

FAUW FORUM

ISSUE 144
JUNE 2010

DAVID PORRECA,
COPY EDITOR

President's Message



George Freeman, Electrical & Computer Engineering

At this point, I've served about a year as President of your Faculty Association and I'm about to start my second year-long term in that post. It seems like a good time to reflect on events and issues, and perhaps even to inspire some of you to become involved.

There's nothing like a little responsibility to speed up learning. It takes about a year to see the typical things once and quite a bit of help to understand them properly. What makes FAUW/UW involvement so special is the incredible calibre and enthusiasm of the other faculty volunteers and the superb knowledge and dedication of our two staff members. It is almost an embarrassment of riches in terms of making an easy transition from knowing nothing to making a difference.

With apologies to the rest, FAUW does two things mainly. One, we try

to nudge policies and practices of the university in directions which improve the working conditions for faculty. Two, we help individual faculty members who find themselves in trouble with respect to terms and conditions of employment. Our ethical framework revolves primarily around three concepts: natural justice, academic freedom, and collegial governance. Every faculty member can improve UW just by becoming familiar with these three ideas.

There's a certain commonality to the university labour situations across Ontario and across Canada, so we get a huge benefit through membership in the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) and the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT). Every time I attend an OCUFA or CAUT meeting, I am struck by the same realization: how high the quality of the relationship is between FAUW and our UW administration. This is truly something to cherish and protect. There are many, many universities which seem to have a structurally adversarial relationship in which every little detail is something to be negotiated every couple of years. At UW, we negotiate compensation every one, two or three years but everything else is a topic for constant discussion and evolution, often through the Faculty Relations Committee (FRC) which meets a couple of times per month. I can't say the two sides always

(Continued on page 2)

Inside this issue:

President's Message	1
Wanted: Policy for Directors	5
FAUW Notices	6
UW's Weather/ Emergency Closing Guidelines	7
Open letter to the Chair, University Appointment Review Committee	8

FAUW Office Information

Administrative Officer
Pat Moore
MC 4002
519-888-4567 x.33787
pmmoore@uwaterloo.ca

Administrative Assistant
Miriam Kominar
MC 4001
519-888-4567 x.35158
mkominar@uwaterloo.ca

<http://www.fauw.uwaterloo.ca>

(Continued from page 1)

agree but we can always talk. Many things which other associations must push to achieve are handled proactively by administration or staff in support units at UW. Recently, I've also come to realize that many universities have no faculty association representation on their Senate (or equivalent). At UW, this is enshrined in the University of Waterloo Act. As a practice, the FAUW President sits on the Senate Executive Committee. Under many measures, UW is comparatively well off and I continue to try to understand and appreciate why this is so.

The remainder of my message will highlight some issues at the national, provincial, and local levels, in no particular order of importance.

National (CAUT)

Polling of the public continues to show strong support for universities and professors. In fact, more than fifty percent responded positively to a question about whether university funding should be increased even if personal income tax rates would rise to compensate. Professors are trusted (more than university presidents, believe it or not). The public believes very strongly in the notion of universities as drivers of the economy through university-corporate linkages. I think this is somewhat dangerous in overvaluing the short term and perhaps undervaluing serendipity and curiosity-driven research or research in areas that are not obviously of direct commercial importance.

On some Canadian campuses, there are corporations coming in (or trying to) and teaching lower-level courses for a profit. In particular, there seems to be a focus on preparatory courses for international students who are then guaranteed admission to their program of choice, sometimes at the second-

year level. Often these courses are offered on campus, taking up scarce space/time resources. Underlying this is a management concept called the "virtual enterprise" which gained popularity in a couple of high-tech companies over the past decade. These deals seem to be worked out in secret, mainly with either Navitas (Australia) or Study Group (Australia, in the portfolio of CHAMP Private Equity which is related to the US-based private-equity firm Castle Harlan). A key indicator that such a problem may exist is a university budget dependent on attracting a certain number of international students. If you hear mention of any such thing, please let FAUW know.

All three federal granting agencies (CIHR, NSERC, SSHRC) have boards which have, over the past decade, become dominated by people from the corporate world who sometimes have little basic research experience. UW plays well in this arena but I still think we should be concerned with preserving other models for research activity and funding than just university-industry collaboration.

CAUT remains concerned about the evolution of copyright laws and the implications of faculty members using web-based services for email, file hosting, and the like. Global corporations in the content-provider areas continue to push for very restrictive copyright laws and Canada would be caving except for other delays. Using certain web applications is very dangerous from the points of view of privacy/security and moral/legal rights over content. If the provider has any US affiliation, you (or your students) can be exposed to the provisions of the US Patriot Act. As I write this, it appears that Canada is finally moving on copyright law and, for example, the backup strategy I use on my computer will soon become illegal because it results in more than one

backup copy of some legally purchased content.

A lot of model clauses for policies and practices are drafted by CAUT. They recently settled on the terms "Regular Academic Staff" (RAS) and "Contract Academic Staff" (CAS) to indicate whether one has a permanent or a contractually time-limited appointment, respectively. Part of the appeal of "regular" is in the implication that this is the way it should be. In the US, RAS are now below 30% of the total for four-year degree-granting institutions.

The university and corporate worlds do not always mix particularly well around the concepts of academic freedom and collegial governance. A recent problem involving the University of Manitoba and its partnership with the Winnipeg Regional Health Authority is heading down the path to a CAUT censure of UM. Two interesting terminology inventions in that world include "contingent tenure," which seems to give some kind of budgetary veto to tenure, and the "nil appointment," which means a professor is given the title only (but no salary) from the university.

I was a bit disappointed that the Spring CAUT Council passed a resolution that member fees will be waived when the member association is on strike. On the selfish side, Waterloo can't strike. The old scheme of deferring fee payment does not seem like an undue financial hardship on associations, and we and other associations can, and do, show solidarity by contributing financial aid directly to those associations who are on strike. Much smaller budget issues have seen more debate.

CAUT Council approved a fairly significant restructuring around the representation of so-called "equity-seeking" groups (women, people

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued from page 2)

with disabilities, racialized minorities, people who are culturally First Nations or Francophone, and people with minority sexual preferences or gender identities). There was concern expressed over whether the representative power of women was being diminished. There seemed to be considerable support from women who also fall into one of the other groups. There was some concern over a modest increase to the cost of running these committees and working groups. Overall, I think everyone wants the new structure to be a success. It will be monitored and evaluated, particularly with respect to the representation of women.

On the general topic of equity, Anthony Stewart, President-Elect of the Dalhousie Faculty Association, made a presentation to Council entitled “The Power of Redescription: Developing a New Vocabulary for Talking about Diversity.” In his view, there will always be more-privileged and less-privileged groups so the battle for equity will never be over. Those holding privilege can be ignorant of it, can abuse it, can address it in only token ways, etc. He warned against the attitude of privilege worn as a badge and instead proposed the metaphor of holders of privilege viewing themselves like the occupying army of a city. They are there without the full support of the populace, in a difficult situation, and with a responsibility to manage things somehow. In that sense, we are all responsible, in our own spheres of influence, to be the “equity-seeking” group on behalf of people not enjoying full privilege.

Provincial (OCUFA)

Obviously, one big activity on the provincial scene is to understand and interpret what the Ontario Government is doing with its Bill 16,

Schedule 25, “Public Sector Compensation Restraint to Protect Public Services Act.” FAUW and UW do not negotiate in public so I won’t say much more here. You should receive email updates from our negotiating team as things progress. What remains of concern to me, in terms of institutional autonomy, is the degree to which the government may try to intrude more into line items of the universities’ budgets under the guise of budgetary policy (as opposed to legislation).

A recent OCUFA workshop brought us up to date on the implications of Bill 168, “An Act to amend the Occupational Health and Safety Act with respect to violence and harassment in the workplace and other matters.” These new rules come into effect on June 15 and essentially focus on prevention of harassment and violence in the workplace by putting new obligations on employers. This covers a gap between the existing Occupational Health and Safety Act and the Human Rights Code. Other than the obvious actions of assessing risks, making and implementing policies, and training employees regarding the new rules, employers have to (a) provide a worker with information, including personal information, related to a risk of workplace violence from a person with a history of violent behaviour if the worker can be expected to encounter that person in the course of his/her work and the risk of workplace violence is likely to expose the worker to physical injury; (b) respect an expanded right of work refusal which includes a worker’s right to refuse to work if workplace violence is likely to endanger himself or herself; and (c) take every reasonable precaution to protect a worker from domestic violence where the employer becomes aware, or ought to be aware, that domestic violence that would likely expose the worker to physical injury may occur in the

workplace. Some of these will only be fleshed out as case law evolves and may pose interesting problems for the university community being so large, distributed, diverse, open, etc. A UW Health and Safety workshop is upcoming and I will be attending. FAUW’s role is supposed to be one of monitoring/ensuring adequate policy, procedures, training, and reviewing/updating. Also, we are meant to provide fair representation to faculty members in cases where they are making a complaint, defending against an accusation, seeking to be informed enough to remain safe, or seeking to limit disclosure of too much personal information.

On the pension front, the Ontario budget contained an update on actions taken by the Liberal government over the last few years to strengthen pension plans registered in Ontario and also laid out a general blueprint for pension reform in the coming year. OCUFA maintains an ongoing dialogue with the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) and the government as pension reform proceeds. UW’s Pension and Benefits Committee is very active in monitoring the situation and reporting back to employee groups.

In March, I attended the OCUFA/MPP Reception at Queen’s Park which had a record turnout of both OCUFA ambassadors and Members of Provincial Parliament. One third of the Legislature attended. I was able to speak briefly with Hon. John Milloy, Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities & Research and Innovation, Kitchener Centre (Lib). I also talked with Jim Wilson, Critic – Training, Colleges and Universities & Research and Innovation, Simcoe-Grey (PC). I remain on the fence regarding the cost-benefit tradeoffs for this event (but remember that I am an engineer, not a politician). There is a

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

similar national event in November with MPs in Ottawa which, unfortunately, I could not attend this past year.

Local (FAUW)

One of the big successes for FAUW over the past year has been a revitalization of our Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AF&T), which basically handles the helping of individual faculty members in trouble. Under Sally Gunz' leadership as Chair of AF&T, there has been a number of significant improvements. The committee is larger and better trained, with the goal of having each member handle only about one case per year. After much back and forth, we have agreement with the administration on some practices and wording to help avoid snags in the tenure/promotion processes. Sally has been working with the FAUW staff to create a web site of helpful advice on tenure and promotion. She has also created workshops for faculty members at critical career points. On a side note, it turns out that our Academic Vice President and Provost, Feridun Hamdullahpur, has had occasion to study tenure and promotion policies at a range of universities. He noted that ours, although workable, could be a lot more "inspiring." Having recently been a promotion referee for another university, I tend to agree that it is possible to word these things in ways that look less like hurdles and more like aspirational goals.

You should have received notice of changes to the annual performance review (merit) processes which have been agreed to by FRC. Please have a careful look at the changes as they are not identical with the recommendations coming from the joint committee report of April 28, 2009. In particular, we did not change to a two-year reporting cy-

cle for tenured faculty (recommendation 1.6). We did not eliminate the rubrics or introduce a target mean value to the merit scores (recommendation 1.8). We did not establish any new ongoing salary enhancements for service (recommendation 4.4). A few of the other recommendations saw slight changes. Discussions around recommendations 1.6, 1.8, and 4.4 will continue over the next year.

Progress on the new amalgamated daycare facility, announced in the Daily Bulletin of October 5, 2009, was stalled a bit by changes in the upper administration, and some due diligence on the part of our new Provost. Some fruitful discussions were held and that project now seems to be back on track.

FAUW has been involved in a task force to deal with changes implied by the Access to Ontarians with Disabilities Act. The one-sentence summary would be that we all must now be more prepared in advance to offer our services to people with disabilities. There will be some mandatory training for all UW employees, somewhat akin to the requirement for Workplace Hazardous Materials Inventory System (WHMIS) training. FAUW has been pushing for the written document form (rather than the web-based flash-animation form) as most desirable for busy faculty members (fast readers).

This is by no means a complete list of things happening at the local, provincial, and national levels with FAUW. There are things we could do better. For example, the FAUW standing committees on Compensation and Benefits and on Political Relations are dormant. I believe we might do a better job of monitoring activities at faculty councils. Some associations are following the lead of university administrations and looking at better imaging and mes-

saging.

Most FAUW committees and representative positions have service-time limits to encourage new blood and new thinking. Thus, you will see people leaving certain roles as their time expires, perhaps taking a year or two off or switching to something else in the FAUW domain. There's lots of room for new volunteers to engage and become part of this set of interested faculty members. With respect to the core Board activities, I'd like to thank Kelly Anthony, David Porreca, Frank Zorzitto and Jock MacKay who are departing (temporarily it is hoped) from some of all of their current roles and welcome (in some cases back) Michael Boehringer, Roydon Fraser, Steve Furino and Lori Curtis.

We have been revitalizing our Council of Representatives under the leadership of our Vice President, Shelley Hulan, and have had two very successful meetings this year. There are still some academic units without representation (please see the list on the FAUW website under "About FAUW"); if you are interested in serving as the representative for your department or school, please let us know.

Finally, I would like to give a special thanks to our compensation negotiating team, Metin Renksizbulut and Jock MacKay, for their hard work over the past six months and the preparation for arbitration which they will need to do over the summer. Think about them as you enjoy the good weather.

Wanted: Policy for Directors

Dave DeVidi, *Philosophy*
FAUW Past President

A recent development at the University of Waterloo that I personally find lamentable is the proliferation of “schools.” At one time this was a word reserved for what would otherwise naturally be called “departments,” but where the discipline was associated with a recognized profession—hence, we had a School of Optometry and a School of Accounting. Other than this difference of name, schools are administratively on a par with departments, so much so that it is a reflex when writing documents to insert a clarification that “Chair also means Director, Department also means School.” To use the jargon, both departments and schools are *academic units*. Others may disagree with me about whether the increase in schools that are academic units is lamentable, but some of Waterloo’s schools are *not* academic units, and this is unquestionably a problematic situation.

One reason this is a problem is that while *not* academic units, they do have people holding the title “director.” But this is only an example of a more general trend of “directors” that are not just chairs with a different label. There are “directors” of interdisciplinary programs and centres that are not housed within any particular academic unit, “directors” of new programs that are “housed” in a dean’s office, “directors” of institutes. *The FAUW Board feels there is a huge gap in UW policies* having to do with the role of such directors. I want to use this *Forum* article to indicate why we think there is a problem here.

There are several important problems that arise from this situation, having to do among other things

with collegial governance, administrative efficiency, and academic freedom.

Faculty members at Waterloo are supposed to be appointed to academic units. In recent times, some Faculties have tried to appoint new faculty members to schools that are not academic units; in one case FAUW pointed out that this was a problem when the appointment was about to reach Senate. In many cases, faculty have in fact been appointed to work in programs that do not have a departmental home (being “temporarily” housed “in the dean’s office”).

What’s the big deal? When people are hired into programs that do not have the usual academic structure, e.g., those that are “temporarily” run “out of the dean’s office,” the lines of reporting are unclear. This gives rise to no end of problems. When FAUW recently ran sessions for faculty applying for reappointment or tenure, it became clear that vastly disproportionate numbers of problems occur in programs with this sort of irregular structure. People don’t know to whom they report. Their annual performance review is written by the dean, the same person policy tells them they have to appeal to if the review is unreasonable. Proposals for new programs can be hatched with no opportunity for faculty to have appropriate input because there is nothing requiring the “director” to be answerable to those working in the program. And so on.

Faculty members who are appointed to departments, or schools properly so called, answer to a director who is covered by Policy 40 (The Chair). This policy is a key part of what

constitutes collegial governance in this university. It is written into Policy 40 that a requirement of the chair’s job is the ability to maintain the confidence of departmental colleagues, and one of the grounds for removal of a chair with cause is failure to maintain this confidence. Moreover, the policy guarantees that nobody is appointed chair unless s/he receives the majority of the votes cast by the faculty members on the Chair Nominating Committee selected by the faculty in the department. The chair, crucially, is *not the boss*, but is a colleague temporarily performing an administrative role. The same goes, of course, for the directors of schools properly so called; they are not *bosses*, though their role gives them particular duties and powers to be exercised in reasonable ways that will maintain the confidence of their colleagues.

What rules govern the selection or roles of directors of other sorts? Who knows? There is no policy that sets out a director’s duties, nor do those who answer to them have any defined role in selecting them.

This absence of policy is also problematic for these directors themselves. At least for large centres, institutes or schools that are not academic units, the directors hold those positions because they are expected to show certain sorts of academic leadership and to show academic judgement—for instance, by taking part in the hiring of high quality faculty, in the design of programs, sometimes in assigning teaching or other duties, and so on. The role is, in key respects, akin to that of a chair, though more limited.

(Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 5)

One of the things Policy 40 does for chairs is set down the expectations of the job, so that chairs know by what yardstick they will be measured. Another is to spell out clearly the conditions under which a director can be removed from the job. Without such a governing policy, it is not clear what grounds are appropriate for removing a director from office, nor for negative performance reviews.

This lays such directors open, at least theoretically, to being punished for exercising their academic judgement in ways that displease those higher in the administrative food chain. Moreover, since some of these schools and institutes come into being via large donations, one can imagine that if those we elect to nominate presidents, provosts and deans do not do a sensible job by

nominating only people who will defend the academic autonomy of the university come hell or high water, situations might arise in which a director is punished for academic judgements that displease donors.

It is our impression from discussions at the Faculty Relations Committee that the current Administration shares some of our concerns about this, and at least sees our point on the others. The FAUW Board will be working to make sure that this issue does not drop off the radar and, we hope, we will be cooperating with the Administration to construct reasonable policy to fill this gap.

This will, of course, take time. We cannot, for instance, simply extend a version of Policy 40 to cover everyone who currently holds the title “director” on campus. Some direc-

tors are *already* covered by Policy 40, but many others have jobs that do not involve the full range of a chair’s duties. Moreover, there are some “director” jobs of programs that have, say, a dozen students enrolled at any one time, and where the duties are limited. So a complicated first step will be to sort out to whom a new policy would apply.

If you have suggestions, or see issues we should take into account that we may not have thought of, we invite you to let us know what you’re thinking. You can send your comments to us via the FAUW Administrative Officer, Pat Moore (pmmoore@uwaterloo.ca), get in touch with the FAUW President George Freeman (freeman@uwaterloo.ca), or write to any other member of the FAUW Board, including me (ddevidi@uwaterloo.ca).

FAUW Notices

New Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee Website

The FAUW Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee (AF&T) has launched its new website. You can access the site via the FAUW website at www.fauw.uwaterloo.ca. You will need your WatIAM userid and password to enter the AF&T section. If you experience difficulty accessing the site, please contact Miriam Kominar for assistance at mkominar@uwaterloo.ca or x. 35158.

The AF&T website is intended to provide you with basic information about key documents that impact all regular faculty members at the University. Inevitably, as the content of this site is new, there may be some elements that work better than others. The site is designed to assist faculty, and the reflections of users will undoubtedly be most important in improving the materials over time. Please contact Sally Gunz, Chair of the AF&T Committee, with your comments and suggestions at sgunz@uwaterloo.ca.

Erratum, Issue 143, Dave DeVidi’s article “Update on Merit and Women’s Salary Equity Reviews”

The second paragraph under Women’s Salary Equity should read: “In the first category were six women [not three] for whom there was unquestionably a salary anomaly. These six received an immediate salary adjustment....”

A corrected version has been posted online under Newsletter at www.fauw.uwaterloo.ca.

UW's Weather/Emergency Closing Guidelines

Shannon Dea, Philosophy

Member of the FAUW Status of Women and Equity Committee (SWEC)

In October 2009, UW updated its Weather/Emergency Closing Guidelines (available here: <http://www.secretariat.uwaterloo.ca/guidelines/stormclosing.htm>). Prior to these revisions, this policy stipulated that, on business days, if the local school boards closed due to inclement weather, then the university would do so too. The revised policy no longer mentions school closings. Here is the procedure dictated by the revised policy:

A decision to “close” during the day will be made by the Provost, in consultation with as many of the following as can be reached: the Director of Police & Parking Services, Director of Communications & Public Affairs, Director of Custodial & Grounds Services. Such a decision will specify whether the closing is “immediate” or at a stated hour and will be conveyed to departmental offices as expeditiously as possible, as well as being posted to UW’s homepage and conveyed to local radio stations. Unless otherwise specified, the closing continues from that hour until 7 a.m. the next day. At the designated hour, staff and faculty (except those providing “essential services”) are entitled to leave, without loss of pay. As seems reasonable, a Department Head may give permission, for staff and faculty to leave sooner. A class or examination that would continue past the specified closing hour is cancelled in its entirety, as are scheduled evening classes.

Divorcing the UW closure procedure from the decision made by the school boards has the advantage that UW need no longer be constrained by weather conditions and/or reports obtained at 5:00 a.m. (when a decision about whether to run school buses must be made). However, this change has implications for faculty, staff and students with school-age children, who likely face childcare challenges on snow days declared by the school system, but not the University.

FAUW's Status of Women and Equity Committee (SWEC) would like to hear FAUW members' thoughts on the revised policy. What are your reactions to the change in policy? How (if at all) are you impacted by the change? Please send your feedback to Shannon Dea (sjdea@uwaterloo.ca) or Diana Parry (dcparry@uwaterloo.ca).

FAUW Forum

The FAUW Forum is a service for UW faculty sponsored by the Association. It seeks to inform members about current Association matters, to promote the exchange of ideas and to foster open debate on issues with a wide and balanced spectrum of views.

Opinions expressed in the Forum are those of the authors, and ought not to be perceived as representing the views of the Association or its Board of Directors unless so specified. Members are invited to submit letters, news items and brief articles.

If you do not wish to receive the Forum, please contact the Faculty Association Office and your name will be removed from the mailing list.

Open Letter

17 May 2010

Professor Ellsworth LeDrew
Chair, University Appointments Review Committee

Dear Professor LeDrew:

FAUW's Status of Women and Equity Committee (SWEC) wishes to express its serious concern over the severe gender disparity in new faculty recruitment this year so far. Since January to the date of writing, UW has hired 31* new faculty, 28* of them men. Even for UW, a female recruitment rate of less than ten percent is shocking.

While there may be some challenges hiring excellent women candidates because they are in high demand, many UW departments should be in a position to meet these challenges. We see no reason why so few departments were able to successfully recruit women.

We appreciate that it is not unheard of for a department to make an offer to an excellent female candidate who accepts a position elsewhere, leading the department to make an offer to an excellent male candidate. However, it stretches credulity to suppose that this occurred in more than a small handful of this year's hires. Similarly, some of the recruitment may have occurred in departments in which women are already well-represented; however, it is clear from the UW job ads that appeared in *University Affairs* over the past academic year that the bulk of open positions at the university were in departments that are already disproportionately male.

This is, in one sense, unsurprising since the relevant applicant pools are likewise disproportionately male. And, as UW administrators regularly point out, there is a "pipeline" problem in hiring women in such disciplines. To wit, since most universities are trying to recruit more women in these disciplines, there is considerable competition for the few women in the relevant applicant pools, making it more difficult to recruit them.

It is very troubling to SWEC, however, that this "pipeline" problem persists even in a year in which UW is one of the very few major North American universities still hiring tenure-stream faculty. This year afforded us the best opportunity we've had in years to recruit female faculty members in male-dominated disciplines, and yet our recruitment of female faculty is more deplorable this year than ever. On the face of it, this year would seem to put the lie to the pipeline argument and to UW administrators' repeated claims that they take equitable hiring seriously.

Perhaps even more troubling is the fact that these results occurred in a year in which all UW faculty hiring was "mission critical." The unavoidable conclusion is that UW's programs in male-dominated disciplines are regarded as the most mission-critical programs at UW.

Indeed, it would seem that mission-critical hiring – regardless of which programs are favoured – tends to exclude women. There is abundant empirical evidence that female academics tend more often than males to engage in interdisciplinary work or to have broad areas of specialization, and hence that broader specializations in academic job ads net more female applicants (Valian 218). This year's record suggests that mission-critical hiring at UW manifests as single-discipline, narrow-specialization job ads – exactly the kind of ads that scholars have long known further reduce the number of female applicants in the pool.

It goes without saying that failures to recruit female faculty members can lead to serious challenges in retaining them. Women faculty can feel alienated in a "men's club" environment, especially when that ethos is reinforced in hiring years like this one. Moreover, female faculty members in male-dominated departments tend to take on a larger share of service work due to the need for gender equity on committees. This can lead to fatigue, frustration and alienation. Moreover, this could have serious implications for obtaining tenure.

It is a matter of grave concern to SWEC that the University of Waterloo has, it seems, responded to times of austerity by further widening UW's faculty gender gap. We urge the University Appointments Review Committee to take immediate measures to address the female faculty recruitment shortfall before it manifests as a serious retention challenge. It is of the utmost importance that the University of Waterloo demonstrate that equitable hiring is critical to the university's mission.

Sincerely,

Diana Parry, Chair
On behalf of the Status of Women and Equity Committee

CC: Dr. Feridun Hamdullahpur, Vice-President, Academic and Provost
FAUW Forum

Reference

Valian, V. "Beyond Gender Schemas: Improving the Advancement of Women in Academia." *NWSA Journal* 16.1 (2004) 207-220.

*Since the letter was written the total number of regular faculty hires (definite-term, probationary and tenured) has increased to 35, 32 of them men.