

QUFA VOICES

VOICES IN THIS ISSUE

- QUFA IMAGES:** QUFA Workshops Thrive!, by Robert G. May . . . 1
- PRESIDENT'S VOICE:** Salary Concessions, Governance Remain Top QUFA Concerns, by Cathy Christie . . . 1-2
- QUFA OPINIONS:** Some Reflections on Principal Woolf's Financial Update Statement, 26 November 2009, by John Holmes . . . 3-5
- LETTER TO THE EDITOR:** "Q Days" May Be the Only Option Left, by Lorne Carmichael . . . 5-6
- QUFA REMEMBERS:** Sue Hendler, Former Head of Women's Studies Department, by Bev Baines . . . 6
- FYI:** Queen's University Submission to Copyright Legislation . . . 7-8
- QUFA EVENTS:** Cary Fraser Delivers Seventh Annual QUFA Lecture on Academic Freedom, by Robert G. May . . . 8-10
- QUFA OPINIONS:** Some Thoughts on Supervising Foreign-Language Graduate Students (Part 3 of 3), by Leda Raptis . . . 10-11
- WORTH REPEATING:** Seeking Tenure "Conversion," by Scott Jaschik . . . 11-13
- QUFA EVENTS:** QUFA Workshops Prove Popular with Members, by Ramneek Pooni . . . 14

PRESIDENT'S VOICE

Salary Concessions, Governance Remain Top QUFA Concerns

By Cathy Christie
President, QUFA



I just returned from the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) Council meeting in Ottawa, where I discovered

that we are the only unionized Faculty Association in attendance being asked for salary concessions.

In the past year, 14 of the 16 settlements reported to CAUT Council had annual salary increases of more than 3.0%. The other two settlements were at 2.5% and 2.9% a year.

QUFA IMAGES

QUFA Workshops Thrive!



Robert G. May

Gillian Barlow, University Records Manager, led a QFA Workshop on 7 October 2009 devoted to information management. Please see page 14 for details about past and future QFA Workshops. Any QFA Member can participate!

The Principal's recent request to reduce earnings is about politics and public relations. Our current situation is one where Principal Woolf would like to be the first among his peers to persuade a faculty union in Ontario to agree to wage concessions and the renegotiation of salary outside of regular bargaining.

We are preparing to negotiate a new Collective Agreement. If we agree to salary reductions before those negotiations begin, we will sacrifice leverage when we negotiate the next Agreement, in terms of salary and non-salary issues. Workload will certainly be one of the non-salary issues, given the effects of the cuts that we have all suffered. A salary reduction would undermine the existing Collective Agreement and seriously compromise the next one. I encourage you to read John Holmes's article in this issue of *QUFA Voices* for more information about this and other issues.

University governance remains a central concern at Queen's. Professor Emeritus David Mullan—one of Canada's foremost administrative lawyers—recently completed a discussion paper, "The Role of Senate at Queen's University" (<http://www.qufa.ca/files/2009/20091124.php>). He concluded:

- The March 2009 decision of the Faculty of Arts and Science to suspend for one year enrolment in certain academic programs, types, and concentrations (with a view to phasing out some of them) should not have been taken without reference to Senate. The Senate's authority in relation to such matters is guaranteed by the 1982 Board of Trustees' Policy, Functions of the Senate.
- The Principal should, in consultation with and with the approval of Senate (and, if necessary, the Board of

Trustees), develop a protocol on how the Senate's rights in matters such as this are to be respected in the future.

- Given the extent to which this incident has revealed a problem as among the Senate, the Board of Trustees, and the Executive Officers of the University regarding their respective responsibilities over fiscal and academic matters, consideration should also be given to whether this issue and similar issues of potentially overlapping authority need to be dealt with in the Functions of the Senate Policy.

I wish to remind QUFA Members that Senate provides us with a fair amount of power to influence academic decision-making at Queen's.

This paper is especially important in light of Principal Woolf's recent proposal to create a University Planning Committee (UPC) to bridge the gap between Senate and the Board of Trustees. Closer examination of his proposal demonstrates that Administration and Board of Trustee Members will be guaranteed places through "ex officio" positions, while the Senate representation is left to chance with the election of faculty, students, and staff who may or may not be connected to Senate (http://www.queensu.ca/secretariat/senate/Nov26_09/SORCRptb.pdf).

I urge you to discuss these issues with your colleagues, and I encourage your Senator to e-mail your concerns to SORC at senate@queensu.ca.

QUFA has received many e-mails and phone calls concerning these issues and others, and we encourage you to continue writing to QUFA and to the Queen's Administration. I invite you to copy QUFA on any communication you have with the University's Administration.

I look forward to seeing you at our two upcoming meetings:

Special General Meeting
Monday 7 December 2009
12.30 p.m. – 2.30 p.m.
Ellis Auditorium

Fall General Meeting
Tuesday 15 December 2009
11.45 a.m.
Room 201, Kingston Hall

Cathy Christie can be reached at christie@queensu.ca.



QUFA Special General Meeting

A QUFA Special General Meeting will take place

Monday 7 December 2009
12.30 p.m. – 2.30 p.m.
Ellis Auditorium

All QUFA Members are invited to attend.

QUFA Fall General Meeting

The QUFA Fall General Meeting will take place

Tuesday 15 December 2009
11.45 a.m.
Room 201, Kingston Hall

All QUFA Members are invited to attend.

QUFA OPINIONS

Some Reflections on Principal Woolf's Financial Update Statement

26 November 2009

By John Holmes
Department of Geography



The Principal's statement was not so much a financial update as a not-too-subtle attempt to

create divisions and tensions both within and between campus employee groups. Unlike similar financial updates presented over the past year by Tom Williams, Principal Woolf's address was short on numbers and long on political rhetoric. In fact, with the exception of the financial implications of the recent QUSA agreement, there was no update of any of the financial data. The numbers that were mentioned were simply a repeat of those used in May 2009 when the Board of Trustees approved the 2009-2010 budget. There was no mention of how well the endowment and investment funds have fared with the strong recovery experienced by stock markets since March 2009. Similarly, there was no mention of the current projections of the impact on the Operating Budget of the financing costs associated with capital projects—even though Queen's is now embarking on two new capital projects: the new Medical Building and the Performing Arts Campus.

The Broader Context

The Principal began his address by talking about the "external context" (incidentally, Canada's current monthly unemployment rate of 8.6% is not, as the Principal stated, "the

highest it has been in the past 50 years." Between 1982 and 1985 and again between 1991 and 1994, it stood at over 10%).

So let us also start by examining the broader context:

- The Queen's projected operating deficit for 2009-2010 is \$8.3 million. According to the Principal, this has now been reduced to \$6.3 million since the University had actually budgeted for a scale increase closer to 3% for the non-unionized staff, but persuaded QUSA to agree to 1.25% instead.
- Remember that as late as February 2009, Principal Williams was forecasting an operating deficit of over \$6.0 million for 2008-2009, but just three months later, Queen's ended the financial year with virtually no deficit! For several previous financial years, there had been year-end surpluses in the operating budget even after some funds were transferred from operating to other parts of the broader University budget. In the light of past experience and the emerging economic recovery, how much confidence can we have in the projected deficit numbers?
- How do the financial challenges currently faced by Queen's compare to those at other Canadian universities? Many are not only running annual operating deficits but have proportionately larger deficits than Queen's. For Queen's, the \$8.3 million deficit represents just 2.4% of total operating revenue in 2009-2010. The equivalent deficit figures for other universities are: Toronto 3.1%; Western 5.4%; McMaster 5.9%; and Guelph 11.0%. McGill's accumulated deficit stands at over \$73 million, which represents 12% of its annual operating revenues. The bond

rating agencies (Standard and Poor's, DBRS) continue to praise Queen's financial strength. For example, in May 2009, the most recent S&P Queen's credit rating report observed "Superior balance-sheet strength. In fiscal 2008, Queen's unrestricted financial resources (internally restricted endowments plus unrestricted net assets) were about 409% of debt, and 202% of debt plus unfunded post employment liabilities. These credit metrics are the strongest among the university's rated Canadian peers, and among the strongest compared with those of other public universities that Standard and Poor's rates globally." As this indicates, there is room for additional borrowing before Queen's credit ratings would be affected.

- The Principal proposed that QUFA ask its Members to reduce the scale increase for 2010-2011 from 3.2% to 1.2%. In the last few months, three settlements in the Ontario PSE sector (at Ottawa, Carleton, and York) have included scale increases of between 2.5 and 3.0%. Quarterly data released last week by Statistics Canada show that annual wage increases negotiated in the broader public sector during the first three quarters of 2009 have been in a similar range.

Is (Faculty) Compensation to Blame for the Operating Deficit?

As reported by the Principal, the projected Queen's deficits for 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 are now \$6 million, \$13 million, and \$6 million, respectively. What are the factors contributing to this deficit?

In his presentation, the Principal points to compensation growth. Why has the Administration seemingly been taken by surprise by

compensation costs? The current QUFA-University Collective Agreement was negotiated in early 2008. It expires on 30 April 2011 (not in July 2011, as stated by the Principal in his address). Thus, the Administration has been fully aware for some considerable time of what compensation costs would likely be for 2010-2011. The total amount of additional money to be directed towards salaries and benefits for 2008-2011 was never an issue during this last round of bargaining.

So how, exactly, to use the Principal's phrase, has "the world ... changed" since we negotiated our collective agreement back in early 2008? First, it is true that the financial crisis eroded the size of endowment and investment funds and thus reduced the amount of investment income flowing to the operating budget. However, investment income is now recovering. Second, several items have needed to be added to the expenditure side of the operating fund. For example, the infamous "other expenditures" category is forecast to increase by 18.5% in 2009-2010—an increase of about \$6 million—having increased by 25% in the previous year. The Report on the 2009-2010 budget noted that, starting in 2010-2011, \$6 million will be charged to the operating budget for "capital projects debt financing." Three million dollars a year is being charged to the operating budget for the next decade to pay for the new QUASAR administrative system. These are the true key components of the forecast deficits—not an unanticipated increase in faculty compensation.

What Are Faculty Already Contributing?

When asked in the question period how much faculty compensation costs were already being lowered by vacant full-time faculty positions remaining unfilled, Principal Woolf declined to provide an estimate. A year ago, we were told that the

University planned not to refill 54 full-time faculty positions (47 in Arts and Science, 5 in Applied Science, and 2 in Law) that were expected to become vacant through retirement and resignation over the next three years. A conservative estimate suggests that "shedding" 54 full-time faculty would save a minimum of \$6 million to \$7 million in salary and benefit costs. Already there were 19 fewer full-time faculty in 2008-2009 as compared with 2007-2008. Meanwhile, student enrolments continue to increase, and so the work represented by the unfilled faculty positions will not disappear, but instead will be offloaded to the remaining faculty in the shape of increased class sizes and increased supervisory loads. Since faculty compensation is not a piece-rate pay system, the University saves money by decreasing faculty complement and increasing faculty workloads. These savings must also be credited as a contribution by faculty.

How Many Senior Administrative Positions Are Projected To Be Closed?

The Principal announced that he will take a 2% salary cut as of January 2010 and forego any salary increase next year. Let us put this symbolic gesture into perspective. While there are far fewer upper-level administrators than there are faculty, their salaries over the last decade have been growing at a much higher rate than those of QUFA Members. For example, in just one year (from 2006 to 2007), the salary of the Vice-Principal (Operations and Finance) rose by 7.9%, and the salary of the Vice-Principal (Academic) rose by 35.8%. Furthermore, between 2000 and 2007, the salary paid to the Principal rose by 44%, the VP (Academic) by 81%, the VP (Finance) by 52%, the VP (Advancement) by 148%, and the Dean of Business by 119%. Over the same period (2000-2007), the salary of a senior professor receiving an above average score of 12 merit points a year

increased by 30%.

Information recently obtained by OCUFA under a FIPPA request reveals that in 2008 two Queen's VPs who also hold academic appointments *each* received 20 academic merit points and 16 administrative merit points for a total of 36!

Early Retirement Plan, Anomalies Fund, and Salary Model Review

The Principal implied that "he" had "persuaded" QUFA to reopen talks on these issues. In reality, it was QUFA that urged the University to restart discussions regarding retirement plans and a review of the salary model. It was the University that pulled the plug on the retirement talks back in the summer, and it is the University that has to date not produced the data that both parties agreed was needed for the joint committee on the salary model to undertake its work. The distribution of salary anomalies monies to our Members is several years behind schedule due to the apparent inability of the University to generate the necessary data in a timely fashion. The University is holding (and presumably earning interest on) hundreds of thousands of dollars in anomaly funds which rightly belong to QUFA Members.

What Would Be the Consequences for Future Bargaining of Acceding to the Principal's Proposal?

The Principal expressed disappointment that the QUFA Executive declined his request to propose to its Members a 2% reduction in the negotiated salary increase for 2010-2011. I am disappointed that Principal Woolf, who takes great pride in the fact that he served on the Faculty Association bargaining committee while at Dalhousie, ever seriously thought that the QUFA Executive in the current context would counsel its Members to

reopen the collective agreement. There are a number of reasons why doing so would be a bad idea.

The current agreement expires in April 2011 and, if recent history is anything to go by, bargaining for a new collective agreement will commence in December 2010. Bargaining is about trade-offs, give-and-take between employer and employee. When QUFA bargained the compensation provisions in the current agreement, there invariably would have been trade-offs against other items under discussion. If QUFA were to agree today to roll back scale for 2010-2011 without any other issues being on the table, a mere twelve months from now our bargaining team would enter what promises to be a very difficult round of negotiations already behind the eight-ball.

In negotiating salary agreements, both the Administration and employee groups take calculated risks based on their current assessments of the state of the University's finances, the future inflation rate, and the pattern of recent settlements at other universities and in the broader public and private sectors. Often, these predictions turn out to be inaccurate (inflation turns out to be higher or lower than expected, the University may receive unexpected additional funding, other wage settlements may be higher). However, there is no point to a collective agreement if it is not binding on both parties. Implicitly, the Principal suggests that, because inflation is currently low, we should willingly give back the majority of our negotiated scale increase for 2010-2011. Today, if inflation were running at 6%, what would Principal Woolf's response be if QUFA asked him to reopen the collective agreement to increase our scale component for the final year of our agreement?

While non-unionized staff have little if any negotiating power, QUFA's negotiating strength benefits other

employee groups on campus. Our unionized co-workers who are represented by CUPE will bargain in 2010. If we compromise on salary, employees on campus who make much less than we do will feel the pressure to do likewise. Remember that it is QUSA's settlement that is out of step with the current pattern of public-sector wage settlements in Canada, not QUFA's.

Likewise, voluntarily reducing our scale increase would put considerable pressure on University employee groups across the province and across the country. As I noted earlier, recent settlements at Ontario universities have come in at around 2.5% to 3.0%. Five other Ontario universities are currently bargaining, and ten others are slated to begin next year. Agreeing to reduce our scale increase in 2010-2011 to 1.2% would have a significant negative impact on those negotiations. We are affiliated with provincial (OCUFA) and national (CAUT) organizations. We must support not only our Members but our colleagues across the province and country and provide leadership (one of the Principal's favourite words!) in the struggle to preserve both the quality of University education and the working conditions of academic staff. As at Queen's, compensation agreements for academic staff elsewhere set the tone for agreements with non-academic staff and thus affect a broad range of salaries, not just those of our academic colleagues. QUFA should not support a course of action that would jeopardize the bargaining positions of colleagues and non-academic employees well beyond our local situation.

John Holmes has been a Queen's faculty member since 1971. He was the Head of the Geography Department from 1993 to 2004.

John Holmes can be reached at holmesj@queensu.ca.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

"Q Days" May Be the Only Option Left

By Lorne Carmichael
Department of Economics



The Editor:

By now, many of us have been through departmental meetings and are becoming aware of the magnitude of the financial problems we all face. If things are allowed to unfold as planned, we may soon be at a university without the money to pay for adjunct instructors, teaching assistants, or graduate students. Our undergraduates may not be able to find the credits they need to graduate.

So the big question is, "What are we faculty doing about it?" So far, our QUFA leadership has told us that the situation is not our fault, that faculty salaries are not the problem, and that the collective agreement has a financial exigency clause that has yet to be invoked. In other words, "Nothing." We watch as our programs start to crumble. We accuse our trustees and administrators of uncaring and incompetent decision-making, but we continue to rely on them to get us out of this mess.

There may be some few of us who are content to watch it all play out, confident that our personal situation is secure at least until the next round of collective bargaining. But there are many more of us who take pride in the quality of our programs and the students they attract. We are pleased to be associated with an institution that has stature in Canadian society and the academic world. We grieve at the prospect of seeing this all disappear. How can we stand by and let it happen?

Surely it is time for faculty to take responsibility—not for the problem, but for its solution. And we all know what that solution is. We need wage restraint from everyone who works at Queen's: faculty, administrators, and staff. The proposal that we all take unpaid holidays, or "Q Days," should be resurrected, modified, and presented by QUFA to our Administration. I would personally like to see the required number of days off increase with salary, with the same formula for all employee groups. Staff would lose the fewest days (and might actually enjoy taking them off) while administrators would lose the most. Of course, we faculty and administrators will work as many hours as we ever do: for us it's just a wage cut.

Our QUFA leadership has stated that they have long wanted to open discussions about the faculty salary structure. The "Q Days" proposal does not prevent this, and it can be implemented now. More important, we surely do not want it to be faculty salaries alone that respond to this situation. The "Q Days" proposal has the distinct advantage that it will reduce administrative salaries, as well. If our administrators refuse the offer, or insist that it not apply to them, I think we can conclude this crisis is not as serious as they have made it out to be.

It is clearly some combination of administrative incompetence and bad luck that led to this situation. So, let's just agree that it is our administrators who led us into this swamp. It's all their fault. So what? Right now, we have to get ourselves out. The path lies clearly before us. If we choose not to take it, what happens next will be our own fault.

Lorne Carmichael can be reached at carmykle@econ.queensu.ca.

QUFA REMEMBERS

Sue Hendler, Former Head of Women's Studies Department

By **Bev Baines**
Department of Women's Studies

In Memoriam

We are very sad to report that Dr Sue Hendler, former Head of the Department of Women's Studies, passed away on Monday 14 September 2009, in Kingston, after a long and courageous fight against breast cancer.

Sue Hendler was a Co-Coordinator of Women's Studies in the 1990s, and then served as Director / Head of Women's Studies for five crucial years from 1999 until 2004.

She will be remembered for the many important policy changes that she initiated and implemented while leading the Department, including drafting the first proposal for what has become our M.A. Program in Gender Studies, overseeing robust growth both in course offerings and the enrolment of concentrators, and recognizing the need to convert the Institute into a Department.

Under her wise leadership, the LGBTQ Certificate Program, now the Sexual and Gender

Diversity Certificate Program, was created and began to flourish.

As more permanent faculty members were hired, Sue guided the Department through its first Internal Academic Review.

Sue was politically savvy, wise, and a very hard worker on behalf of the interests of all members of the Women's Studies Department.

Those of us here now owe her enormous gratitude for the efforts that she devoted to ensuring Women's Studies would flourish at Queen's University.

Bev Baines can be reached at bainesb@queensu.ca.



supplied

Dr Sue Hendler, former Head of the Department of Women's Studies, passed away Monday 14 September 2009, in Kingston, after a long and courageous fight against breast cancer.

FYI

Queen's University Submission to Government Copyright Consultation



On 4 September 2009, Queen's University submitted the following document to the Ministers of Industry

and Heritage as part of the Ministry's consultations about copyright legislation. The document was signed by the Principal, the Vice-Principal (Research), the Vice-Principal (Academic), the QUFA President, the AMS President, the SGPS President, and the University Librarian. QUFA Voices is pleased to reprint the document in its entirety.

Preamble

As the primary source of advanced training and basic research in today's knowledge economy, universities are key participants in copyright policy discussions. Copyright is a legal system which provides incentives and rewards for innovation and creativity. Professors, researchers, librarians, and students play multiple roles in the copyright system: we are users, creators, analysts, preservers, and transmitters of copyrighted material. Because of our multiple activities, we share the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada that the effectiveness of copyright "lies not only in recognizing the creator's rights but in giving due weight to their limited nature" (Théberge 2002).

Academic research demonstrates authority and builds on previous knowledge by displaying the materials on which its claims are founded. In many cases, that

evidence consists of copyrighted material. Fair dealing, the Copyright Act's mechanism for permitting some unauthorized reproduction of copyrighted work for purposes of review, criticism, research, or private study, is thus essential to academic work. Universities seek a copyright law that recognizes the right of creators to make decisions about the reproduction of their work, and also promotes a broader social imperative that copyrighted works be accessible as resources for the next generation of innovators and scholars.

Positions

Although there are myriad copyright issues of importance, we will limit ourselves to four:

1. Protection of digital locks must not impede users' rights.

Quoting from a book or a newspaper is established fair dealing, and it ought to follow that quoting from a digital file would constitute fair dealing too. If such fair dealing is prevented by digital locks, and those are given an extra level of legal protection, scholars and students will only be able to engage with an increasingly limited portion of the world around us. Courses will become removed from the cultural context of the times; critique and creativity will be stymied. Teachers, students, and researchers need to be permitted to show and recontextualize clips from digital media, or sequences of software code, just as they were in the analog age permitted to copy "fairly" for purposes of criticism, review, research, or private study. The Supreme Court stated in *CCH v. LSUC* (2004) that "the fair dealing exception is ... an integral part of the Copyright Act.... Any act falling within the fair dealing exception will not be an infringement of copyright. The fair dealing exception, like other exceptions in the Copyright Act, is a user's right." The prevention of fair dealing with digital locks would thus

be not only a major threat to innovation and teaching, but a major distortion of the Copyright Act as understood by our highest Court.

2. Fair dealing ought to be amplified and clarified in the light of recent Supreme Court rulings.

Scholars and students have relied upon and will continue to rely upon fair dealing as the most useful mechanism to permit limited and reasonable copying of copyrighted materials. The *CCH* case (SCC 2004) lists factors that a court might consider in assessing whether a given dealing was "fair" or not. What we are seeking in copyright reform is the integration of some of the language of the *CCH* into the statute to give copyright owners and users greater confidence and clarity. We also seek some degree of flexibility in fair dealing so that, for example, reasonable teaching or artistic uses might fall under its umbrella. All that may be needed is a "such as" clause to make the existing categories suggestive rather than exhaustive. Rendering fair dealing more flexible will not erode copyright, but rather enhance it, by making it a system offering benefits to all parties.

3. Specialized exceptions ought to be used sparingly and carefully.

The "exception" approach to users' rights is inherently piecemeal, bureaucratic, and bound to lag behind new technologies; it will never adequately enable the full range of reasonable research and educational practices. Expanded fair dealing would be a more visionary way to handle users' rights, and it would be easier for ordinary Canadians to understand. Examples of the pitfalls of exceptions can be seen in Bill C-61. Its digital interlibrary loan provision stipulated that digitized materials evaporate after 5 business days, far too short a time for busy researchers. Its consumer time and format-shifting exceptions would have

been of no use to teachers because they required the use be contained within the home. Its digitization exception carried with it unreasonable record-keeping and cost expectations. And the distance education provision was also limited in impractical and costly ways: it required destruction of materials after a course is over (surely an unwise practice for an institution trying to save costs), and would have placed the burden of encryption of lessons onto educational institutions.

4. Licensing mechanisms ought not to be seen as a substitute for users' rights.

The licensing of copyright through collectives has advantages for creators, owners, and users alike. It can indeed improve access to copyrighted works and revenue flow-through for creators and owners. However, users' rights are not a mere placeholder pending the development of licensing mechanisms. Users' rights are important both in practice and in principle. Because expression often requires the reproduction of the expression of others (for example, to criticize a statesman or scientist, we may need to repeat what they said), the foundation of users' rights lies in Section 2(b) of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, freedom of expression. While digital technologies may permit us to monetize various new uses of copyrighted texts, this does not mean that laws need encourage it in every sphere, particularly when there are compelling reasons against it. Instead, a balancing approach ought always to guide our decisions. There is a fiscal policy dimension of this issue as well: a "license maximization" approach will cause Canada to bear much higher costs in the educational sector than its trade partners.

Conclusion

While we are fully supportive of

efforts to contain and reduce commercial-scale piracy of copyrighted works, we also insist that users' rights are an essential part of a working copyright system, and we are confident that there are ways of combatting piracy without extensive collateral damage to scholars, students, taxpayers, and citizens.

We thank you very much for offering us this opportunity to comment on this important policy issue.

We wish you the very best in crafting appropriate copyright legislation.

Sincerely,

Dr. Daniel Woolf (Principal and Vice-Chancellor), Dr. Kerry Rowe (Vice-Principal (Research)), Dr. Patrick Deane (Vice-Principal (Academic)), Dr. Cathy Christie (President, Queen's University Faculty Association), Paul Wiens (University Librarian), Michael Ceci (President, Alma Mater Society), Jeff Welsh (President, Society of Graduate and Professional Students)

Cathy Christie can be reached at christie@queensu.ca.



Help Spread the Word!

QUFA encourages you to print out and post *QUFA Voices* in a visible place in your department or unit.

Thank you!

QUFA EVENTS

Cary Fraser Delivers Seventh Annual QUFA Lecture on Academic Freedom

By Robert G. May
Editor, *QUFA Voices*



On 1 October 2009, Cary Fraser, Professor of History at Pennsylvania State University, delivered

the Seventh Annual QUFA Lecture on Academic Freedom, entitled "The Politics of Knowledge and the Responsibilities of Citizenship."

Fraser began his lecture by asserting that the next generation of North Americans will inherit a world heavily damaged by such problems as a culture of war and widespread environmental degradation, and that therefore it is the responsibility of the present generation to instill a sense of responsible citizenship in the next generation. Only by doing so, Fraser suggested, will the next generation be able to respond effectively to the increasingly serious cultural, environmental, and psychic problems that will confront it.

History, for Fraser, has two faces: one that looks forward into the future and one that looks backwards into the past. It is up to the historian to strike an appropriate balance between these two competing views of history. Historians, in other words, must exemplify effective, responsible citizenship by weighing the lessons of the past against the needs of the present. History is, after all, the forum in which all change is debated and negotiated, and it is the glue that binds people together in time and space.

Fraser pointed out that he was inspired to think of the historian as inhabiting the role of responsible citizen after having lived through the George W. Bush administration in the United States, an administration that, in Fraser's view, rendered history marginal by virtue of the narcissism generated by its immense military power. Fraser quoted from an article called "Faith, Certainty, and the Presidency of George W. Bush" by the Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Ron Suskind to illustrate the Bush administration's narcissistic attitudes towards history:

The aide [to Bush] said that guys like me [Suskind] were "in what we call the reality-based community," which he defined as people who "believe that solutions emerge from your judicious study of discernible reality." I nodded and murmured something about enlightenment principles and empiricism. He cut me off. "That's not the way the world really works anymore," he continued. "We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality—judiciously, as you will—we'll act again, creating new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors ... and you, all of you, will be left to study what we do."

The aide's comments about empire, for Fraser, represent a troubling combination of historical ignorance and blind power that would come to define the Bush era.

This historical hubris of the Bush regime gave rise to Fraser's central question: "How did a society that had emerged as a global symbol of progress over the course of the twentieth century become a symbol of political dysfunction in both domestic and international contexts in the first decade of the third millennium?"

Fraser answered his question by persuasively showing how political dysfunction in every American presidency since the 1970s—Nixon's Watergate scandal, Ford's pardoning of Nixon, Carter's Iranian hostage crisis, Reagan's Iran-Contra scandal, Bush Sr.'s Savings and Loan crisis, Clinton's Monica Lewinsky scandal, Bush Jr.'s so-called War against Terror—is a result of what Arthur Schlesinger refers to as the "Imperial Presidency." Executive powers had grown from the 1890s to the 1970s to such an extent that, by the Nixon era, the President's ability to exercise seemingly unlimited powers rendered the Office of the President practically indistinguishable from an imperialistic regime. Schlesinger writes:

With Nixon there came ... a singular confluence of the job with the man. The Presidency ... found a President whose inner mix of vulnerability and ambition propelled him to push the historical logic to its extremity.... Nixon not only had an urgent psychological need for exemption from the democratic process. He also boldly sensed an historical opportunity to transform the Presidency—to consolidate within the White House all the powers, as against Congress, as against the electorate, as against the rest of the executive branch itself....

For Fraser, the resignation of Nixon following the Watergate scandal marked the end of the Imperial Presidency, something that subsequent administrations—especially Republican administrations—never fully recovered from, despite their attempts to re-establish some form of



Cary Fraser delivered the Seventh Annual QUFA Lecture on Academic Freedom this past October. QUFA thanks Professor Fraser for his stimulating talk.

imperialistic government throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Fraser offered a thumbnail sketch of American geopolitical history from the Watergate scandal to the World Trade Center attacks to illustrate the extent to which Reagan's, Bush Sr.'s, and Bush Jr.'s foreign and domestic policy initiatives have focused on the restoration and revitalization of the American imperial project.

According to Fraser, the problem with this single-minded desire to restore an imperialistic worldview to American geopolitics is that it creates an imbalance between the two competing views of history—the backwards-looking view vs. the forwards-looking view—that Fraser articulated at the beginning of his lecture. At precisely the time when America should be looking to the future to solve present-day problems such as terrorism, global warming, the economic crisis, and others, it is looking to the past by attempting to impose a militaristic, imperialistic worldview upon the rest of the world. In other words, America is shirking its responsibilities of citizenship by ignoring the lessons of the past and proceeding blindly into the future. Even the Obama administration, Fraser contended, in its hesitancy to

bring the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq to a decisive end, is demonstrating a reluctance to abandon the imperial presidency and its accompanying culture of fear.

Fraser ended his lecture by suggesting that the example of the United States can serve as a cautionary tale to scholars at universities, the promoters and repositories of academic freedom. We abandon history at our peril, Fraser asserted, adding that the University—as a place where curiosity must be nourished and academic freedom cherished—has a special responsibility to foster citizenship, and thereby to speak truth to power. It is going to be at the University where the present generation will most likely and most effectively instil this sense of responsible citizenship in the next generation. President Eisenhower's farewell address, Fraser concluded, is just as applicable to America as it is to the University, and just as resonant today as it was in 1961:

As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering for our own ease and convenience the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

Fraser's lecture was followed by a stimulating question and answer period. QUFA thanks Professor Cary Fraser for his relevant and thought-provoking talk.

Robert G. May can be reached at mayr@queensu.ca.

QUFA OPINIONS

Supervising Foreign-Language Graduate Students

Part 3 of 3

By Leda Raptis
Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Pathology and Molecular Medicine



In the first two parts of her article, Leda Raptis discussed a number of issues with respect to working with foreign-language students in a graduate university setting. You can read them in the Jan.-Feb. 2009 (Issue 21) and the Mar.-Apr. 2009 (Issue 23) numbers of QUFA Voices.

In this, the last instalment of her article, Raptis discusses the value of the Queen's International Centre, and she gives some tips on examining foreign-language graduate students effectively.

About the Queen's International Centre

The Queen's International Centre (QUIC), located in the John Deutsch University Centre, can be extremely useful to foreign-language students who wish to meet people from their home countries. According to QUIC's Web site, the Queen's International Centre "is a support service for all members of the Queen's community" that strives to promote "an internationally informed and cross-culturally sensitive learning environment."

Despite the obvious value of the Queen's International Centre, I think it is wise to exercise some cultural sensitivity as you recommend your foreign-language students use the QUIC's services. Remember that some foreign-language students

come to Canada because of conflicts in their own countries and may therefore be apprehensive, at first, about meeting their compatriots. For example, in Iran during the years of the Ayatollah Khomeini, expatriate Iranians were afraid to divulge to other Iranians their dislike for Khomeini for fear of their safety. When I came to Canada in 1973, we had a military government in Greece, and so meeting other Greeks was tricky.

It will be different for each student's situation. Some students may worry about being unduly scrutinized by their compatriots about their choice of clothing (e.g., whether a woman from the Muslim tradition chooses to wear the veil or not to wear the veil), since clothing is often tied very closely to politics and religion for many cultures.

You will probably find that most students, even if they do not wish to avail themselves of the services of the International Centre immediately, will appreciate your letting them know about it. Their Web site is <http://www.quic.queensu.ca>, and they also have a presence on Facebook and Twitter.

How to Examine Foreign-Language Students Effectively

Often, a course can be a powerful screening tool to determine a foreign-language student's ability to complete their degree. And having a degree from Canada can make a huge difference on a foreign-language student's future employment prospects.

For native Canadians who have a degree from Canada already, performance in graduate courses may not matter that much, so some graduate courses often take on the format of a "discussion" with no formal written exam. This structure takes away the pressure of getting good marks, and students are able to

discuss a topic in a relaxed and informal way.

However, for a foreign-language student, this model will not work. Because of the language barrier, a foreign-language student may feel uncomfortable speaking among native English speakers, even if the student is fully conversant about the topic in his or her first language. If the student possesses gaps in his or her knowledge about the subject, it will be more difficult to identify and fill those gaps in this informal, discussion-based model. It may be necessary to provide a more formal, structured component to your course to assist your foreign-language students with these issues.

Oral examinations also tend to be unhelpful to foreign-language students. It is easy to forget that foreign-language students may have difficulty comprehending spoken English, even if they understand written English well. The speed of spoken English and the large variety of accents and dialects can be particularly problematic for foreign-language students. Providing a foreign-language student with a written examination allows for more flexibility than an oral examination: you can adjust the length of time given to the foreign-language student, allow him or her to bring a dictionary into the examination, etc.

Another idea is to use diagrams in conjunction with text in written examinations. Sometimes, a foreign-language student may comprehend a diagram more ably than written descriptions, thus enabling you to gauge more accurately whether any gaps in their knowledge are genuine, or merely a problem with English comprehension.

Leda Raptis can be reached at raptisl@queensu.ca.

WORTH REPEATING

Seeking Tenure “Conversion”

By **Scott Jaschik**
Inside Higher Education



This article originally appeared in the October 2009 issue of Inside Higher Education. QUFA

Voices is grateful to Inside Higher Education for permission to reprint this article in its entirety.

In discussions about the use and abuse of adjunct faculty members, “conversion” is a controversial topic. Typically it refers to a decision by a college or university to convert some number of adjunct positions into a number (typically a smaller number) of tenure-track positions. The idea of conversion has been key to the reform proposals of national faculty groups. Some colleges actually have bucked the trends and converted slots to the tenure track in various ways.

The American Association of University Professors on Tuesday entered the conversion debate in a significant way with a new draft policy on the treatment of adjunct faculty members.

A cursory look at the draft might suggest that it is just another statement from a faculty group calling for better treatment of adjuncts and the creation of more tenure-track lines. But it actually reflects an attempt to shift how conversion might take place—by calling for a switch not of slots, but in the status of those currently working as adjuncts, whom the AAUP wants tenured (or converted).

Specifically, it calls for these faculty members to be considered for tenure based on their teaching contributions

(assuming that like most adjuncts they focus on teaching), even if they are at research universities. Further, while the AAUP praises the tactic used by many academic unions and some individual colleges of providing adjuncts with more job security and better benefits and pay, the association goes on record as saying that anything short of tenure can’t be viewed as a substitute.

“As faculty hired into contingent positions seek and obtain greater employment security, often through collective bargaining, it is becoming clear that academic tenure and employment security are not reducible to each other,” the draft statement says. “A potentially crippling development in these arrangements is that many, while improving on the entirely insecure positions they replace, offer limited conceptions of academic citizenship and service, few protections for academic freedom, little opportunity for professional growth, and no professional peer scrutiny in hiring, evaluation, and promotion.”

Many parts of the AAUP policy are likely to find favour with adjuncts and other faculty members, many of whom fear the impact of the shift at many colleges to reliance on adjuncts as opposed to those on the tenure track.

But parts of the draft could be controversial. For instance, the theory behind the draft is that anyone who has been teaching year after year at a college should be qualified for a tenure-track job. At the vast majority of colleges that are teaching oriented, the AAUP can argue that the adjuncts are in fact performing the duties of faculty members just as those down the hall (with tenure) do.

But the issue is more complicated at research universities—which led to some disagreements on the AAUP panel that drafted the report. Most research universities look for

evidence of research potential when hiring for the tenure track, and most adjuncts—by virtue of spending all of their time teaching, and much of it rushing from campus to campus, with little if any support for attending conferences and other research activities—don't tend to have the same publication records as others.

So universities that in fact employ the same adjuncts year after year to teach freshman composition might never seriously consider those individuals for a tenure-track line in English. How would conversion take place there?

The AAUP draft isn't specific on the issue, because of the disagreements about what to do. One vision—outlined by Marc Bousquet, co-chair of the committee that wrote the draft and a professor of English at Santa Clara University—is to push for the creation of dual tenure-track lines at research universities. Bousquet said that there is “a mistaken idea that tenure should be reserved for research-intensive” careers. “The foundation for academic freedom” that tenure provides is just as important for those teaching, so they should be offered tenure as teaching professors at research universities, he said. The bottom line, he said, is that anyone teaching at a college or university needs academic freedom that only comes with tenure.

While Bousquet acknowledged that there are concerns associated with having multiple tenure tracks at the same universities, he said that the most important thing was to provide full academic freedom protections to everyone, not just those who can get jobs based on their research. It would be problematic if research universities

in such a system treated those on the research-oriented track better than those on the teaching-oriented track, he said, “but there are hierarchies now. They already exist.” The difference is that those on the bottom of today's hierarchies don't have any tenure rights.

While many on the committee endorsed Bousquet's vision of dual tenure tracks to allow for the conversion of slots, one member who did not is Cary Nelson, national president of the AAUP. Nelson said that a “two-tiered class structure” would be “incredibly destructive” to morale among research-university faculty, and that he can't support such a measure. Nelson said that a majority of members of the committee

The idea of conversion has been key to the reform proposals of national faculty groups. Some colleges actually have bucked the trends and converted slots to the tenure track in various ways.

that drafted the policy probably agree with Bousquet and that the issue would probably be addressed as the policy is refined.

At the same time, Nelson said that it is disingenuous for research universities to say that they can't hire adjuncts to the tenure track because of standards. “How can they say that about adjuncts they employ for 25 years?” he asked. So Nelson said that he would propose that research universities hire their adjuncts into tenure-track lines “as a stopgap measure, to get justice for the contingent faculty members,” but then stop using contingent faculty members. So future hires would be on a common tenure track, with research and teaching obligations

expected of all hires.

To permanently create separate tracks for teaching- and research-oriented faculty, he said, “would undermine the very nature of the research university.”

While the AAUP draft doesn't explicitly endorse the two track system, it comes awfully close.

It says: “The best practice for institutions of all types is to convert the status of faculty serving contingently to eligible for tenure with only minor changes in job description. This means that faculty hired contingently with teaching as the major component of their workload will become tenure-eligible primarily on the basis of successful teaching. (Similarly, contingent faculty with research as the major component of their workload may become eligible for tenure primarily on the basis of successful research.) In the long run, however, a balance is desirable for most

faculty. A tenure bid by a person in a teaching-intensive position is unlikely to be successful in the absence of campus citizenship and professional development, so even teaching-intensive tenure-eligible workloads should include service and appropriate forms of engagement in research or the scholarship of teaching.”

Beyond recommending this course of action as a means to “stabilize” the faculty, the draft statement outlines various college policies that it endorses. And it offers reasons why the current system of increased use of non-tenure-track faculty members hurts the academic freedom of all professors.

"In short, tenure was framed to unite the faculty within a system of common professional values, standards, and mutual responsibilities," the draft says. "By 2007, however, almost 70 percent of faculty members were employed off the tenure track. Many institutions use contingent faculty appointments throughout their programs; some retain a tenurable faculty in their traditional or flagship programs while staffing others—such as branch campuses, online offerings, and overseas campuses—almost entirely with contingent faculty. Faculty serving contingently generally work at significantly lower wages, often without health coverage and other benefits, and in positions that do not incorporate all aspects of university life or the full range of faculty rights and responsibilities. The tenure track has not vanished, but it has ceased to be the norm for faculty."

While experts on the academic workforce have only started to look at the document, many offered praise and others were critical (for varying reasons). The American Federation of Teachers offered support, calling the draft "a welcome contribution to the cause shared by the two organizations." The AFT's Faculty and College Excellence project has as its twin goals the improvement of adjunct working conditions and the creation of more tenure-track positions. While the AFT has said that adjuncts deserve fair consideration for those positions, it has not suggested that the individuals should be moved to the tenure track in the same way being suggested by the AAUP.

Maria Maisto, president of the Board of Directors of New Faculty Majority: The National Coalition for Adjunct and Contingent Equity, praised the AAUP draft, and she drew particular attention to the way the AAUP proposes to get adjuncts into the tenure track. "It's not just a question of creating more positions, but you

have to take advantage and reinvest in the resources you already have," she said. "We're really pleased with that."

Maisto said that when colleges simply add tenure-track positions, adjuncts frequently lose jobs, unfairly. She noted, for example, that many colleges routinely hire those without Ph.D.'s to teach certain courses, but then—after adding a tenure-track slot for the courses—say that a doctorate is a requirement. "That's the kind of scenario that the report recognizes," she said. "We think the conversion of persons rather than positions is the way to go."

But for others, that's reason to question the AAUP draft. KC Johnson, a historian at Brooklyn College, spoke out against a conversion plan similar to what the AAUP is suggesting when the City University of New York faculty union sought one. (While the union didn't win the conversion plan as it proposed, CUNY did create numerous new tenure-track positions.)

Johnson said he opposed the AAUP draft for the same reasons he opposed the idea proposed by the CUNY union. "The AAUP statement is deeply troubling," he said. "Adjuncts are not hired through competitive, national searches, nor (with very, very rare exceptions) does an adjunct position contain any expectation of scholarly production. Converting them en masse to tenure-track faculty status would send a message to graduate students entering the field—much less to state legislators, donors, and alumni—that institutions no longer have any interest in ensuring that tenure-track positions result in the hire of the best candidate, drawn from a national pool to include consideration of the candidate's scholarly publications."

Keith Hoeller, co-founder of the Washington State Part-Time Faculty

Association, said that he thinks the AAUP draft is based on a presumption that tenure is the only way to protect faculty rights. Since Hoeller—a long-term adjunct, who teaches at several colleges in the Seattle area—believes that he and many others will work without tenure, he thinks that's the wrong approach. "I think the AAUP is trying to put their fingers in the holes of the dike, but they don't have enough fingers," he said.

Specifically, Hoeller said that the conversions envisioned by the AAUP draft will not take place at any kind of level to employ most adjuncts. "This would end up pitting adjunct against adjunct to compete for these new slots, and will leave the tenured faculty in control," he said. If research universities created the new track that Bousquet suggested for teaching-oriented faculty members, "they would be a little above the other adjuncts, but not at the same level of the tenured faculty," Hoeller said. "Adding more tracks is not going to solve the problem."

If the AAUP and other faculty groups cannot bring tenure-track options to everyone, Hoeller said, they should look for new ways to protect academic freedom. "There has to be a whole new look at the system," he said. "They need to think outside the box, but they can't. I'm not surprised that an association that's 90 percent tenured faculty would decide that the solution is more tenured faculty."



Inside Higher Education can be accessed on the Web at <http://www.insidehighered.com/>.

QUFA EVENTS

QUFA Workshops Prove Popular with Members

By Ramneek Pooni
Member Services Officer, QUFA



This Fall term, QUFA organized two workshops to augment Member Services. A third workshop, to be held on 3 February 2010 at 12.00 noon, will explore how faculty members can cope with the current expectations of university teaching. Details about this workshop will be sent in January.

On 7 October 2009, Gillian Barlow (Queen's Archives) presented "Tips for Managing your Information: And Some Inconvenient Truths!". The presentation was given from her perspective as University Records Manager. Its aim was to address issues faced in managing information in both paper and digital form in the university workplace.

The workshop tackled such topics as:

- organization of files for optimal retrieval;
- keeping your e-mail inbox under control;
- best practices when using mobile technologies such as laptops and

- USB keys;
- access and privacy issues arising from legislation;
- secure disposal of sensitive information;
- techniques for keeping digital information long-term; and
- the dilemmas of Web 2.0 technologies.

A number of people were unable to attend the session and asked if Gillian would agree to post her presentation slides on the QUFA Web site. She has kindly agreed, and you can find a link to them on the main QUFA page (<http://www.qufa.ca/>).

On 12 November 2009, Wendy Pentland (Queen's School of Rehabilitation Therapy) presented "An Academic with a Balanced Life: You Must Be Kidding!". The conversation was broad ranging, from covering the tasks and the stresses people juggle every day and the ways some people manage, to examining the notion of balance in a world that tugs us in too many ways to make balance a realistic coping strategy.

Participants explored various loyalties and expectations, personal and external, that require them constantly to rethink and to remind themselves of their priorities.

Several people who attended the workshop wondered if another meeting or series of meetings could be set up to continue the discussion, as it seemed to help to be able to talk these issues over honestly with



Did You Know?

QUFA plans to organize more Member Services workshops next term.

Any QUFA Member can participate in QUFA Workshops!

Watch your e-mail and QUFA Voices for more information!

people who are in similar situations.

If you are interested in continuing this discussion, please contact me directly.

Ramneek Pooni can be reached at poonir@queensu.ca.

Gillian Barlow can be reached at gfb@queensu.ca.

Wendy Pentland can be reached at pentland@queensu.ca.

QUFA Voices is published every two months by the Queen's University Faculty Association (QUFA), 9 St Lawrence Avenue, Kingston, Ontario, K7L 3N6, Canada (qufa@queensu.ca). It is distributed electronically to all QUFA Members via the QUFA-NEWSLETTER-L listserv. Past issues are archived on the QUFA Web site at <http://www.qufa.ca/publications/>.

QUFA Voices publishes QUFA-related news and information for QUFA Members and provides QUFA Members with a forum to express their QUFA-related ideas and opinions. We want to hear from you! Please send your QUFA-related story ideas, news items, opinion pieces, letters to the editor, photographs, and other submissions to the editor at mayr@queensu.ca.

QUFA Voices is edited by Robert G. May (English). He can be reached at mayr@queensu.ca.