endure, it is true that UPEI has seen a significant enhancement of infrastructure and facilities. We have also seen phenomenal developments in research, a sustained increase in enrolment, recognition of our strength in teaching and learning and attention to students, significantly enhanced standing for UPEI in reputational terms, and innumerable partnerships with community, on Prince Edward Island and farther afield. Perhaps most importantly, we have extended our sense of pride and expectation, in what we can achieve as a University. I expect that these elements together will endure, and will continue to develop and evolve.

What do you see as UPEI's current strengths? Apart from external factors – demographic shifts, an economic recession and so on – can you define any "internal" threats to the University's functioning and the welfare of our community?

UPEI's greatest strength is our advantage of scale. This translates into trust and beneficial relationships within the University, and to generous support from and positive partnerships with the broader community. A closely related strength of UPEI is the calibre and commitments of the people who are the institution, and the multitude of ways that we relate to and care about each other.

The greatest internal threat, and I do not consider UPEI to be alone in this, is that we could see our commitment to the truth and intellectual rigour

lose ground to domestic politics. Universities must honour active, rigorous, honest debates, and respect for the truth, including how we deal with language and standards of inquiry, and how we deal with and respect each other. These essential values, and what you refer to as the functioning and welfare of our community, can be undermined by attacks on personal grounds or by a lack of rigour and intellectual honesty in our internal debates and collegial governance. Our norms at UPEI are both rigorous and respectful, but this requires continual reinforcement and collegial good faith.

You've announced your desire to cut roughly 1.5 million dollars from the University's operating expenditures in the face of poor market performance and the implications this has had for pension fund investments. Three questions on this theme:

- *First, it is difficult to reconcile the recurrent messages surrounding sound financial management and an extremely successful Building a Legacy campaign with messages about the need to restrain, constrain and cut resources. How do you do that without sending contradictory signals? For instance, we have on the one hand an image of a shrink-wrapped UPEI bus, and on the other a member of the new Budget Task Force assigned to address paper usage. In terms of scale (never mind the issue of environmental implications) these images seem at odds.*

- *One of the Budget Task Force members has been assigned to address "academic program efficiencies," and will consider ways to realize temporary and longer term salary (and presumably benefits) savings. Another has been assigned to investigate "administrative and support efficiencies." This looks like a consideration of cuts, either through the non-replacement of retiring faculty, or the restriction of sessional contracts, or the reduction in support staff. I anticipate your response will be that this matter is still at an investigatory stage, and that only recommendations, not actions, are in the works. Nevertheless, I had the curious pleasure of attending one of the Task Force consultation sessions, and the only comment I heard the VP-Finance make concerning areas where cost savings might be realized concerned staffing,*

salaries and benefits. So, I'm interested in your responses to two finer points here. Are you concerned that this might be read as a threatening or intimidating posture, with the concomitant spin-offs of staff/faculty anxiety, poor morale and defensive postures? And, as I asked Mr. Hyndman in an earlier interview, do you view any areas as cut-proof?

- *Thirdly, in the context of the Task Force consultation meeting the VP-Finance conveyed your opinion that, while the current economic downturn certainly presents a number of challenges, it might also present a number of "opportunities." At the same meeting, a senior staff member described the pension issue as a "red herring," reminding us that we had not long ago been on a "pension holiday." There are four collective bargaining contracts currently open on campus. What would you say to the critically engaged member of the UPEI community who wondered aloud if the "opportunity" currently available is to "cry poor" in an effort to limit the demands brought to the bargaining table?*

The phrasing of this question is an example of what I referred to in my previous response. The work of the Budget Development Task Force is acting on the obligation to manage university resources responsibly and to do the best we can in the most challenging economic conditions in a lifetime, not by a 'desire to cut' or to 'cry poor'. I don't know of a university in Canada or elsewhere that is not taking these economic challenges seriously. By comparison with what is being undertaken at universities such as UofA, Western, UofT, Guelph, Laurentian, Laurier, McGill, UNB and other Canadian schools, not to mention the situation in the U.S., the UPEI objective to identify less than 2% of our status quo spending to address critical needs and priorities is serious but achievable. The pension funding issue is the largest single driver and it is real, most notably to the people who are counting on a UPEI pension as a current or future source of income. The UPEI pension fund is currently underfunded by almost 30%, and the employer is already making contributions equal to almost 13% of the salary base. With the work of the Task Force, I am confident that we can manage our way through this, together. I have been impressed by the participation in the work of the Task Force, and

by the quality and quantity of constructive suggestions that have been put forward by colleagues from throughout the University. I respect the empirical quality of this initiative, and I appreciate the work that is being done in twenty-one separate areas, to address both savings and revenues. There are no red herrings, and nothing is sacrosanct.

The work of the Budget Development Task Force offers an opportunity to address misconceptions, such as the comment about the Panther bus. The wrap and the bus were paid for by Trius Tours, not by UPEI, and the bus belongs to Trius. The University rents the bus, when we need it and if it's available, on the same terms as we have rented buses for years. Whether it is UPEI or other customers who rent the bus, UPEI gets a lot of aesthetically-pleasing advertising throughout the Maritimes and beyond. As for the environmental implications, being a new bus, it's technologically up-to-date, and I believe it's generally known that buses are an efficient form of transportation by comparison with moving the equivalent number of people in cars or planes.

On the general obligation to manage our resources as well as we possibly can, UPEI is a sizeable economic operation, with total expenditures now exceeding \$100 million annually. Resources are key to everything we do, as is the prudent and optimal use of our resources. While it is never easy, and resources are by nature scarce, UPEI has an exceptional track record of sound financial management. This is something in which we all share, and to which we all contribute. The work of the Budget Development Task Force, and the broad based participation in that work, will ensure that we stay on track, that we live within our means, and that we meet our obligations, together.

A final question related to cost-savings: the Administration and Faculty Association have been involved in over 40 grievances since the signing of the present Bargaining Unit #1 Collective Agreement. Some of these have gone to legal arbitration, with all of them settled in the Faculty Association's favour. The costs – not only real monetary costs but also the investments of time and the nurturing of frustration – are enormous. While you might suggest the Union has moved

most of these grievances forward, the fact that it is victorious might be seen to signal the justification of its actions. Indeed, if there is a justifiable grievance, the FA is legally bound to move the grievance forward. You are on record as saying the UPEIFA has "one of the best collective agreements to be found at any university in the region." And so this begs the obvious question. If the agreement is sound, why not follow it, especially if this means substantive cost savings (in the multitude of ways "costs" can be understood)?

I don't think the grievance picture is as one-sided as your question represents. This is a two-way street. A collective agreement is a very complex exercise of reducing to contract language the myriad of issues and decisions that are involved in the academic employment and decisionmaking. Beyond negotiating and writing the agreement, there is the equally or even more complex exercise of implementing it to everyone's satisfaction. With 229 full-time faculty members and 155 people currently teaching on sessional contracts, with more than 1500 course sections offered annually, and with the many issues that arise with appointments, tenure and promotion decisions, leaves, retirements, employment benefits, etc., it is not surprising that issues of interpretation will arise, especially in the initial years of the collective agreement. It would be interesting to count up all the decisions that have worked out in the normal course of things, and the number of situations where issues have been resolved in an anticipatory or preemptive way between the Association and the employer. In total, these would number in the tens of thousands.

We are still in the early years in both the Faculty Association's and the administration's experience of working out the various nuances and interpretations of the Collective Agreement. This has involved a significant culture shift for both the Association and administration, and has included the implementation of major substantive changes such as the move to a 3-2 normal teaching workload, moving timetabling and workload decisions to a much-earlier point in the annual cycle, and implementing a new system for sessional appointments. A number of grievances have dealt with the same or very similar issues

and the administration and the Association have agreed to combine these and deal with them together. Many issues have been resolved without going to arbitration. Some have proceeded to Arbitration for a third party decision. Within the Arbitration process, about half have been resolved by the parties prior to a hearing or through mediation/arbitration, meaning the parties have come to their own resolution with third party assistance.

These resolutions are encouraging. I am especially encouraged by increased dialogue with the Association through vehicles such as the Joint [labour - management] Committee and the efforts of the Association's Executive and Grievance Officers together with representatives of administration, as well as by constructive informal dialogue at all levels of our relationship. Grievances are not a cost-effective way to resolve things, and we should anticipate a future when they will be fewer in number, as we work together in a constructive relationship to implement what is admittedly a very complex and sophisticated set of commitments.

The PEI Government has announced its new economic plan, which centres on the mobilization of bio-resource sciences and industries. It is clear the University is presented with many opportunities that follow from this agenda. How does the University balance those opportunities against the integrity of its academic mission? Does the University have a duty to defend its academic mission and the collective sense of academic priorities in the face of such opportunities or against the pressure of directed funding?

Governments in Prince Edward Island and elsewhere have spent significant resources on economic development for decades, even for centuries. Until relatively recently, public policy has mainly not drawn the linkage between advanced education and research and sustainable economic development. We might wonder why it took so long to make this connection. Universities can accept a large share of the responsibility because of our historic tendency to 'defend' ourselves. Now that the potential for universities to contribute is better understood, we do indeed have opportunities. Along with these

opportunities we require an astute sense of advocacy, to ensure that governments and the community at large understand and appreciate the character and values of the university. The challenge is to be effective communicators, advocates and partners, not to insist on our isolation.

As an historian, you will know that these dynamics are not new. In PEI history, the most dramatic example of government drawing the linkage between higher education and development came with the creation of UPEI. The April 2, 1968 policy address by Premier Campbell announcing the government would only fund a single public university was taken by many in the PEI college community at the time as an attack on their autonomy. Fortunately, there were many good people within the academic and broader communities who poured their hearts and souls into building UPEI into the fine institution that we continue to build today.

On the precise point about advocating for our academic mission and for funding that is not 'directed', it is noteworthy that the core operating grant to Main Campus from the PEI government will have increased from less than \$15 million in 1999 (after not having increased in the previous decade) to almost \$30 million in 2009-10. There are few parallels in Canada for such an increase in core operating support from government during this same time-frame. Our advocacy for UPEI should include acknowledging this level of operating support from government.

As for 'directed' support or special partnerships, which generally begin with the expertise and leadership of colleagues within the University, I am aware of many relationships and initiatives in areas well beyond what you refer to as 'bioresource sciences'. These include tourism research, the environment, nursing, music and cognition, island studies, animal and human health, aboriginal education, learning disabilities, internationalization and mobility, information technologies, library resources, cooperative education, and the list goes on. One way of expressing the extent of these diverse initiatives, and of gaining an appreciation for the special expertise and rich relationships that underpin them, is to note that colleagues at UPEI

collectively engage in more than \$30 million annually in specially supported activities, over and above the resources we attract through core grants and tuition. So far from defending against these initiatives, UPEI should endeavour to do its best to celebrate and support them - astutely.

We've witnessed several expansions of AVC during your tenure, the growth of the Business programme and a new building, the growth of the Education programme, a new NRC facility, renovations to Duffy and emerging plans to expand science space, and numerous student and sport facilities. I'm asking this because my colleagues in the Arts would, I think, want me to. The Faculty of Arts has the highest enrolment of any faculty in the University and is thus the highest generator of tuition-based income. And yet, we've seen little of the built infrastructure and relatively fewer programming enrichments come our way – or so it looks. Where do you see the Arts programme fitting in the growth and development plan for the University? Why has it not been prioritized – or not been seen to have been prioritized – in the past few years?

One of the truly special characteristics of UPEI is the high degree of collaboration and trust that exists amongst colleagues and across units within the University. The benefits of a 'one university' culture are many, giving rise to numerous interdisciplinary opportunities and initiatives. Most importantly, it has allowed UPEI to function with a high degree of common purpose and collegiality. The danger of a 'not getting our fair share' mindset is that it quickly spirals downward to a point where no one believes they are getting enough.

All Faculties and Schools have their challenges, and their opportunities. Of twenty five new academic programs submitted to the MPHEC by all UPEI Faculties and Schools since 2002, eight have come from the Faculty of Arts. A colleague in Arts has just received UPEI's largest-ever council funding grant. Last month we celebrated thirteen new books authored by colleagues in Arts.

On the point about infrastructure, if we had stopped the clock in 1989, many at UPEI would likely have commented that the very expensive

transformation of Main Building plus the renewal of Steele, notably to create the Recital Hall, had pretty much tied up Main Campus infrastructure priorities and resources for the decade. In the 1990s, Cass and KC Irving got their turn, with other initiatives in the queue of priorities. In this decade, no fair-minded colleague would question that the School of Business was due for a move from the Kelley Building. Nursing and Education are now bursting at the seams. The improvements to student facilities and campus amenities have been responsive to identified priorities. Also in this decade, UPEI has been able to do a lot of catching up with 'deferred maintenance', including the complete replacement of the windows in Main Building in 2008, at a cost of almost three-quarters of a million dollars.

In response to the spirit of your question, I have three observations. First, optimism goes further than pessimism in advancing the University or particular units. Second, form follows function, and infrastructure will follow institutional needs and opportunities. The focus should not be on infrastructure for its own sake, or for the sake of comparison. Third, a 'one university' philosophy is of inestimable value, to all of UPEI and perhaps especially to the Faculty of Arts.

There is much conversation these days about the corporate ethos and operating procedures infiltrating the leadership of universities and recasting the culture of the universities. Could you comment on this trend broadly? And, I'm wondering if you might address it more specifically in relation to your recent appointment to the Atlantic Gateway Council, where you represent UPEI – a public institution – on a consortium otherwise comprised entirely of private company representatives. Indeed, the press release announcing the Council reads "individuals representing companies from across the four Atlantic Provinces and Canada announced today that they are creating a new Atlantic Gateway Council. The Council will consist entirely of private sector representatives from a broad range of industries."

My comments on this point will substantially echo my response to question 7 above. We can use up a lot of good energy and miss out on many

opportunities in a defensive or isolationist mode, when the real challenge is to be engaged - and to be astute about it. We don't have to go back very far at UPEI to find a time when the University was considered to be 'in a world of its own' in the eyes of the Prince Edward Island community and when we were ranked well below where we should have been ranked in reputational terms in the Atlantic region and across Canada. Isolation is not the answer.

As for the question's focus on the 'corporate ethos', in historical and legal terms, universities are corporations. It is through this structure that we assert our collegial values, our autonomy and our intellectual independence. In contemporary and functional terms, we are expected to be accountable through ever-expanding requirements for ethics reviews, financial reporting, workplace and environmental safety, and a multitude of comparable requirements. The most prolific source of corporate obligations is our complex human resources environment with multiple unions. These are not to be complained about. They come with the nature, scale and expectations of a modern university, but they could not be met if the university were not a corporation.

In financial terms, the public university is constantly performing a balancing act, endeavouring to meet rising internal and external expectations that come with the pursuit of excellence, while living within our means. For starters, we do not have taxing powers, although many people seem to require continual reminding on this point. We plead and compete for everything we get, on a continuous basis. Government grants and student tuition are the two most significant contributors to our operating resources. Both require constant attention and affirmation. Universities cannot run deficits - at least not UPEI. This means we have no choice but to balance the books. Among universities, there is intense competition for reputation, resources and recruits.

As UPEI President, it has been a priority to be involved in provincial, regional and national community endeavours that advance the profile and recognition of UPEI and that advance the case for the contributions of universities to the

community and our collective welfare. These commitments have included terms as a director of the national Public Policy Forum and the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, two years as Chair of the Association of Atlantic Universities, and four years as Chair of the Standing Committee on International Relations of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. My community involvements include being a fundraising Ambassador for the Atlantic Ballet Theatre, a founding supporter of the Montgomery Theatre, and a founder and regular participant in the work of the Friends of Covehead and Brackley Bays. So, there's an obvious ideological slant in singling out my participation in the Atlantic Gateway Council.

I believe it is important for universities to be represented in the work of the Gateway Council. It would be better if there were more than one such participant or if there were someone from the college sector, but it's a twelve-person body and I was not the one doing the inviting. If significant public resources are to be devoted to investments in the Atlantic Gateway, the input of universities and colleges can help to increase the likelihood that these investments will be tied in to our areas of research excellence, or to the education and training contributions of our colleges and universities. If opportunities for UPEI arise, they will be brought forward through the normal University processes. If there are opportunities for other universities, I will bring them forward as a member of the Executive Committee of AAU or as Chair of the AAU Regional Advocacy Working Group. If there are opportunities for Holland College, I'll relay those as a member of the Holland College Board. On balance, I hope that I can accomplish more by accepting the invitation to participate on the Gateway Council than I could by declining on the ground that the Council was not the place for universities.

What do you think members of UPEI's Faculty Association are doing especially well? What would you like to see us do better? How would you define and assess the contributions of Sessional Instructors at the University?

Faculty and sessional instructor colleagues are true professionals. They care deeply about the

University, about students, about each other, and about the pursuit of excellence. They take enormous pride in their own work and contributions, and in our collective achievements as colleagues and as the University of Prince Edward Island. I am always impressed by the professionalism, the enterprise and the commitment to excellence of my colleagues. As for what we can do better, the commitment to excellence necessarily brings with it a belief that we can improve, and that we can do better. Notably, this includes a commitment to continue building a university that will hire the most outstanding and excellent people we can find to replace us when the opportunity arises.

With two years remaining in your presidency, what are your goals and priorities for the rest of your term?

I will mention six specific areas of focus, and a general one:

Recruitment and enrolment continue to be preoccupations, perhaps less so for UPEI than for some universities in the region, but we cannot avoid the demographic realities. We have a well articulated enrolment management strategy, and many people including the President will be working hard to achieve it. This includes a commitment to student engagement and retention as a top priority.

Academic planning is a never-ending process, and it's more about grass roots initiatives than about goals for the President. Over the next couple of years, based on what I hear at Senate and in conversations with colleagues, and what I can see in external expectations, including the influence of the Bologna Accord, I believe there will be more emphasis on innovation, student mobility and partnerships than on expansion. UPEI should be well placed for this, as we find creative and innovative ways to build around what we already have. Student engagement and student success will continue to figure prominently in our academic planning.

The Strategic Research Plan adopted by Senate in 2008 maps out ambitious goals and strategies that we will all be working hard to achieve.

The next two years will be challenging financially. The results and recommendations from the work of the Budget Development Task Force will be important in setting directions and in finding our way forward in a difficult global economy, the implications of which for Prince Edward Island may arrive later in the cycle and could last longer.

We still have work to do to ensure that UPEI's reputation matches up with its quality. With the many ways in which our continuing pursuit of excellence enhances UPEI's quality, this makes it even more imperative to get our message out. A Strategic Communications Plan building on the work of the Visual Identity Task Force and on a multiplicity of communications efforts will be completed this spring.

On the fundraising front, it's good that we have completed the Building a Legacy Campaign, as this would not be a great time to be starting out on a campaign. In a sense, though, it never ends. We have an ambitious goal to raise \$6 million annually on a continuing basis. That won't happen without a lot of hard work, and some luck. Our goals should include room for luck.

The comment about luck brings me to my general goal. Stephen Leacock remarked: "I'm a great believer in luck and I find the harder I work, the more I have of it.." This reminds us of the essential requirement of hard work to have a great university. Over the coming two years, I intend to continue working hard to advance the achievements and the cause of UPEI in every way that I possibly can, in close and happy collaboration with colleagues throughout the University.

When your term as President was extended last spring, both you and the Chair of the Board of Governors cited "transition issues" that required attention and warranted the continuation of your appointment. Mr. Hyndman has declined to respond to this issue and has referred us to you. Would you care to comment on what those issues are and if progress is being made?

My specific comment referred to "the University's need to take a measured approach to transitions and succession planning." Over the course of last spring, it became clear to most of the University

community that a presidential selection requires a considerable window of time and a process that is backed by consensus. By taking the necessary time, and with the adoption by the Board and the Senate of clear procedures, the University will enhance its prospects for the successful selection of a President.

You may not be inclined to answer this, but I will put this forward for your consideration. Many of us have regrets about something we have either done or failed to do in the past. And most of us, I think, occasionally wish we had the opportunity to have that moment back – a "do-over." If you were given one presidential "do-over," what would it be?

This is a good question. The drive from our home to the University takes 22 minutes. It's not unusual for the (typically early) morning drive to include a rehearsal in my mind of things that I will say or write during the day. And it's not unusual for the drive home to include a congratulatory review of decisions to 'hold my tongue', as our mothers encouraged us to do, rather than deliver the lines rehearsed in the morning. People would likely be surprised to know the extent to which being President requires holding your tongue. It makes me think of Mark Twain's quip that the only place we have free speech is in the grave. I'll be taking a long list of 'do-overs' to the grave, for the drive home.

Is there one particular moment in your presidency that you know you will always treasure?

To single out a particular moment would be invidious. But I can describe a category of moments. They occur on a daily basis. I can think of at least ten such moments that I treasure from yesterday. They all consist of interactions with smart, happy, hard-working, caring people. I'm an easy read on this. I respond with joy. It's what I love most, and love every day, about life in the university, especially in contexts where people are working things out, or moving things forward. Your question prompts me to suggest that we should all keep a journal to record these moments, because we can easily fall into taking these joyful moments and the joyfulness of our lives in the university for granted.

So, you have your dream job. What's next?

Rumours of political ambitions abound. Rumours of another presidency elsewhere abound. Rumours of another term here at UPEI abound. What do you imagine for yourself after 2011? Are you considering staying beyond that date?

I can honestly say that I was not aware of the abundance of rumours. It's interesting to learn about them, but it causes me to wonder if people are using their time well. For starters, I look forward to more regular sleep. Beyond that, there are lots of things to do. My preference would be to take on things that are substantially different from my current endeavours, so that should dispose of most of the rumours. We've talked about starting a vineyard, but I suspect that will give way to something that brings faster results, such as growing pumpkins or getting a puppy. I've always had it in mind to write a cookbook; that would be a natural, creative outlet, and a chance to record a lifetime of experiments. PEI will remain home base. I have a great life, in the fullest sense. I expect to be happy, as I am today.

Faculty Awards and Recognition Night

Saturday, April 18th

at

The Culinary Institute

Reception at 6:00, Dinner at 7:00

Tickets available from Susan Gallant,

UPEIFA Office.

\$25.00

Celebrate and honour your colleagues who are retiring and toast the winners of the Hessian Teaching Award and the Merit Award for Scholarly Achievement.

the FABric Editorial Policy

The FABric is the newsletter of the University of Prince Edward Island Faculty Association. The primary intent of the FABric is to keep all members of the UPEI Faculty Association up-to-date and informed. It is also the intent of the FABric to communicate UPEI Faculty Association activities and perspectives on issues to a wider community. *The FABric* is published three times per year: September, January, and April, and serves the following purposes:

- ▶ to provide a means for the exchange of ideas, views, and issues relevant to the Association and its members;
- ▶ to provide the Association's membership with information relevant to the operations of the Association;
- ▶ to provide documentary records of matters pertaining to the Association; and to serve all the functions of a newsletter.

Contributions (letters, articles, article summaries, Dear *FAbby* questions, and other pertinent information) are encouraged, but anonymous material will not be considered for publication. Under special circumstances, however, *the FABric* may agree to withhold the author's name.

The UPEI Faculty Association Executive retains the right to accept, edit, and/or reject contributed material. The opinions expressed in authored articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the UPEI Faculty Association.

To Reach the Editor

Letters to the Editor, questions for Dear *FAbby*, and other pertinent materials may be sent to the editor, Sharon Myers, at shmyers@upei.ca

The next edition of *the FABric* will be published in September.

The UPEIFA Executive

President:

David Seeler, Companion Animals

Vice-President:

Betty Jeffery, Robertson Library

Past-President:

Wayne Peters, Engineering

Secretary/Treasurer:

Debra Good, Business

Members-at-Large:

Nola Etkin, Chemistry

David Groman, Diagnostic Services

Jane Magrath, English

Jim Sentance, Economics

UPEIFA Office Manager:

Susan Gallant

The UPEI Faculty Association

Room 214, Main Building

University of Prince Edward Island

550 University Ave.

Charlottetown, PE C1A 4P3

Tel: 1-902-566-0438;

Fax: 1-902-566-6043

Email: facultyassociation@upei.ca

UPEIFA Website:

www.upeifa.org

the FABric

April 2009

Vol. 4 No. 3

Published three times a year

ISSN 1718-3022