

FAUW FORUM

Issue 145
March 2011
David Porreca, Copy Editor

Vice President's Message



*Shelley Hulan, English
Language and Literature*

Explaining what the Faculty Association has been doing over the past seven months in a single report is a daunting task. In what follows, I draw on all my high-school practice writing précis to attempt it:

The recently renewed struggles over an amalgamated daycare on campus remind me of my rookie year at the University of Waterloo, in which the theme for the Faculty Orientation was work-life balance. No one participating in the half-day of panels actually explained how to achieve it, and no one who attended really expected them to, even if someone at UW had really discovered the secret. Had that been the case, I would have bought the book along with everyone else and made UW an extremely wealthy institution. Having worked here now for eight years, I would have to say that even without the bestseller revenues for its coffers, the

University is hardly hurting moneywise. That's one of the reasons why the Faculty Association Board of Directors is pleased to see some forward movement on the agreement to build the new daycare, fifteen months after it was announced in the Daily Bulletin (Oct. 5, 2009).

The project hit a roadblock when the architectural firm the University hired to design the building estimated that the new facility would involve higher construction costs than were originally allotted in the capital budget for it. In the end, the budget shortfall was \$700,000, bringing the total price tag for the project to \$3.7 million. The creative solution to the impasse had two parts, the first being the agreement of the FAUW membership (via an email ballot sent out in mid-December) to commit additional FAUW funds to the project as one that unquestionably affects work-life balance in a positive way both for working parents on campus and the academic units that benefit from employees who have less chaos in their lives and more options for coordinating job and family responsibilities. A key objective of building the new daycare has always been to add fifty new childcare spaces to the existing number, bringing the total to 196. In collaboration with Dave DeVidi from the FAUW Board, and working with the money that FAUW members pledged to the cause, the Amalgamated Daycare Board of Directors has come up with several options that will retain

(Continued on page 2)

MARK YOUR CALENDAR

FAUW ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Tuesday, April 5, 2011
2:00 pm, MC 4020

light refreshments

~~~~~

#### AF&T COMMITTEE APRIL 2011 WORKSHOPS

see page 10 for details

#### Inside this issue:

|                                              |    |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| What's happening with the new daycare?       | 4  |
| UARC response to SWEC's open letter          | 5  |
| Member response to SWEC's open letter        | 6  |
| Is it time to change our hiring practices?   | 8  |
| SWEC: Who we are and what are we working on? | 9  |
| AF&T Committee April Workshops               | 10 |
| Call for nominations                         | 11 |
| Nomination form                              | 12 |

*(Continued from page 1)*

those spaces, and with them, perhaps also some of the faculty and staff with young families desperately in need of the service, as one new faculty member pointed out at the Faculty Association's Annual General Meeting in December.

This faculty member saw accessible daycare as a powerful recruitment tool; the number of daycares on campus helped convince him and his wife that Waterloo was the place for them. Some statistics on UW's recruitment of new faculty were presented at the November 2010 meeting of Senate, at which the Director of Institutional Analysis and Planning Mary Jane Jennings noted that the University's hiring of new women faculty has stalled at around 23% of total UW hires, coming in at slightly under that figure (22.6%) in the last year (2009) for which data has been gathered. Is eliminating this stagnation a matter of attracting more women faculty to Waterloo or of hiring more of the women who do apply? What we know for sure is that new faculty, male and female, have to make life decisions as well as career decisions, and giving them a few choices when they're making them will enrich UW in important respects.

Also at the November Senate meeting, FAUW President George Freeman brought forward a motion "That Senate direct the Faculty Relations Committee to develop a process, consistent with the procedures in Policy 1 on Initiation and Review of University Policies but ensuring broad consultation with Waterloo faculty, that will lead to two new policies on (1) donor agreements and (2) governance of centres, institutes, and schools which are not academic units." He made this motion after the release of the CAUT Report on the dismissal of Dr. Ramesh Thakur from the Directorship of the Balsillie School. Len Findlay, the University of Saskatchewan professor appointed to investigate the dismissal, identified serious flaws in the process that led to Dr. Thakur's dismissal from his post, an outcome that seemed incompatible with university practice and in particular with the extension of his term (from two years to five) that he received in 2009 by a unanimous vote of CIGI's Strategic Committee. As the FAUW executive noted in a memorandum to its members at the time, the difficulties in this case

were exacerbated by a lack of relevant university policy. While the terms "director" and "school" both occur in the description of the position from which Dr. Thakur was terminated, the Balsillie School is not a "school" in the same sense of "academic unit of the university" as are, for instance, the School of Accounting and Finance or the School of Computer Science. Nor was Dr Thakur a "director" in the sense of being covered by Policy 40. Had he been covered by such policy, there would have been well-defined processes for annual performance review and, if there were genuine and significant problems with performance, a well-defined process for removal with cause could have been invoked.

It is imperative that the mechanisms by which all faculty are evaluated for performance review purposes are utterly clear, transparent, and consistent with other feedback they receive. The breakneck proliferation of centres and institutes at UW—there are now forty, some created in advance of the governance documents to regulate them—sounds alarm bells for the same reason. Faculty have the protections afforded them under the Memorandum of Agreement and UW Policies, which include procedures for assessing the quality of their work that are followed by academic units, into which it is expected that all faculty members are hired. There is at present no provision (or protection) for any employee hired into a centre or an institute—nor, it should be noted, should any faculty be so hired. Without a unit "home," it is not clear how they will be assessed or who will assess them, and this state of affairs leaves faculty, especially pre-tenure faculty, vulnerable in a system where employment security and long-term job prospects depend upon positive evaluations written by people qualified to make them, and in settings where one's co-workers (who may sit on performance review committees advisory to the unit chair) are also one's peers. After an animated discussion, the Senate motion passed.

Faculty performance reviews in general are undergoing a series of changes to implement the recommendations of the Report of the Working Group on Faculty Performance Evaluation released in April 2009. The working group, which had a mandate to review "the existing processes and systems that comprise and support the annual faculty performance evaluation," proposed a series of changes to the process that will be implemented in 2011, for example, the formation of mandatory evaluation committees advisory to the chair of any academic unit of 15 or more FTE members.

To return for a moment to work-life balance: For two weeks this past August, representatives from employee associations and labour unions in four public-sector employee groups gave their vacations a miss in order to meet with provincial government officials in what was billed as a series of "consultations" intended to build consensus on a plan to meet the provincial government's policy objectives, one of which was no net compensation increase for public sector employees for the first two years of any agreement signed after an

*(Continued on page 3)*

(Continued from page 2)

association's current contract expired. Announced in July, the talks were held at the Royal York Hotel in Toronto under a media blackout during the dog days of summer, while periodic conference calls updated fellow associations as to the content and progress of the discussions. These meetings, and the provincial government's clear attempt to replace the collective bargaining process used by individual faculty associations to negotiate salary for their members, supply part of the context for last year's marathon salary negotiations, which began in November 2009 and ended only with an agreement struck after the FAUW and the University administration had gone to arbitration in September 2010. As you know, that deal included the two years of 0 scale, though merit pay was not frozen. As the Faculty Association's chief negotiator, Metin Renksizbulut, said at the time,

a faculty member making \$125,000 annual salary, "approximately the average salary at UW," would, after the five years covered by the current agreement had passed, have received "a compounded average salary increase of 4.5% per year" (Message to Members 13 September 2010). Subsequent salary negotiations and arbitrations at other Ontario postsecondary institutions have yielded agreements roughly equivalent to UW's, with Western's Faculty Association ratifying a deal that will see scale increases of 1.5% in each year of the four year agreement, Carleton's Academic Staff Association winning 2.2% of payroll each year for two years at arbitration, and the University of Toronto being awarded 2.25% per year, retroactive to July 2009 and continuing to June 30, 2011, also at arbitration. UTFA returns to the table for a new round of negotiations this spring.

#### **2010-2011 Board of Directors**

**President & OCUFA Director**—George Freeman , *Electrical & Computer Engineering*

**Past President**—Dave DeVidi, *Philosophy*

**Vice President**—Shelley Hulan, *English Language & Literature*

**Treasurer**—Steve Furino, *Dean of Mathematics Office*

**Chief Negotiator**—Metin Renksizbulut, *Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering*

#### **Directors**

Michael Boehringer, *Germanic & Slavic Studies*

Roydon Fraser, *Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering*

Doris Jakobsh, *Religious Studies*

Doug Kirton, *Fine Arts*

Susan Leat, *Optometry*

Cyntha Struthers, *St. Jerome's University Faculty Association Representative*

#### **Non-Voting Members**

Sally Gunz, *Chair, Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee*

Diana Parry, *Chair, Status of Women & Equity Committee*

Lori Curtis, *Liaison, Pension & Benefits Committee*

Leeanne Romane, *LAUW Official Visitor*

David Porreca, *Forum Copy Editor*

#### **TAX TIP**

##### **Your dues are deductible!**

Human Resources will mail your information to you in early March. If you have any questions or need a re-print, please contact Human Resources main reception at x. 32524.



## What's happening with the new daycare?

*David DeVidi, Philosophy, Past President*

As most FAUW members will know, and as Shelley Hulan discusses in her Vice-President's message, in December Waterloo faculty voted in overwhelming numbers to give the FAUW Board the right to use a portion of members' fees to help assure that the new daycare building on campus is built with the originally mandated number of spaces, and to help improve access to those spaces for faculty members.

This unprecedented referendum of the Association membership was necessitated by some quite puzzling decisions and public statements by the University administration last fall. At the time, they insisted that budgetary constraints meant the daycare needed to be built in a way that would not increase the number of daycare spots at UW. I won't rehash the reasons the FAUW Board has for thinking this a poor decision, as we did what we could to make those reasons clear in advance of the referendum. What matters is that the result of the referendum was an overwhelming show of support — 80% of those expressing an opinion voted in favour of granting the authority, with a substantial voter turnout. This shows,

I think, that faculty all across campus recognize the importance of the availability of quality childcare to the proper functioning of our university. Even those of us who don't have our own nightmare stories about trying to find child care almost all have junior colleagues who do.

It may be because of the recognition of how strongly faculty feel about this issue, as reflected in this vote, or it may just be the dollars on the table ... whatever the cause, there has been a marked change of tone and increasing displays of flexibility by the university on the daycare financing issue. As Shelley Hulan notes in her column, there was a substantial gap between the architects' estimate of the cost of the building and the original budget estimate of how much it would cost the university to build the daycare centre. The money FAUW brought to the table was a start to help bridge the gap.

What FAUW has also tried to bring to the table has been a willingness to think creatively. We worked with representatives of the daycare, one of whom is a representative of the Staff Association, and devel-

oped proposals that we thought would bridge the financial gap in ways that would address the priorities of all stakeholders: for faculty, access to quality daycare; for staff and students, affordability; and for the University, ensuring that the daycare will be financially viable and that the spots in the daycare it builds will go, as much as possible, to the children of UW employees and students. We asked possibly embarrassing questions (e.g., Does the university really need to make money out of this project by charging the daycare commercial interest rates on this mortgage?) and got back creative counter-suggestions (perhaps we can reconceive the university financial contribution as something other than a loan, and this would be in the financial interests of everyone).

I do not want to try to negotiate in public, nor to count un-hatched chickens. But as of the time of writing this article (Feb. 9), discussions about how to bridge the gap are ongoing and are being carried out in a constructive spirit on all sides. It is not unreasonable to hope for an announcement of good news soon.

### ***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 at [fauw@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:fauw@uwaterloo.ca) and your name will be removed from the mailing list.*

## UARC response to SWEC's open letter (Issue 144, 06/10)

---

I write on behalf of the University of Waterloo UARC (University Appointments Review Committee) to comment on issues related to gender balance in hiring. Some of these issues were raised in the letter of 17 May, 2010, from Diana Parry, Chair of the Status of Women and Equity Committee of the Faculty Association. This letter has been reprinted in the FAUW newsletter of June 2010.

UARC has discussed these issues in two regular UARC meetings held since receipt of this letter. We have also assessed the UARC data as reported to Senate each year to determine the history of the ratio of female to male faculty hiring. On June 24, 2010 we reported on the outcome of these discussions to you by letter and followed with a joint meeting of the two committees in the fall of 2010. At this meeting we examined our suggestions and discussed how the situation may be improved. We expect these joint meetings to continue as we progress. UARC has followed up on these discussions through a discussion with Dr. Geoff McBoyle, Vice-President, Academic and Provost.

UARC has had a wide-ranging discussion of gender balance in the hiring process and has concluded that there is more that can be done. We note that Department or School efforts to proactively attract members of the under-represented gender are not well documented, despite the requirement on the Submission Form to report on "Special efforts to recruit candidates of the under-represented sex:" (<http://www.secretariat.uwaterloo.ca/forms/facultyappts.htm>).

The following recommendations have resulted from the UARC discussions:

- The Chair of UARC should raise the issues with Deans and recommend on proactive activity and reporting.
- UARC will provide Guidance through a Best Practices for Chairs document. This document will address issues that include discipline-specific web sites and methods of personal outreach to the under-represented gender.
- Departments or Schools should make specific efforts to appoint and report on the progress to appoint tenured members of the under-represented gender to DACA and SACA's. We recognize that this may strain the resources of some of the smaller units. In these instances, we recommend that specific arrangements for increased service weighting in merit be considered to accommodate this issue.
- The University is requested to develop procedures to invite members from Departments of related interest to join the DACA or SACA for instances when a Department or School does not have a sufficient number of members of the under-represented gender for the DACA or SACA.
- We recommend that the Provost request the breakdown of gender in the Department or School when the Dean seeks approval of the position.
- We recommend that the Provost consider that s/he request a plan for effective gender outreach at the approval stage of the position.
- UARC will approach the Tri-councils and inquire whether lists of current post-docs and Fellows are available and whether they may be used for notification of positions to ensure effective outreach to both genders in all disciplines.
- UARC requests that there be compelling written discussion by the Chair or Director if there are no applicants of the under-represented gender in the short list of three applicants submitted for review.

UARC examined the statistics for gender representation in the hiring process. It has prepared statistics of appointments by gender since 1995 to the end of the 2008-09 academic year for the annual Senate reports.

For the period of record from 1995-96 to 2008-09, the average appointment of females for all Faculties was 34% of the total with an annual maximum average of 49% for 2007-08. Note that in the June 2002 "Welcoming Women Faculty: The report of the Provost's task force on female faculty recruitment" document, the ratio cited for 1999-2000 academic year alone was 20.3%. While progress has been made we agree that we can do better. These summary data were also used in the 2008-09 academic year report to Senate this past winter and are available in those minutes.

As cited above, UARC recognizes that more must be done to resolve the gender-balance issue and we have come forward with a series of steps to move in the right direction. These issues have been discussed with your

*(Continued on page 6)*

*(Continued from page 5)*

committee in a very productive session. We look forward to further collaboration as our recommendations are considered and future opportunities arise.

Ellsworth LeDrew  
*Geography and Environmental Management  
 Chair, University Appointments Review Committee*

## **Member response to SWEC's open letter (Issue 144, 06/10)**

---

As a member of the Economics department's recruiting committee last year, I strongly disagree with the positions expressed in the SWEC's open letter in the FAUW Forum, issue 144, June 2010. The open letter argues that UW should alter its hiring procedures to increase positions allocated to small multidisciplinary departments. Rather than discussing issues such as the nature of "mission critical" positions, or the University's strategic plan, the letter instead criticizes recent hiring by way of irrelevant and poorly informed gender related arguments. This is inappropriate and discredits committees for the advancement of women in academia. In what follows, I address several of the letter's key points.

"The bulk of open positions at the university were in departments that are already disproportionately male. This is unsurprising since the relevant applicant pools are disproportionately male."

As a result of several recent resignations and retirements, the Economics department was one of the departments given permission to hire. Moreover, due to severe shortages of faculty in two key areas necessary to staff our PhD program, hiring in our department was considered mission critical. Our hiring process followed all relevant university procedures, including checks to make sure that hiring is not discriminatory. Economics received 303 applications, 26.7% (81) came from women. We met with 58 candidates, 22.4% (13) were women. These numbers are in line with the male-female breakdown in economics PhDs in North America (Freeman, 2004, Ginther and Kahn, 2004, CWEN report, 2001).

Other majority male departments, such as engineering and mathematics, remain so despite trends towards pushing women and young girls into these fields over the last 30 years. Why is that? Research by Fryer and Levitt (2010) documents a gender gap in mathematics which starts as early as grade 1 but cannot identify one major source for this gap. Hunt (2010) documents the higher exit rate of women compared to men in science and engineering. She finds different determinants of the gender gap in exit rates in science and engineering compared to those in other skilled occupations suggesting the solution cannot be an easy "one-size fits all" policy.

"UW's programs in male-dominated disciplines are regarded as the most mission-critical programs at UW"

The letter makes it sound as if the criterion for mission critical was based on whether the department is largely male. It might be worth remembering here that the University of Waterloo's reputation within Canada and abroad is based on the strength of its mathematics, computer science and engineering departments. In years of budget cuts, it is legitimate for the University to focus on preserving strengths instead of cutting everywhere or trying to develop smaller departments.

"There is abundant empirical evidence that female academics tend more often than males to engage in interdisciplinary work"

The letter argues that the University should create more interdisciplinary jobs, because those are the jobs women work in. However, little evidence of this is given, and a broader view of the literature shows that women are concentrated in different fields than men, not necessarily more interdisciplinary ones (Ginther and Kahn (2004)). In economics for example, there are relatively more women in the fields of labour and health economics. Would

*(Continued on page 7)*

(Continued from page 6)

creating a faculty of labour and health studies as large as the engineering faculty then minimize and perhaps eliminate the university gender imbalance? But wait, I have lost what we are trying to achieve here. Shouldn't a university first decide what are its goals and needs, and then hire the best candidates available, instead of just creating jobs for women to fill?

"Failure to recruit female faculty members can lead to serious challenges in retaining them. Women faculty can feel alienated in a men's club environment"

Not all women automatically view the hiring outcome as a violation of equal treatment of men and women. Women can also feel alienated by being hired solely to fill a quota. I find the idea of a department that chooses candidates based on their gender to be very alienating and such a department would be unattractive to me. By alleging unfairness without even attempting to provide evidence of it (was a better qualified women passed over to hire a weaker male candidate?), the SWEC contributes to these problems.

Rather than the old boys club, the SWEC works to create an old girls club by organizing a female faculty networking event and inviting *only* women, such as the meeting this past June 24<sup>th</sup>. Excluding men goes against the spirit of academia. We should work together on women and more generally, on family issues, mixing gender as well as disciplines because all of these have something to bring to the table. The SWEC *women-only* networking meetings is to me what creates alienation and retention issues, not only for women like me but for men as well.

Stéphanie Lluis

*Economics*

#### References

Bayard J. and E. Greenlee, 2009, "Graduating in Canada: Profile, Labour Market Outcomes and Student Debt of the Class of 2005". Statistics Canada. Human Resources and Skills Development Canada.

CWEN Report, 2001, "Report of the Special Committee on the Status of Women Economists in Canada", available at <http://www.yorku.ca/cwen/SWECFINALREPORT.pdf>

Freeman, Catherine E., 2004, "Trends in Educational Equity of Girls & Women: 2004." US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC, November.

Fryer R. and S. D. Levitt, 2010, "An Empirical Analysis of the Gender gap in Mathematics", *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, vol 2, pp. 210-240.

Ginther D. and S. Kahn, 2004, "Women I Economics: Moving Up or Falling Off the Academic Career Ladder?", *Journal of Economics perspectives*, vol 18(3) , pp 193-214.

Hunt, J., 2010, "Why Women do Leave Science and Engineering?", NBER working paper # 15853.

#### How to contact FAUW

Pat Moore  
Administrative Officer

MC 4002, Ext. 33787  
pmmoore at uwaterloo.ca

Miriam Kominar  
Administrative Assistant/  
Communications Coordinator

MC 4001, Ext. 35158  
mkominar at uwaterloo.ca

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

## Is it time to change our hiring practices?

*Dave DeVidi, Philosophy, Past President*

Judging by the available objective measures, this university is not doing well when it comes to gender equity in hiring. It's tough to say so because when you point to these measures people—in particular, people involved in hiring or the strategic direction of the university—tend to hear it as a personal accusation. As a general rule, questioning the character of someone whose cooperation you need is seldom good strategy. So it's very important for everyone to acknowledge that it's a mistake to think that the only way unfair and inequitable things happen is the presence of a sexist (or racist or homophobic ...) somewhere along the decision-making chain.

A letter from SWEC published in the last issue of the Forum (June 2010) noted that in the most recent hiring year fewer than 10% of job offers went to women, which I'm sure shocked many on campus. Of course, one year's worth of data does not by itself prove very much. One difficulty we have in evaluating the equity situation at Waterloo is a lack of good UW-specific longitudinal data—a point I'll return to.

But the data we do have doesn't present a pretty picture. Waterloo is last among the G13 research-intensive Canadian universities for percentage of female faculty, and not just by a little bit (25% at Waterloo; second worst is McGill, 29.9%; Dalhousie is tops at almost 40%). A 2007 FAUW study, carried out by highly respected faculty from across campus, carefully compared Waterloo's hiring in Science, Engineering and Math to comparable units elsewhere. It concluded "UW has low percentages of female faculty compared to other Universities, and it would seem that we have a problem recruiting in Science and Mathematics."

Various explanations have recently been bruited by the President and Provost. The overall low percentage of women faculty at Waterloo is due to our having a higher percentage of faculty in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) than most universities, and STEM areas notoriously have lower percentages of women than, say, humanities or social sciences. This is at least partly a "pipeline" issue—there is a lower percentage of PhD holding job candidates in STEM fields. And, as was suggested at the November town hall, Waterloo hiring is done according to policy.

Of course, the FAUW study took care to compare apples with apples before concluding that Waterloo has a problem. And it's important to see the limits of the pipeline argument: using data from the university's Key Performance Indicators for the most recent hiring year, the percentage of women in the relevant PhD pool in Math was 45%, while the rate of hiring at Waterloo was 10%; in Science, it was 26% and 9%, respectively.

I'm sure that hiring is (almost always) done according to policy. What these numbers suggest is not that bad will, sexist attitudes, or any sort of conspiracy keeps women from being hired. Rather, given that if we keep doing what we've been doing we're likely to get similar results, they suggest this: If we're serious about wanting to hire women at a rate within shouting distance of the supply in the pipeline (or even higher until the dispiriting shortage in the pipeline is fixed), changes in our hiring practices are in order. Right now, UARC, the University Appointments Review Committee, works hard to ensure that policies are followed. But if the policies and practices are not themselves well-designed to meet equity goals,

making sure that hiring policies and existing standards of practice are enforced will not get us there.

When I was FAUW President, the then-Provost and I were both enthusiastic about creating an Associate Provost, Appointments position with: (i) a mandate to research what changes in practice have made a real difference elsewhere; (ii) the ability to gather relevant, Waterloo-specific hiring information to evaluate whether the changes would work here; and (iii) the clout to get buy-in from those who have been getting excellent colleagues for years hiring the way it has traditionally been done. Unfortunately, we were the only two enthusiastic about this idea, and it died. Times of fiscal restraint are not ideal ones for creating still more positions in Needles Hall when departments, especially in the non-STEM parts of campus, have faculty positions that are sitting vacant.

But Waterloo can investigate "best practices" for faculty hiring with equity as a goal. A quick web search turns up literally dozens of university "best practices" reports, and the recommendations overlap to a remarkable degree. Of course, so do most documents on any particular topic produced by several universities—which university doesn't have a strategic plan that suggests differentiating it from the rest by being innovative and entrepreneurial? But these reports are based on research, and there are currently research projects underway investigating approaches to promoting equity, particularly in STEM disciplines, in ways that simultaneously enhance quality.

Waterloo can make progress on two fronts. By gathering relevant

*(Continued on page 9)*



*(Continued from page 8)*

statistical data systematically we will have good longitudinal evidence—no more basing judgements on one-year snapshots—and the UARC Chair can make more detailed reports to Senate, making clear who is making progress and who is not. The point is not to shame people—though, I suppose, repeatedly being singled out as delinquent in this respect might lead someone to feel some shame in the future—but to identify what works and what doesn't. And the administration and FAUW should work together on defining new, more effective hiring practices.

## **Status of Women and Equity Committee: Who are we and what are we working on?**

*Diana Parry, Recreation & Leisure Studies, SWEC Chair*

After a three year hiatus, the Status of Women and Equity Committee (SWEC) was reactivated in June 2009. Its letter dated May 17, 2010 to the FAUW Forum concerning gender inequities in hiring on campus brought renewed awareness about the committee. We are pleased that the discussion of faculty hiring is continuing in this issue of the Forum, but this is just one of many issues we have been addressing. Our purpose in writing this submission is to acquaint faculty members with SWEC's mandate, introduce its membership, highlight its current issues, and solicit input on matters the campus community would like to see the committee address.

### **Mandate**

SWEC is a standing committee of FAUW concerned with matters related to equity and the status of women, including hiring, working conditions, and compensation. The committee undertakes educational and advocacy activities as appropriate and liaises with other related committees of the University, OCUFA, and CAUT.

Under this mission, SWEC: (1) maintains a watching brief for FAUW on issues related to equity and the status of women; (2) develops policy positions pertaining thereto, especially as related to FAUW's role as the representative of faculty on terms and conditions of employment; (3) actively supports research focused on issues related to equity and the status of women; (4) promotes equity through activities such as organizing speaker series, hosting social events, and developing information networks; (5) monitors the University's progress toward equitable hiring and its treatment of faculty through collecting published information and surveying and reporting faculty viewpoints; (6) provides active assistance to the FAUW Board, and to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, the Compensation Committee, and the Pensions and Benefits Committee at their request when specific cases or situations involve issues of equity and/or gender; (7) reports to the FAUW Board bi-yearly on its activities and provides to the Board a yearly budget request to support its activities; and (8) serves as a liaison with other relevant committees at the University of Waterloo and the OCUFA and CAUT Status of Women and Equity Committees.

### **Membership**

Currently, the committee includes eleven members who have been appointed to represent each Faculty and the Library. The current SWEC members are: Diana Parry (Chair, Recreation and Leisure Studies), Dan Brown (Computer Science), Melanie Campbell (Physics and Astronomy), Shannon Dea (Philosophy), Fraser Easton (English Language and Literature), Anne Fullerton (Library), Doris Jakobsh (Religious Studies), Kathryn Plaisance (Faculty of Environment), Susan Shaw (Recreation and Leisure Studies), Cynthia Struthers (St. Jerome's, Statistics and Actuarial Science), and Elizabeth Weckman (Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering).

### **Activities**

Given its mission and the duties with which it has been charged, SWEC has focused its efforts on a number of issues on campus. Our activities thus far include: (1) working with Human Resources to establish and make accessible a summary of HR administered leaves and reduced workload policies/guidelines applicable to faculty (see FAUW website); (2) soliciting feedback on the change in the snow closure guidelines; (3) establishing relationships on campus with the Office for Persons with Disabilities, the Conflict Management and Human Rights Office, and other groups including Women's Studies and GLOW, and provincially with the OCUFA Status of Women committee; (4) initiating an investigation into resources for elder care; (6) launching a SWEC website linked to the FAUW's site to keep faculty informed; and (7) promoting equity through activities such as hosting social events, and developing information networks. SWEC also monitors the University's progress towards

*(Continued on page 10)*

*(Continued from page 9)*

equitable hiring and treatment of faculty. As outlined in the submission by Dr. LeDrew, we work hard to address hiring inequities on campus and have established an exceptionally positive working relationship with UARC. We are very optimistic about the changes which our committees are currently working on together. In closing, SWEC strives to advance a variety of equity issues on campus.

We welcome your feedback and suggestions on matters you would like the committee to address. Please feel free to contact Diana Parry, Chair of SWEC, or any member of the committee to pass along your comments, questions, or concerns.

## WORKSHOPS FOR FACULTY

*The FAUW Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee is presenting four workshops to help faculty through key transitions in their academic career.*

### FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The probationary contract period and applying for tenure can be intimidating! The biggest risks you face are those stemming from uncertainty on your part about the expectations of your peers and of university policy. These workshops are designed to provide critical information on how to succeed and to ensure you know where and how to get your questions answered. The workshops complement the Documenting Your Teaching for Tenure & Promotion workshop presented by the university.

#### **Faculty recently hired to their first probationary term**

*Wednesday, April 6, 2011, 9:00 am to 12:00 pm*

#### **Faculty applying for contract renewal in 2011**

*Tuesday, April 5, 2011, 8:30 to 10:30 am*

#### **Faculty applying for tenure in 2011**

*Wednesday, April 6, 2011, 1:00 to 4:00 pm*

### FOR TENURED FACULTY

#### **Applying for promotion to full professor**

*Tuesday, April 5, 2011, 11:30 am to 1:00 pm*

Tenured faculty who are considering applying for promotion in 2011 or the near future should attend this workshop for advice on Policy 77 and clarifying what is expected from peers and from the university in the promotion process. This workshop will walk you through the process step by step and will provide explanations of formal policy as well as practical tips to help you succeed.

### IMPORTANT INFORMATION

- *All workshops will be held in MC 4020.*
- *Pre-tenure faculty may register for more than one workshop.*
- *Please contact Miriam Kominar at [mkominar@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:mkominar@uwaterloo.ca) to register.*
- *The registration deadline is Monday, March 28, 2011.*
- *Questions about the workshops should be sent to Sally Gunz, AF&T Committee Chair, at [sgunz@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:sgunz@uwaterloo.ca).*

*The AF&T Committee comprises tenured faculty members from across the university who are trained in key elements of university policy and the Memorandum of Agreement. The committee assists faculty members who have difficulties involving the application of these documents or who have other concerns that impact their conditions of employment.*

## FAUW CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

### PRESIDENT (one-year term of office) and DIRECTORS (five to be elected)

The Faculty Association is one of the few bodies on campus where faculty and librarians can effect changes in University policies and procedures. It needs the involvement of members from all units in order to serve the membership effectively and to represent its concerns well to other members of the University community. Please consider standing for one of these positions.

The Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo invites nominations for its Board of Directors. The Board consists of eleven Association members: the president, past-president, eight at-large directors, plus one director elected by and from the St. Jerome's University Faculty Association. All faculty and librarians who are members of the Association are eligible to sit on the Board. Under the Memorandum of Agreement, service to the Association is considered service to the University when faculty members are assessed for the purposes of annual performance reviews, tenure, and promotion.

The Board considers all matters concerning faculty relations with UW's administration, university governance as it affects the Association membership, and the Memorandum of Agreement. The Board also advises the FAUW representatives on the Faculty Relations Committee, where a wide range of university issues related to employment and policy are discussed. The Board normally meets bi-weekly on Thursday afternoons from 2:30 to 4:30, September through June.

The positions of president and director (five vacancies) are open for terms that will begin July 1, 2011. The term for the president is one year and for directors, normally two years. Incumbents may run for re-election subject to limits specified in the Constitution. Nominations must be signed by three members of the Association and nominees must agree in writing to stand for election. The nomination form is on the reverse of this page or can be obtained from the Faculty Association office in the Math and Computer building, Rooms 4001 and 4002. **The deadline for nominations to be received in the FAUW office is 4:30 pm, Friday, March 4, 2011.**

**Elections Committee:** David DeVidi (*Philosophy & Chair*), Susan Leat (*Optometry*), Michael Boehringer (*Germanic & Slavic Studies*)

### CURRENT FAUW BOARD OF DIRECTORS

#### TERM ENDING JULY 1, 2011

##### President

George Freeman (Electrical and Computer Engineering)

##### Past President

David DeVidi (Philosophy)

##### Directors

Shelley Hulan (English Language & Literature)

Doris Jakobsh (Religious Studies)

Doug Kirton (Fine Arts)

Susan Leat (Optometry)

Metin Renksizbulut (Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering)

#### TERM ENDING JULY 1, 2012

##### Directors

Michael Boehringer (Germanic & Slavic Studies)

Roydon Fraser (Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering)

Steve Furino (Dean of Mathematics Office)

*Director elected by and from St. Jerome's University faculty: Cynthia Struthers (Mathematics)*

# Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo (FAUW)

## NOMINATION FORM for President or Director

We hereby nominate

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Department/School \_\_\_\_\_

as a candidate for election to the position of  President  Director

NOMINATORS (3 signatures required):

Name

Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### NOMINATION ACCEPTANCE

I agree to stand for election for the position indicated above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of nominee)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

#### PLEASE NOTE:

- *If an election is required, nominees will be asked to provide a brief statement (maximum 100 words) that will be circulated with the ballot to the membership.*
- *Nominees and nominators must be members of the Association.*
- *Results of the election will be announced at the Spring General Meeting on **Tuesday, April 5, 2011.***
- ***Deadline for receipt of nominations: 4:30 pm, Friday, March 4, 2011.***

*Please return completed nomination forms to the FAUW Office, MC 4002 or 4001.*