

QUFA VOICES

Compensation
And Benefits

**Academic
Freedom**

Merit

Workload

Performance
Indicators

Equity

The Status of Sessional Adjuncts

The working conditions of many Sessional Adjuncts are notoriously bad. They receive low pay (an hourly rate that is less than graduate students), no benefits, poor institutional support, and no job security (not knowing from term to term whether they will be bumped by other faculty or graduate students or whether their course will be cancelled). Their appointments are often last minute with little preparation time, and they are often asked by colleagues and students to "volunteer" for additional duties without compensation. Yet they often have the same academic qualifications as full-time faculty, and students expect them to meet the same high standard of performance. This treatment of Sessional Adjuncts is long standing and is not driven by any genuine need of the University.

Some Sessional Adjunct appointments may be necessary to meet some temporary needs or to provide some unique expertise (such as in the professions); however, the University relies on the continued availability of over 300 Sessional Adjuncts who, along with other non-tenure/non-tenure stream instructors, teach 43.9% of undergraduate course sections.*

In some situations, the University can rely on professionals to provide voluntary or inexpensive services. However, in most situations, the University should be prepared to pay more for flexibility and unique expertise. After all, the compensation should be greater to get the best candidates with unique qualifications on a short-term basis who must teach with little support. This should be a high priority for a University concerned about the quality of undergraduate teaching. Instead, the University's administrative and budgeting practices treat the appointment of Sessional Adjuncts as a last-min-

ute scramble to staff as many courses as possible at the least expense from what's left over in departmental budgets. The identity and qualifications of the individuals appointed to these positions seem to be of little concern to the University administration, whose attitude and practices emphasize the temporary nature and marginal status of these appointments.

QUFA has represented Sessional Adjuncts since 2003. In the first collective agreement, QUFA had modest success in introducing a more open appointment process, increasing the minimum stipend, and obtaining some acknowledgment from the administration that Sessional Adjuncts should be compensated for additional duties. However, in practice, the administration has resisted fair compensation for additional duties, and many Sessional Adjuncts report that they perform such duties without compensation. The minimum stipend remains very low in many units, and other support is non-existent.

QUFA and the Administration are now negotiating a new collective agreement. QUFA will attempt to improve the working conditions for Sessional Adjuncts. This will not be easy without a significant shift in the attitude of the Administration and a willingness on their part to recognize the critical role that Sessional Adjuncts perform in both undergraduate and graduate teaching. Their attitude should be what can they do to help Sessional Adjuncts be more successful, rather than how can they staff as many courses as possible with the least expense and commitment.

**Source: Article 35 Report for 2004-05, pursuant to Article 35.1.4 of the FLA CA.*

In This Issue

The Status of
Sessional Adjuncts
1

Support for
Community
College Professors
2

President's Report
John Holmes
2

Pension Plan
Update
3

**Academic
Freedom**

**Academic
Freedom for
Clinical Faculty**
William Egnatoff
4

**How to Be an
Engineering
Professor Yesterday**
Karen Rudie
5

QUFA Needs You!
Announcements
From the Editors
7

Support OPSEU



Support OPSEU by spending an hour on the picket lines. Talk with your college colleagues about the teaching they do, what their graduates do, the conditions of their work, and their concerns. Walk with them!

President's Report

This month's report addresses three issues: a report on a recent meeting on the Pension Plan called by the Principal, the impending elimination of mandatory retirement, and recent concerns expressed by some of our members regarding a proposed change to the constitution of the School of Graduate Studies and Research.

Pension Meetings Update

On December 11, 2005, I circulated (by e-mail) to all QUFA members an update on the discussions regarding proposed changes to the Pension Plan. Since then, and as anticipated, a meeting was convened by the Principal on January 31, 2006. Besides members of the senior administration and Mercer Human Resource Consulting (the firm that provides actuarial advice and services to the University Pension Committee), the meeting was attended by the leaderships of the campus employee groups and a representative from RAQ (the Queen's Retiree's Association). QUFA's actuarial consultant, Ashley Crozier (Canadian Benefits Consulting Group), accompanied us to the meeting. Mercer presented their actuarial valuation update of the Pen-

sion Plan, essentially the same presentation they made to the University Pension Committee and the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees in early December, 2005. The administration twice declined QUFA's request for a copy of Mercer's report to review in advance of the meeting. As a consequence, beyond the presentation itself the meeting was confined largely to questions of clarification. The main points from the Mercer presentation are summarized elsewhere in this newsletter. However, I wish to make a few general observations relating to the pension discussions.

First, from the independent analyses conducted by Ashley Crozier it is clear that, while not constituting an immediate crisis, the increasing unfunded liability within the pension plan is nevertheless real and cannot be ignored.

Second, there are a number of ways of responding to the unfunded liability. If no changes are made to the Plan, at the next official filing of an actuarial valuation report, in about one year from now, the administration will be required to increase the extra funds it must pay into the Plan to reduce the unfunded liability. Any changes to the provisions of the existing Plan that will reduce the unfunded liability, in turn, will reduce the amount of extra funds that the administration will need to contribute. This fact lies at the core of the administration's desire to persuade the employee groups to accept changes to the Plan.

What has made discussions so difficult to date is that the changes proposed by the University Pension Committee in its March 2005 Discussion Paper would have very different financial impacts on different groups of plan members (between employee groups, between active and retired members, and between different groups of active members within QUFA). I have impressed upon both the Principal and Andrew Simpson (V-P Operations and Finance) the need to develop and consider proposals beyond the narrow set of changes proposed by the University Pension Committee. In particular, alternatives to the proposed cap on the

minimum guaranteed pension must be found. Our actuarial consultant estimates that, as it stands, the proposed cap could negatively impact a very significant proportion of the QUFA membership who will retire over the next 20 years. There are other university pension plans in Canada facing similar challenges but using quite different strategies to address them.

Finally, QUFA is working closely with the other campus employee groups on this issue and in the process is building solidarity among Queen's employees. Prior to and immediately following the January 31 pension meeting, QUFA convened meetings of the employee group members of the Unity Council (the Presidents and senior officers of the three CUPE locals, QUSA, and QUFA) to exchange views and explore common positions. Until the January meeting, the administration had met with the different employee groups separately to discuss the pension issue. Moving forward, the Unity Council agreed to meet collectively rather than separately with the administration in future discussions around the pension issue. No further meetings with the administration have taken place since the January 31, 2006 meeting.

Elimination of Mandatory Retirement

The legislation eliminating mandatory retirement in Ontario does not take effect until mid-December 2006. On January 26, 2006, the Queen's administration called meetings with the leaderships of each of the campus employee groups to propose that mandatory retirement at Queen's be eliminated effective May 1, 2006. QUFA Executive and Council voted to support this proposal. As a consequence, members who were scheduled and would have been required to retire on June 30, 2006 (the annual mandated retirement date for Queen's faculty) may now choose to continue to work if they so wish. There are several points regarding the shift from mandatory to voluntary retirement that are worth noting. The provincial legislation still allows the employer to offer different levels of insured benefits to employees

over the age of 65. QUFA has taken a very strong position that there should be no discrimination at Queen's on the basis of age with regard to things such as insured benefits or performance reviews. We are encouraged that the administration is undertaking a review of the insured benefit plans with the goal of having one insured benefit plan for all active employees irrespective of age. We also asked if the administration contemplates bringing forward other proposals in connection with the elimination of mandatory retirement, such as a phased-in and/or early retirement program. The answer we received was "not at this time." The administration has indicated a desire to negotiate the development of a protocol with regard to how far in advance employees would be required to indicate their intention to retire. However, currently no such protocol exists and members are free to retire on a date of their own choosing. Any member who feels unduly pressured by their unit head or dean to make a decision regarding retirement should contact QUFA.

Proposed Change to SGSR Constitution

Late in the Fall Term, the School of Graduate Studies and Research (SGSR) brought forward a proposed change to the SGSR Constitution. This proposal would have made it mandatory for new faculty to complete the "Focus on Graduate Supervision Certificate Program" before being granted membership in the Graduate School and being allowed to sole-supervise graduate students. The Certificate Program has been designed and is being implemented by the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) in collaboration with SGSR. To complete the Program successfully, a faculty member must attend five core workshops within a consecutive two-year period and complete an independent learning project. QUFA has no objection to the Certificate Program as such—in fact, it may well be welcomed by colleagues with no prior supervisory experience who wish to complete it on a voluntary basis. We did, however, hear concerns

from members regarding the proposed change to the SGSR constitution that would have made the Certificate mandatory for new faculty wishing to supervise graduate students. The proposal also encountered significant opposition when presented at several Divisional meetings of SGSR. QUFA raised this issue with the administration at the January meeting of the JCAA. On February 17, 2006, we were informed that the SGSR has decided to withdraw the proposal to make the Certificate mandatory.

If you have any questions about these or any other issues, please do not hesitate to contact me.

John Holmes
QUFA President

Pension Plan Discussions Update

The following are the main points from the presentation made by Mercer Human Resource Consulting to the leaderships of the Queen's employee groups at a meeting held on January 31, 2006 (see President's Report above).

- Pension plan actuarial valuation reports must be filed with the Financial Services Commission of Ontario at least every three years. When an unfunded liability exists the employer is required to put extra funds into the plan (such increased contributions are not to be confused with the employer's monthly contributions to employees' individual money purchase accounts). The employer is allowed to amortize the required extra funds over a 15 year period (at present, Queen's is contributing an extra approximately \$1 million annually to pay down the unfunded liability identified in the most recently filed valuation report).
- The most recent filed report (February 29, 2004), which was sum-

marized in the March 2005 Discussion Paper circulated by the University Pension Committee, showed an unfunded liability of \$10.7 million and the University's total contribution rate at 8.24% of pensionable payroll.

- In 2004 Mercer estimated that by August 31, 2006 (the date of the next scheduled valuation which will probably be filed sometime early in 2007) the unfunded liability would increase to \$24.0 million and the overall employer contribution rate would rise to 9.05% of payroll. The estimated increase in the unfunded liability from \$10.7 million to \$24.0 million was almost entirely due to the phasing in of new mortality tables.
- In the Fall of 2004 and at the request of the University Pension Committee, Mercer prepared updated estimates for the August 31, 2006 valuation. Based on the **same actuarial assumptions** as those used in 2004, the unfunded liability is estimated to reach \$28.5 million by August 31, 2006 if the provisions of the pension plan remain unchanged.
- Mercer, however, is recommending that the University Pension Committee change two of the actuarial assumptions; namely, reducing the assumed long-term interest rate from 6.5% to 6.0%, and increasing the non-reduction reserve from 2.5% to 3.5% of basic pension liabilities. If these changes are accepted the August 31, 2006 estimated unfunded liability rises to \$54.3 million (median estimate) and the University's overall contribution rate rises to 11.11% of payroll.
- The underlying factors contributing to the increased unfunded liability include:
 - the increasing longevity of Queen's retirees;
 - anticipated lower market returns on money purchase accounts leading to an increase in the

- number of people going out on the minimum guarantee pension;
- rising liability related to the non-reduction of pension guarantee for retirees;
- expected continuation of low long-term interest rates.

Academic Freedom for Clinical Faculty—A Public Good

Every year, QUFA sponsors a public lecture on academic freedom. This year's lecture, *Defending Academic Freedom for Clinical Faculty* by prominent medical researchers Nancy Olivieri and Brenda Gallie, was held on March 13 and was co-sponsored by QUFA, the Queen's Faculty of Health Sciences, and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). Dr. Olivieri, Professor of Pediatrics and Medicine, University of Toronto and Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, and Dr. Gallie, Professor of Ophthalmology, Molecular and Medical Genetics, and Medical Biophysics, University of Toronto and Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, together with CAUT Executive Director James Turk, are taking their disturbing stories of courageous and painful whistleblowing on a sixteen-stop tour across Canada to promote awareness of the need for systemic reform in policy and practice. At stake is nothing less than the advancement of medical knowledge for the public good.

Like other whistleblowers, Olivieri expected that her action would have no dire consequences. Her reasons included:

- The University of Toronto and the Hospital for Sick Children would support her decision to publish her findings concerning the reduced efficacy and harmful effects to some patients of the drug she was testing;
- She was a well-published and

prominent researcher with allies in other institutions who understood the situation;

- Her faculty association and CAUT would support her;
- Her colleagues would be loyal to her rather than side with the institution;
- She did not do anything wrong;
- Her patients would speak in support of her action;
- The Health Protection Branch would serve as a stop-gap;
- Other organizations outside her institution, such as the Canadian Medical Association Journal and the Ontario Medical Association, would support her;
- Confidentiality clauses were likely not legal so they would not hold up to a legal challenge. If they were legal, she would be able to find a good lawyer to defend her;
- There would be a proper inquiry through the proper channels.

Dr. Olivieri gave a detailed account of how almost all of these reasons crumbled, with some crucial exceptions. Her Faculty Association provided very strong leadership and support, expending approximately \$800,000. CAUT also provided very strong leadership, expended approximately \$500,000, and undertook a painstakingly detailed investigation of her case that generated a 522-page report (Thompson, Baird, & Downie, 2001). Although that report indicated that in one instance Olivieri ought not to have signed a confidentiality agreement without appropriate modification (even though it was in keeping with University and Hospital policy), the report provided this vindication: "Notwithstanding Apotex's legal warnings and the lack of support from the University and the Hospital, Dr. Olivieri complied with all of her ethical obligations, including reporting obligations, and she published her findings" (p. 29). She concluded, "If you have God, the facts, the law, and the press on your side, you have about a 50-50 shot of succeeding with bureaucracy."

Gallie, an ophthalmologist, had a long-established career specializing in the study retinoblastoma, a rare disorder. As a Queen's graduate, she was taught to believe—and still believes—that "excellence in academic medicine depends on a work environment characterized by intellectual curiosity, relentless critical inquiry, and a desire to improve clinical practice and advance scientific knowledge." When her administrative responsibilities at The Hospital for Sick Children expanded to include Olivieri's lab, she reviewed her case and promptly drew to the attention of her superiors what she felt was wrong. She reflected, "at that point I had a choice: I could become an administrator and be loyal to my institution, or I could do what I believed was the right thing, because being a Queen's graduate, I knew that the patient came first and this was how it had to be. I could not think of it otherwise." The Hospital's director of research wrote, "You apparently believe that your moral duty overrides your accountability to me as director of the research institute and to the formal leadership of this institution." Indeed she did. She consequently became embroiled in a battle concerning her own work. She had developed a procedure that set a new world standard to identify mutations of the retinoblastoma gene, and she sought to have it implemented and funded. Even though it would greatly improve patient care and reduce costs, she received no recognition by the Hospital, which went ahead with an inferior testing procedure that it could not justify against what Gallie had developed. She moved her lab and began a fight that lasted from 1999 to the present. All the money spent on lawyers could have tested all the families for the next twenty years. In the end, she paid for Ontario patients herself. Typical of whistleblowing scenarios were secrecy and lack of debate based on presentation and scrutiny of evidence.

Considerable attention was given in the talk and in the ensuing discussion as to why things are as they are. In Olivieri's case, it seemed that the po-

tential to lose substantial funding for the university drew it to favour the corporate donor over the academic freedom of its own faculty member. In Gallie's case, it seemed that pride may have been at stake. A matter that should have been solved by rational discourse focused on carefully vetted evidence and the best interests of patients may have been clouded by the fact that her method was superior and well documented, whereas the method it was to replace was inferior and not adequately monitored.

Gallie provided an explanation that points to a fundamental human failing: "We've done really, really well. Our science is fun and it's beautiful. But maybe, I would like to suggest that the fundamental thing, it hits me everyday, is the phrase, 'We are the best. We are the best in the world.' It's in institutional policy. It's written on the wall, everywhere, that we are the best. And I think that is a profoundly corrupting goal or statement. The reason is you can't measure it. In fact, you better not measure it because you might find it's not true. And so it therefore becomes not something to encourage and inspire people in institutions to move forward. It becomes propaganda."

Little comfort was offered to people entering their careers. Olivieri gave evidence that "big pharm" is not particularly good at innovation but it is good at hiding negative results. (Angell, 2004). Yet the two speakers told new researchers that it would be very hard to resist corporate funding and that they could not address problems of academic freedom on their own. Systemic change is needed of the sort recommended by Dr. Alan Jackson, Professor, Department of Medicine (Neurology), Queen's University, and his CAUT task-force colleagues (Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) Task Force on Academic Freedom for Faculty at University-Affiliated Health Care Institutions, 2004). Nevertheless, Gallie remained hopeful: "I am truly optimistic . . . that some of these issues will get solved. I also believe they will get solved because of the determination of the pa-

tients and because I still am naive enough to think that science inevitably rules in the end." She concluded, "We need a culture shift where every child grows up knowing that public safety comes first. Period."

Work Cited

Angell, Marcia. The Truth About the Drug Companies : How They Deceive Us and What to Do About It. 1st ed. New York: Random House, 2004.

Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) Task Force on Academic Freedom for Faculty at University-Affiliated Health Care Institutions. Defending Medicine: Clinical Faculty and Academic Freedom. Ottawa: Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2004.

Thompson, Jon, Patricia Baird, and Jocelyn Downie. Report of the Committee of Inquiry on the Case Involving Dr. Nancy Olivieri, the Hospital for Sick Children, the University of Toronto, and Apotex Inc. Ottawa: Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2001.

William Egnatoff is an assistant professor, computers in education, Faculty of Education and QUFA Secretary.

How to Be an Engineering Professor Yesterday

© 2003 IEEE. Reprinted with permission from IEEE Control Systems Magazine (June 2003): 10-11.

I miss the days of science I never knew: the days when scholars sat in cafés, eager students at their feet, breathlessly digesting the words of their teacher. I miss the loud arguments over cigarettes and coffee. I miss the withering away of hours on a single word, a definition perhaps. A miffed colleague slowly softening his philosophical stance after reason or exhaustion got the better of him. I say "him" because, of course, such a world would have been closed to me. And perhaps it would have made me un-

comfortable: a gentlemen's club, posturing and pretension as present as the smoke in the café. But I know I'd feel more alive in it than I do in the academe of today.

When I was a postdoc at the Institute for Mathematics and Its Applications (IMA) in Minnesota, I worked with Jan Willems, who brought me as close to that bygone world as I'd ever (or have since) come. I remember more than one Saturday afternoon spent at a British pub in downtown Minneapolis doing a pale imitation of the disciple/master gig I've idealized above. We didn't accomplish much math on those afternoons, but we accomplished something more important for me as a soon-to-be professor. We talked about control systems problems as if they were complex, controversial ideas, as if they were worth arguing about and pouting over, as if they were worth mulling over. Here's the thing: they are interesting and controversial and complex. It amazes me that I spent four years of an undergraduate degree being led to believe that a control system is, say, a transfer function, is, say, a collection of four matrices. Almost never in my undergraduate education had anyone ever reminded me that what we were doing was a mere modelling of the world. That the world—this complex, annoying, beautiful, breathtaking world—was sitting there and doing its thing and would keep doing its thing no matter how awkwardly, and sometimes inadequately, we fumbled toward it. That we would occasionally stumble on some "truth" because we may have been fumbling in the dark, but we weren't complete idiots.

My first true control science teacher was my Ph.D. advisor, Murray Wonham. From him I learned that science was not the flat, dull study of which my undergraduate electrical engineering courses had done such a good job of convincing me. I had an opportunity I'm sure most graduate students today don't have: a chance to see a true teacher and scholar in action. Why am I sure of this? Because we professors nowadays are too busy with the *administration* of being professors to ac-

tually be good professors.

In *The Vocation of a Teacher*, Prof. Wayne C. Booth speaks about the terrible void, in his field, of critical scholarship and a free exchange of ideas. Although what he writes is in reference to disciplines in the humanities and liberal arts, it could as easily be said about our field:

. . . perhaps most tragic for an association like ours, we lose our capacity to address each other, with force and grace and clarity, about our most ambitious scholarly findings. We produce more and more books and articles for fewer and fewer readers. No one can be blamed, of course, for producing as fast and as much as possible, since professional survival too often depends on the number of titles listed. But we can all be blamed for building a world in which professional survival depends on titles listed rather than on qualities of mind and heart, qualities that can be realized in scholarly writing only when the scholar has been given—or has taken—the years that are required for learning to share a deepening and refining inquiry. Once again here, as in the scandal about freshman courses, we have built a world that victimizes the young teachers—even those fortunate ones who are clever enough or lucky enough to earn promotion through early publication. I hear many a scholar complain, at 40, about having been forced at 25 or 30 into publishing a premature and finally embarrassing book. I hear many a colleague complain about how little that is published is worth reading. I hear a universal complaint from authors about how incompetently their books are reviewed. Such complaints may reflect, true enough, on the complainers as well as on our institutions. But why do I hear of no profession-wide inquiry into the causes and possible cures of the most embarrassing scandal of all: namely that members of the pro-

fession most committed to teaching the arts of reading, thinking, and writing cannot address each other in critical understanding? (26)

It's now been almost ten years since I was at the IMA, and in those ten years I've been profoundly disappointed by what it means to be a professor in the academy of today. What I see around me are junior professors on the edge of exhaustion, with scholarship viewed—at best—as a luxury we long for but can no longer afford. At worst, no one even engages in intellectual discourse. We are overloaded with administrative duties and with lecturing and grading responsibilities. Curriculum development means something on the order of “should we teach them Chebyshev filters in addition to Butterworth filters” or “should we teach them statistics in second or in third year.” No one even asks “what does it mean to learn” or “what do we want our students to learn” or “what do we want to learn from the experience of teaching?” Research ideas that require years of fermentation before publication are beyond allowances rationed to us by demanding supervisors or funding agencies; they are becoming a bygone notion, affordable only to the tenured and then only to those confident enough to weather the scorn of peer assessment. And even then, those lucky, confident, clever few usually drop out of academia, too frustrated by the norm.

Here's how I think we, the control systems community, can beat back the demise of interesting problem solving, the demise that will surely follow from a university environment that substitutes overwork and quantity for creativity and quality: We need courageous mentors and scholars and role models and, more important, we need a collective voice of dissent. We need to speak up and say this is not okay. It is not interesting or important or useful to publish your every thought. In fact, it diminishes our collective chance at producing scholarly work because we all waste precious time and energy reviewing (and writing) too many papers.

Department heads and deans need to take leadership roles in this respect. They need to reward quality over quantity and discourage the current style of overpublication. On the other hand, we should not rely on the benevolence of individual, astute, forward-thinking deans and department heads. Change has to be made collectively and structurally.

Departments and universities need to restructure, revisit, and revamp administrative organization and curricula so that professors can get back to scholarly research and teaching instead of spending so much time in committee meetings and marking papers. Moreover, this may be the one case in which we ought to get in bed with our students, so to speak. Inasmuch as we have lost touch with our collective history of scholarship, inasmuch as being a teacher has lost its cachet, inasmuch as we drag ourselves through our daily university work in a semihaze of exhaustion and quiet resignation, so too have our students lost their way. How often have we each heard “Will that be on the final exam?” or “Do we *really* need to know this?” How often do our students skip classes to finish assignments? Since software to detect plagiarism is burgeoning, I can only surmise that students everywhere, not just at my university, are increasingly resorting to copying assignment solutions. My guess is that students no longer see themselves as scholars or “students of learning”; they see themselves as overloaded “clients.” With skyrocketing tuition, overflowing classrooms, and government funding cuts to education, this makes them clients who are getting less bang for their buck. Understandably, they are now edgy, angry patrons. They—and we—need to parlay this frustration into action and a shift in attitude. Although I would not advocate a complete return to the antiquated days of the true master-disciple mode of learning, imagine extracting the part where *master* stands for “guide,” “scholar,” and “role model” and *disciple* stands for “eager learner,” “open-minded and open-hearted stu-

dent,” and “scholar.” Then you can see why our students too have lost their footing, and why we need an alliance between students and professors to forge a new version of the old paradigm of the academy: *It's as hard to be a disciple without a master as it is to be a master without disciples.*

We also need to bring the humanity back into science. What motivated me to write the original essay that spawned this one is what I learned from working with Jan Willems. His honest, argumentative, excitable side is the humanness missing from the current academia of engineering and science. We are missing the words in between the formulas. I don't just mean that we need better ways to explain our math, but that it's the words, the discussion, the human connection that occurs in brainstorming and research that ultimately yield the ideas. I imagine learning as a difficult climb up a mountain with a friend, and as you approach the frightening bits, the cliffs, the roads that lead nowhere, your friend distracts you with jokes and engaging conversation, and before you know it, you are at the next ledge. By the end of the climb, you are not sure which has been more important: the climb itself or the relationship with your fellow climber. And to your delight, the distinction doesn't matter.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank friends who read this opinion piece as I was developing it. In particular, Lindy Mechevske, Claire Polster, Laurie Ricker, Phil Rose, and Jan Willems all offered insightful feedback and engaged me in further discourse on the topics of academia, teaching, the corporatization of universities, and collective responsibility for change in the academy. I am grateful to Tariq Samad who, in the course of wonderful conversations, encouraged me to put some of these thoughts on paper.

Work Cited

Booth, W. C. *The Vocation of a Teacher*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.

Karen Rudie

Karen Rudie is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Queen's University. This column is adapted from an essay written by the

author in 1999 for a Festschrift on the occasion of Jan Willems's 60th birthday.

QUFA Needs You! Get Involved—Make a Difference

Queen's University Faculty Association (QUFA) invites you to become a QUFA volunteer during the 2006-07 academic year.

Positions are available on internal QUFA committees, caucuses, or as QUFA representatives or observers. The length and frequency of meetings for each position varies between a few meetings a year to higher levels of intensity for Executive Committee members.

Options range from

- Landscape to Food Services;
- Parking to Board of Trustees;
- Political Action and Communications to Grievance work;
- Take a turn as your unit's Council Representative.

The choice is yours.

You will make new friends, expand your University networks, and learn about how the University works.

Service to QUFA counts as Service to the University on your annual report to your Dean.

Help QUFA make a difference at Queen's!

For more information, contact

Constance Adamson, Chair, Nominations and Elections Committee 2006

(phone # 74546 or email adamsonc@post.queensu.ca)

Elaine Berman, Administrative Officer, QUFA Office

(phone #33033 or email qufa@post.queensu.ca)



News and Announcements

Collective Agreement Notice

The most up-to-date copy of the Collective Agreement can be found on the QUFA website at:

http://www.qufa.ca/qufa/Bargaining05/final_with_links_moas.pdf

FROM THE EDITORS

QUFA Voices addresses calls from our members for regular and timely communication about the concerns and work of QUFA.

The editors welcome and encourage thought-provoking commentary.

Please submit all materials by mid-April to mayr@post.queensu.ca

Robert G. May

William J. Egnatoff

Note: This version, *QUFA Voices 1.2r* includes the pension update inadvertently omitted from *Voices 1.2* circulated by email March 20. WJE April 7.



FORUM

This spaced is reserved for letters to the editor.

Please submit all materials by mid-April to mayr@post.queensu.ca.