

MARK YOUR CALENDAR:

- December 6: FAUW General Meeting
2:00-4:00 pm in MC 4020
- October 26: Waterloo Women's Wednesdays
4:00-6:00 pm at the Grad House
- December 2: Time To Talk!
Mental Health Day (see insert)

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Welcome back to a new term and the new academic year! Some time has passed since the last President's Message, so I have a lot of ground to cover. I'll say a few words about changes in FAUW, copyright, governance, the "Fraser" decision, and work-life balance.

Changes in FAUW

The year for the FAUW Board of Directors runs from July to June. Since most university committees don't operate in July or August, things really kick into high gear each September. The board then meets approximately every two weeks from September to June. In the alternate weeks, five board members meet with five senior administration members at the Faculty Relations Committee (FRC) to discuss issues affecting faculty members and to develop or revise policies concerning the terms and conditions of employment of faculty members.

I'd like to thank four of our board members who had their term end in June: Shelley Hulan, Doug Kirton, Sue Leat, and Metin Renksizbulut. Shelley, as Vice President, was deeply involved in a large number of FAUW initiatives, particularly in terms of revitalization of our Council of Representatives, the improvements to the merit process,



George Freeman,
Electrical & Computer Engineering

and our involvement with governance issues in centres such as the Balsillie School of International Affairs, to name just a few. I hope Shelley will return to FAUW in some capacity after her sabbatical leave. Doug, a member of the Fine Arts Department, brought a fresh perspective to our meetings which was especially helpful in discussions of member assessment. Sue was a very key player in the process of consultations and discussions which led to the creation in policy of clinical faculty positions, approved recently at Senate. This solves a long-standing problem in attracting,

(Continued on page 2)

Susan Shaw: OCUFA's Woman of Distinction

The University of Waterloo's Professor Susan M. Shaw has won a 2011 Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations Woman of Distinction Award.

The award, sponsored by OCUFA's Status of Women Committee, recognizes women who have improved the lives and working conditions of academic women and, by extension, their colleagues, families, and friends.

"Professor Shaw has tirelessly advanced the cause of women in academia with respect to hiring and retention practice, inclusive workplace environments, and family-friendly policy," said Helene Cummins, Chair of the Status of Women Committee. "Her leadership and advocacy on behalf of academic women embodies the spirit of the Woman of Distinction Award."

The award will be presented at an awards dinner hosted by OCUFA in Toronto, October 21, 2010. Professor Shaw retired July 1, 2011 after 20 years at the University of Waterloo and several years on FAUW's Status of Women and Equity Committee.

Visit <http://www.ocufa.on.ca/ocufa-awards> for more information.

IN THIS ISSUE:

President's Message	1
OCUFA Woman of Distinction	1
Anatomy of Conflicts	4
Day Care Update	5
Money Matters	6
Open Access Week	6
OCUFA Conference Report	7

(Continued from page 1)

and providing a proper career path for, our members in clinical research. Finally, Metin, as you probably know, is our chief negotiator and got us the five-year salary settlement for which the “good years,” of three-percent scale increases, start this coming May. (By the way, Ontario CPI for the year ending June 2011 was 3.6 percent according to the latest figures from CAUT.)

I'd also like to welcome our new board members: Aimée Morrison, Katie Plaisance, and Trefford Simpson. In case you're considering participating in FAUW in this way, we typically let new board members take a term or two to learn the ropes before they get landed with a significant task. As many of our activities evolve over a number of years, it can take a while to get up to speed on a reasonable number of fronts.

In terms of continuity, I am serving another one-year term as President until June. There are several continuing board members: Michael Boehringer, David DeVidi, Roydon Fraser, Steve Furino, Doris Jakobsh, David Porreca, and Cynthia Struthers. Michael was heavily involved in FRC last year. David DeVidi, as Past President, and also on FRC, has a depth and wealth of knowledge and insight plus a keen political sensibility which is invaluable. Although I try, I can't say I'm particularly successful at not discussing every FAUW issue with him. His only consolation perhaps is that, come July, I will be the one taking over his current position. Roydon (past, past president) has a nose for new issues, a keen interest in improving our pension plan, and is our link to the parking committee. Steve is serving his second term as treasurer and is also on FRC this year. Doris was previously the board liaison to our Status of Women and Equity Committee but this year is moving over to FRC instead; the liaison position has been taken over by Katie. David Porreca is technically a new board member but was on the board two years ago and in the intervening year remained as copy editor of the FAUW Forum. This year, I'm very happy to report that he's jumped into the role of Vice President and is on FRC. Finally, Cynthia represents the St. Jerome's University Academic Staff Association (their recently formed union) on our board. We have a small constitutional change ahead to recognize the SJU-ASA properly.

In addition to the board, we have some key standing committees and representatives I'd like to mention. Lori Curtis serves as the FAUW liaison to the university Pension and Benefits Committee and keeps us up-to-date on that committee's thinking. Sally Gunz deserves a special place in our hearts for her incredible efforts on behalf of individual members through chairing our Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee. Sally has been a leader in defining better training and support for the committee. She, Dave DeVidi, Pat Moore (FAUW's Administrative Officer), and I have been researching ways to restructure our processes so that Sally's successor will see more support and a much less formidable workload. You will hear more on this later. Diana Parry chairs our Status of Women and Equity Committee which is extremely active of late. They have an obvious interest in the work-life balance issue

(see below) and also have been reaching out to the LGBTQQ faculty on campus, among many other initiatives. Finally, LEEANNE ROMANE is continuing as our liaison to the librarians on campus. FAUW aspires to represent academic librarians but so far this is not recognized in our Memorandum of Agreement with the university.

On the staff side of things, Laura McDonald joined us in August as Administrative Assistant and Communications Coordinator, replacing Miriam Kominar while she is on maternity leave. Laura is breathing some new life into our website and whipped up a fabulous brochure on short notice for a recent new-faculty event. She also assists Pat Moore on a host of behind-the-scenes things which make FAUW actually function from day to day. We bade a fond farewell and best wishes to Trish Van Berkel, Laura's predecessor, as she landed a permanent job in the university. Finally, FAUW, being made up of an ever-changing set of volunteers, is made much more effective by the efforts of Pat to provide oversight, continuity, and research support. Some of the staff restructuring we are considering is to free more of Pat's time to this task which she performs with such care and diplomacy.

Copyright

I'm sure you are as sick as I am of hearing about copyright and what is forbidden. Suffice it to say that, under the circumstances, we believe the university has taken the right stance in ending its relationship with the Access Copyright corporation in the face of an upcoming phenomenal increase in fees per student. FAUW and the university administration discussed it a fair amount as things evolved over the past year and it's come before Senate a couple of times. Unfortunately, some faculty members who need to use a lot of different sources in teaching now face some additional complexity. CAUT has made representations to the federal government and to the Copyright Board of Canada seeking to expand the categories of fair dealing and to allow the breaking of digital locks if the purpose does not circumvent copyright, among other things. Beyond the well-organized information posted on the library website, you may also wish to look at the CAUT Guidelines for the Use of Copyrighted Material (April 2011) which are available at the URL http://www.caut.ca/uploads/Copyright_guidelines.pdf. Finally, please don't forget that our library negotiates good copyright agreements with a number of sources, in some cases better than we had via Access Copyright.

Governance

Regarding research centres and institutes, it was just announced at Senate that the task force on their governance, organized by the VP Research (George Dixon), has produced its report. I was surprised when, upon being asked at Senate what sort of consultation had taken place in the production of the report, Dixon said that the committee charged with writing the report had been allowed but not

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued from page 2)

required to consult. FAUW will therefore be extremely interested in the contents of the report, which I imagine we will be looking at soon, probably in the context of Faculty Relations Committee. This is, I hope, the easier of the governance discussions.

A complex, specific situation where governance matters need to be worked out is the Balsillie School of International Affairs (BSIA). The BSIA is a joint endeavour of Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier, and the Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI), a private think tank independent of the universities. A recent article in the Record indicated that CIGI also has aspirations to more partnerships and programs. FAUW has been very concerned that principles of academic freedom, collegial governance, peer review of funding decisions, freedom from undue influence of third parties in academic matters, and the like, be clearly embedded in any BSIA governance document before it reaches Waterloo's Senate or Board of Governors for approval. During the summer, we obtained a copy of a draft set of governance documents which seemed to us to be problematic in various ways. In cooperation with WLUFA, we drafted a common set of principles which we would like to see encoded in the governance documents for partnerships with donors that our universities might enter into. Recent discussions with representatives of the BSIA seem to indicate no disagreement over these principles which is encouraging, though getting from agreed principles to an acceptable document is always a challenge. Establishing acceptable structures of governance for a high-profile organization such as the BSIA so that it may flourish would be a tremendous victory for Waterloo and the other partners. Failing to do so, we believe, could lead to ongoing problems such as those surrounding the dismissal of Dr. Ramesh Thakur, the inaugural director of the BSIA.

Unfortunately, there's a long history of university-corporate collaborations going badly in terms of governance protections of academic integrity. "Big Oil Goes to College" by Jennifer Washburn, available at the URL

http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/10/big_oil.html is a good read and documents some astoundingly poor arrangements made between the world's largest oil companies and U.S. universities. Failure to safeguard the principles that make universities able to fulfill their unique role in society isn't restricted to agreements with external bodies, though. Even within the university system, there has tended to be a general decay in the effectiveness of collegial bodies such as senates, a situation to which faculty are now reacting. Thus, the governance topic is not just on FAUW's agenda, but also those of OCUFA and CAUT.

The "Fraser" Decision

A Supreme Court of Canada judgment on April 29, 2011, commonly called the "Fraser" decision, confirmed that the

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms section 2(d) on freedom of association applies to collective bargaining but at the same time might have restricted the amount of protection provided. What seems to be interesting to those who fully understand these things is the wide range of opinion inside the Court and thus the potential for more change to come.

Most labour relations requirements trace back to U.S. legislation called the Wagner Act (or National Labor Relations Act) of 1935. That requires, for example, that the employer recognize the collective bargaining unit and bargain in good faith. It was previously thought in Canada that our Charter guaranteed these types of protections. They are enshrined in other places such as the Ontario Labour Relations Act.

There is some thought that the Supreme Court decision opens the door a little bit more to something like what was attempted recently in Ontario Bill 16, namely legislation to control labour costs in the broader public sector. It seems at least a little less certain that a Charter challenge to such legislation would succeed.

The actual "Fraser" decision is part of a chain of events which started with Ontario agricultural workers being excluded from the Labour Relations Act back in 1995.

Work-life Balance

There have been two very successful joint Waterloo administration-FAUW working groups in the recent past, one on "Women's Salary Equity" and one on "Faculty Performance Evaluation." The reports of these groups can be found in the News section of the FAUW website. The latter report includes the following recommendation.

Recommendation 5.1 -- Further investigate two related issues: a) whether the merit evaluation process has features that generate gender-based anomalies; b) how to use the flexibility of the merit evaluation process, in conjunction with other policies, to make UW a more family friendly employer. [Responsibility: Provost and FAUW President]

The Faculty Relations Committee decided a few months back to move on this recommendation by setting up a working group on work-life balance. As I write this, Geoff McBoyle and I have just finished setting up the group, which comprises Steve Brown, Jennifer Clapp, Tara Collington, Dave DeVidi (chair), and Diana Parry. The mandate includes a requirement of substantial opportunity for stakeholders to provide input so please take advantage of this if you have something to say.

I wish everyone a great fall term and hope my next report to you can offer up something good about progress on governance matters.

ANATOMY OF CONFLICTS

George Freeman, Electrical & Computer Engineering, President

Member concern has been raised from time to time that FAUW doesn't appear to stand up to the Waterloo administration very much. I think this is because much of what happens is in fact effective behind-the-scenes conflict resolution (per MOA 9.1.2).

As a hypothetical example of policy conflict, consider the rare but not unheard of situation where a chair or dean loses the confidence of faculty members in their unit, to the extent that they are seeking his/her removal before the end of the normal term. A case involving a chair (policy 40) would be more complicated for FAUW because, in such a case, we represent everyone. The chair is a member. The faculty in the department are members. We need to act in the best interests of all and provide advice to each member who asks for it.

Let's suppose such a situation has arisen and faculty members have expressed their concerns in writing to their dean. The dean can attempt to mediate a reconciliation by holding a department meeting for a full and frank discussion. If the dean believes a formal inquiry is needed, his/her rationale is communicated to the chair in writing and the chair can respond. This information is taken to the VPAP, who then decides whether or not to set up a tribunal.

Here's a potential conflict in a nutshell. If there was no reconciliation, the dean may have specific written concerns from department members and is taking a serious decision on the chair's future. Shouldn't the chair, under principles of natural justice, be allowed to know exactly what was said and by whom? Policy doesn't say.

On the one hand, it is a serious matter to interfere in a department and there's a purity of interpretation in having the principles of natural justice apply right away. This may also serve to prevent another potential problem, of information which was used to decide that a tribunal investigation is necessary being misplaced and not seen by the tribunal itself.

On the other hand, policy seems to be written to preserve

collegiality for as long as possible in the process. After all, whatever the outcome, it is intended that the chair and all faculty who had complaints will go back to being each other's respected colleagues in the department.

One could argue that the dean and VPAP are not actually taking a direct decision on the chair's future, only on whether to investigate. The VPAP, who takes the final decision on a tribunal, should be relatively separated from emotions of the situation to be able to do so in a calm, deliberative manner. The demands of natural justice are arguably met, since the chair would see the exact complaints, and by whom they were made, in the forum in which the complaints must be adjudicated, i.e., at the tribunal.

Supposing FAUW and the administration were on separate sides of such interpretations, what might happen? As the various emails, phone calls, and meetings failed to resolve things sufficiently, this might work up the chain on both sides until it was some type of direct discussion between Geoff McBoyle (VPAP) and me (FAUW President). Some of the exchanges could be rife with tension by then, especially if there was some time urgency on either side. Sometimes the FAUW board will then authorize a formal letter which clearly outlines our position and expresses our worry about things escalating to a formal conflict. After a response, with all arguments clearly expressed in writing, it can sometimes become possible to self-arbitrate by finding the common ground and moving forward from there.

Confidentiality and privacy requirements mean you usually aren't aware of a developing conflict or its resolution. However, you can rest assured that there are such conflicts and it's a big part of the FAUW workload to defend what we believe is the interpretation/development of policy which best serves both the immediate and long-term interests of our members.

How to contact FAUW

Pat Moore

Administrative Officer

MC 4002, Ext. 33787

pmmoore@uwaterloo.ca

Laura McDonald

Administrative Assistant/
Communications Coordinator

MC 4001, Ext. 35158

laura.mcdonald@uwaterloo.ca

<http://fauw.uwaterloo.ca>

DAYCARE UPDATE: (MOSTLY) GOOD NEWS

David DeVidi, Philosophy, Past President

I expect that most faculty members will recall the FAUW referendum last December in which members voted 80% in favour of spending some FAUW dues money in support of building a new child care facility that increases the number of daycare spots on campus. The referendum was a response to the vocal, hostile reaction to the university's decision last fall to cut back to 150 spots from the 190+ that until then had been included in plans for the new facility. (There are currently 150 daycare spots on campus. The higher number was due to the long-recognized need to increase that number.) This article is a brief update for members on what has happened since then. A few months ago, it looked like a pure good news story. More recently, events have created new uncertainties, though the FAUW Board remains optimistic.

The overwhelming positive vote in the referendum was, I think, key to breaking an unfortunate impasse. Following negotiations early this year the board of the new daycare, FAUW, representatives of the staff association, and the university administration reached an agreement in principle to include more than 190 spots in the new building. FAUW and the Staff Association agreed to put money into the building. The University agreed to more reasonable financial arrangements with the new daycare, in particular replacing a commercial-rates loan with a long term lease at rates calculated in a more reasonable way. They also agreed, for the first time, that the new daycare would be something to which Keystone contributions can be directed.

Some creative thinking went into these negotiations. The university administration has long complained that some spots in the existing daycares are held by non-University of Waterloo families. This happens because of the very tight budgets daycares operate under – they simply cannot afford to leave spots sitting open, waiting for a university person on a waiting list to be ready to take it. In the negotiations, the faculty association agreed to invest money every year to hold spots open for children of faculty members when no university-affiliated family from the waiting list is ready to take the spot when it comes open. Any money designated for that purpose that is not used for it in a given year will go into a fund to subsidize spots for low-income university affiliates. Thus FAUW has recognized the validity of the administration's concern, and put money towards addressing it, while also recognizing that for

staff and students affordability can be as big an obstacle as access. We hope that the staff association, and the university on behalf of graduate students, will do something similar.

Unfortunately, after this agreement in principle was reached a more detailed estimate on the cost of the building came back from the architects with a projected cost considerably higher than the one for which the agreement was worked out. In early September, the various stakeholders were back at the table discussing ways to try to bridge the gap. I attended the meeting on behalf of the Association. I left the meeting cautiously optimistic that the spirit of cooperative problem solving and recognition of each other's legitimate interests that eventually governed the earlier negotiations can be reproduced and a revised agreement can be reached soon. We will keep you posted.

Finally, I'd like to say a few words about why I will be making a Keystone contribution to the daycare. I arrived at Waterloo just as my daughter was born. The fact that we were lucky enough to find a spot for her in a high quality, professional, non-profit daycare meant that my wife and I were both able to pursue our careers knowing that our daughter was safe, well cared for, fed healthy food, and spending her days in a stimulating environment while we were at work. Life on the tenure clock, in an age where assistant professors cannot be assumed to have stay-at-home spouses keeping the home fires burning, makes quality daycare essential. My family no longer needs daycare, but my salary is now triple what it was when I was hired 15 years ago. My contribution to the daycare is aimed at providing junior colleagues with the same opportunity to combine career and family that I had. And it's an affirmation of my wife's and my commitment to the goal of making the possibility of combining career and family available to our daughter and her friends.

If you're interested in making a tax-deductible contribution to the daycare project through the Keystone campaign, you have a couple of options. To do so electronically, go to the Keystone donation site. Under "Support a project you are passionate about", click on the **Daycare Building Fund** in the "Other" category. Or you can contact Dipali Batabyal of the Development Office at dbatabya@uwaterloo.ca, ext. 37195.

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 at fauw@uwaterloo.ca and your name will be removed from the mailing list.

MONEY MATTERS

George Freeman, Electrical & Computer Engineering, President

In July, the mil rate by which we determine your FAUW fees increased from 4.75 to 5.25. This was approved by member vote at the Spring General Meeting in April. Based on the May 2010 CAUT survey of associations across Canada, at 4.75 we had only Victoria (4.50) and St. Mary's University College (2.50) below us. The move to 5.25 puts us ahead of McGill and McMaster (both 5.00). There are fifty-plus other schools above us on that list. Many are in the ballpark of twice the cost, such as Wilfrid Laurier (9.00), Western (10.00), or Guelph (11.46).

The primary rationale for a fee increase is to support the approximately \$60k per year maximum commitment by FAUW to the new amalgamated daycare over the next ten years. Other factors impacting our budget include the upcoming addition of a staff support person for Academic Freedom and Tenure

Committee work, the need for more space for the FAUW office and a liability insurance reserve, and smaller returns on newer investments. Legal costs vary greatly from year to year depending on how many conflicts rise to a stage where lawyers are consulted or arbitration is required.

I would estimate that once we get to the stage of hiring another staff member we will probably need another small rate increase depending on the timing of the other factors. This is because part of the daycare cost is upfront rather than spread over the ten years. The FAUW Board takes a close look at fees once per year. If we are accumulating in the general fund beyond what is needed as a defensive reserve you can expect a fee decrease to be proposed.

CELEBRATE OPEN ACCESS (OA) WEEK WITH 100 OTHER COUNTRIES

Anne Fullerton, Library

“Open Access” to information – the free, immediate, online access to the results of scholarly research, and the right to use and re-use those results as you need.

To mark our first uWaterloo OA Week, the Library is launching a **Guide to Open Access** <http://subjectguides.uwaterloo.ca/openaccess/> Learn about green and gold journals, author rights addendum, how the Library contributes to OA publishing and more.

Look for Library Staff wearing the orange “Ask Me About Open Access” buttons and our displays on the potential benefits of OA in the foyers of Porter and Davis Libraries. And check the display in the Student Life Centre created in partnership with WPIRG. Students started OA Day.

PLoS (Public Library of Science) ONE is the largest peer reviewed journal in existence and it is OA. Professor Pu Chen, Chemical Engineering, is on the Editorial Board. Professors Matt Vijayan, Biology, Laura Middleton, Kinesiology, and Brian Ingalls, Applied Math, have each published in one of the seven PLoS journals.

InTech is the world's largest OA book publisher and an OA Week 2011 sponsor. Professor Jatin Nathwani, Management Science, edited “Paths to Sustainable Energy” with InTech. A chapter (in another InTech book) written by a grad student and his advisors has had 143 downloads since July 2011.

How has Open Access enhanced your work? Share your OA experiences and ideas with colleagues - especially with your Liaison Librarian colleagues: <http://www.lib.uwaterloo.ca/tour/librarians.html>



THE RACE TO GLOBALIZE HIGHER EDUCATION IN CANADA

A report from the January 2011 OCUFA conference

Susan Leat, Optometry

When we first mention globalization of higher education, most of us usually think first of the mobility of students – international students coming to Canada and Canadian students going abroad to study. We then might think of Canadian faculty having a role in teaching in other countries and recruitment of faculty from other countries. But internationalization may also be used in a broader sense to include international research collaborations, international influence on curriculum development, the international flavour and experience that students from abroad bring to our campuses and multiculturalism on campus. Knight (2006) defines internationalization of higher education as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural and/or global dimension into the purpose, functions (teaching, research and service) and delivery of higher education”.

Let's start with some figures:

- There are 3x more international students in Canada compared to a decade ago.
- In Ontario, the number of international students on our campuses has grown from about 8,000 in 1996 to about 27,000 in 2008 and this represents more than a doubling of the percentage of international students in the same time period.
- 34% of full-time faculty in Canada earned their PhD outside of Canada (Changing Academic Professions Survey 2007)
- 41% of full time faculty in Canada are not Canadian-born (2006 Statscan data via CAUT Almanac 2010/11)
- 64% of Canadian faculty collaborate with international colleagues (Changing Academic Professions Survey 2007)
- In the 2010 Throne speech, Premier McGuinty announced a commitment to increasing international student enrollment in Ontario by 50% by 2015

So in some senses we are quite international already and we are quickly moving further in that direction. However, there has been little public debate and discussion about internationalization; what it is, its benefits and, perhaps, its problems and cautions.

We are all aware of the pushes and pressures towards greater internationalization of education. Where do these pressures come from? Glen Jones (Ontario Research Chair in Postsecondary Education Policy and Measurement at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto) suggested the following factors; the external general trends towards globalization, more awareness and concern with our position in the international rankings of universities, universities being seen as an instrument to promote our national standing in the global market, the change in Canadian demographics (the upcoming cohort being smaller, resulting in “excess capacity” in the system which can be filled with international students). Other advantages for pursuing internationalization are increasing opportunities to learn about the world, including increased understanding of the new world order, increasing students' preparedness, creating cross-cultural opportunities for both students and faculty, international collaboration, credibility with stakeholders (e.g., faculty can “walk the talk” when it comes to international business), faculty growth and

development in terms of course content and pedagogy (when teaching abroad, instructors have to rethink how they teach), enhancement of the home school's reputation in Canada and, of course, significant revenue generation.

But internationalization also raises questions and potential problems. According to Dr. Jones, international activities are not innately good, international collaborative research can be second rate and foreign students can have unhappy experiences. There are myths about globalization, for example that the presence of foreign students will automatically internationalize our campuses. An active international presence and the number of international agreements may be used as a proxy for quality, when, in fact, a few in-depth collaborative agreements with foreign educational institutions may be more productive. Other concerns are that internationalization may not minimize inequalities between countries, but exacerbate them – “our brain gain is another's brain drain”. This is a real concern for African and South American countries. There may be questions of quality control and fear of commercialization.

In Canada, historically our role in the international educational scene has been smaller compared to the big players, which are the US, EU, UK, Australia and China, and our interest in internationalization is relatively recent. This is largely due to the Canadianization movement in the 1960s and 70s, which was a response to the fact that most textbooks, curricula, films etc., were not Canadian, but largely from the US. There was a move to increase the Canadian content in these areas and to fund Canadian publishing, as well as the formation of the “Canadian first” policy for faculty hiring. At this time there were also concerns regarding displacement (students from abroad would take the place of Canadian students) as until the 1980s we did not have different fees for international students. We took the view at that time that training students from abroad was a subsidy – a form of aid. Thus we were focusing on Canadian content, while other countries started to focus on internationalization.

This has obviously changed, as attested by the figures above. Canadian remote campuses overseas are growing. The UK, the US, and Australia are also very active in this area. According to Robert White (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada), 72% of Canadian universities and colleges offer some form of educational programmes and services abroad. This is not limited to the large universities- all sizes and types of universities are involved. China is the most common location, with India second (which mirrors the fact that most international students come to Canada from these countries). Most of these arrangements involve the students doing part of their studies in Canada. Most involve partnership with a host institution and most offer joint degrees. Stand-alone campuses are rare (3.5%; the UW Dubai campus is one).

Conversely, other countries have also established programmes in Canada, most commonly the US and Australia, some of which have been in place for many years.

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 7)

The experience of Carleton University (described by Ian Lee, Sprott School of Business, Carleton University)

Dr. Lee described his experience with off-shore graduate programmes (specifically Canadian and US MBA programmes) in the non-Western world. Most of these involve sending faculty over to deliver individual “condensed” courses overseas. Usually the same curriculum is taught as at the home university, but offered as a one or two week condensed course. Faculty go in their own time (e.g., during holidays, university breaks or sabbaticals), do not get teaching relief, are paid to go, and are never compelled to go. This is established and regulated by policy. In fact they have an application process for some sites, including submission of CVs and consideration of previous international experience, as there is a great demand to go.

There are, of course, challenges, such as barriers of language and culture. In fact, one cannot just teach an established course without changing at least the examples that are used in the classroom. There are also broader cultural issues, e.g., dealing with timing, accepted corruption in some countries and different values which might sometimes shock Canadian faculty who find that they have to “bite their tongues”. Sometimes the classroom facilities and the accommodation conditions for faculty are poor. Lastly, it must be remembered that teaching abroad is not tourism, but hard work.

With regard to differences in law between Canada and the other country, e.g., laws of non-discrimination, there may be a concern, for example, that discrimination might occur against some visiting faculty. This has not occurred, Dr. Lee said, as the relationship is between Carleton and the local institution, not the local government. However, it is likely that some groups of Canadian faculty who may not feel comfortable simply do not sign up to go.

Another issue is to what extent the curriculum should be left unchanged (in order to maintain the same academic standards) or modified in order to become a true international experience which benefits both parties. In many cases of courses taught with agreements between a Canadian and overseas institution, joint degrees are awarded. To what extent is this justified and is it really fair for the home student?

The Australian Experience (Lynn Meek, L.H. Martin Institute at the University of Melbourne)

In 2008, Australia was fifth worldwide as a destination for international students and it had the highest percentage of international students among its tertiary enrollments (21%), followed by Austria at 15%. This represents a staggering rise from 21,000 international students in Australia in 1988 to 630,000 in 2009. This increase came about because of the following changes: Between 1978 and 1996 there was deregulation of the higher education sector and universities were expected to become more self-reliant financially; there was an increase of fees and a shift of the cost from the state to the individual. Between 1996 and 2007, there was a reduction of operating budgets to universities, an increase of domestic student fees and no Commonwealth supplementation of funding for student places. Thus the sustained growth of international education was born of necessity but has assumed a life of its own. There has been a shift of perception from education for international students being aid to being income. Pre-1980, education of foreign students was subsidized by government aid programmes and funded scholarships. Students, both domestic and international, did not pay fees. Overseas tuition fees were introduced in 1980, but there was still partial subsidization. But in 1986, unrestricted entry of overseas students was opened up on a full cost recovery basis and the subsidy programme was phased out by 1992. The overseas student market was deregulated, allowing institutions to set and retain

their own fees. Australia no longer saw itself as a donor of education, but as a partner providing mutual benefits to individuals and countries.

Now, education is the third largest export from Australia, after coal and iron ore, and is regulated by four government departments. Institutions aggressively market overseas and nearly all Australian universities have an international student office with a Deputy Vice-Chancellor of their own.

The industry weathered the ‘bird flu’ in 1996, SARS in 2003 and the global financial crisis in September 2008. International student numbers continued to rise. But there has been a drop in enrollment in 2010-2011. Reasons for this may be excessively rapid and unsustainable growth together with changes in immigration policy which first encouraged immigration and then retracted, thus giving the impression that Australia no longer wanted international students. Additionally, the Australian dollar is currently strong, there is increased competition from the US and UK, there is development of national systems in Asia and lastly damage to Australia’s reputation because of recent attacks on international students. These observations illustrate the potentially volatile nature of the income from international students. Overall, internationalization in higher education in Australia has been a success, resulting in obvious financial benefits, internationalization of curricula, more cosmopolitan campus cultures and strengthening of political, economic, educational, research and cultural networks for Australia in the region. There are, of course, negatives: the culture and focus on marketing and recruitment, which can be in conflict with traditional academic values, the profit motive which may influence academic ethics (e.g., soft marking for foreign students), increased academic workloads and the overemphasis of particular disciplines such as business and commerce.

The way forward

Internationalization is here to stay, as far as our crystal ball will allow us to see. Internationalization is neither trade nor aid, but should be seen as sharing and a path to quality. There is still an uneven playing field, with some countries (e.g., China) sending more students and others (UK, US) receiving more. According to Eva Egron-Polak (Secretary-General, International Association of Universities), faculty members are perceived as both a driver and an obstacle to further internationalization. One challenge is to ensure that the benefits are mutual. Establishing partnerships with all regions of the world is important - neglecting some is a risk for all. We should be aiming to minimize the risk of the brain drain and commercialization, yet, in fact, countries and institutions usually go after “the best and the brightest”. We market ourselves to vulnerable populations and charge tuition fees that overseas students cannot pay. We go to teach them, or they come to be taught by us, but we listen and learn very little from their experience and knowledge. Differences may be decreased and cultural diversity eroded. Institutions may espouse internationalization, but when faculty members do the same they don’t get the credit; e.g., when faculty members publish in some international journals, less credit is given in annual evaluations compared to publishing in domestic ones. Supporting an ex-international student is not given kudos. Yet there is little discussion of the ethics of all this. Faculty members are often not intimately involved in the development of policies and programmes, yet they are the ones who do the teaching. Faculty members should act as the institution’s conscience, but it is hard for individual faculty members to question the rush to internationalization - they are seen as old-fashioned and not forward thinking. We, as faculty members, need to be involved in the decision process and find ways to move the agenda forward in directions that we would prefer to see.

TIME TO TALK!

A DAY TO LOOK AT MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES IN THE ACADEMIC WORKPLACE

Friday, December 2, 2011

Mental health disorders may affect any one of us. In Canada, mental and behavioural disorders account for as much as 25 percent of reported workplace diseases and injury. The most serious impediment to sound treatment and/or accommodation is our collective lack of understanding.

This is a day dedicated to bringing us all to a common knowledge of mental illnesses, where to get help, how to help others, and what our collective responsibilities are as members of the university community.

PRESENTERS

Dr. Ian Arnold is Chair of the Workforce Advisory Committee, Mental Health Commission of Canada (MHCC). He oversees the development of projects that will help ensure that mental health becomes a priority in the Canadian workplace. Dr. Arnold has considerable experience with mental health issues in the university environment.

Mary Ann Baynton provides consulting services including training, interventions, presentations, and project management to organizations, including academic institutions, that wish to improve or address issues related to workplace mental health. She helped create a multiple-award winning national training program for management and unions as the director of Mental Health Works. As Program Director for the Great-West Life Centre for Mental Health in the Workplace and member of the MHCC Workforce Advisory Committee, Mary Ann is helping to make valuable workplace mental health resources publicly available to all Canadians.

SESSIONS

State of Mind: Learn what the largely invisible state of mental health looks like and how it affects you and others

Open to all faculty and staff

9:00-11:30 am Humanities Theatre

Attendance at this session is strongly encouraged for participation in the following sessions. Registration is requested.

Mind Your Management: Learn the responsibilities that guide policies and practices to effectively handle mental health problems

Working lunch by invitation for Senior Administrators, Deans, Directors and Chairs of academic units, and Faculty Executive Assistants/Officers

12:00 - 2:30 pm Laurel Room

This session will expand on the morning presentation.

Expand Your Mind: Learn more about how specifically to recognize and help yourself or colleagues in issues of mental health

Workshop open by registration to all faculty, including Directors and Chairs of academic units.

3:00-4:30 pm HH 1104

This session will expand on the morning presentation. Because of space limitations, registration is required.

Faculty can register for the morning and afternoon sessions at <http://fauw.uwaterloo.ca/>.

This initiative is supported by the Faculty Association, the President and senior administration, Occupational Health, Human Resources, the Staff Association, the Employee Assistance Program, and our benefits provider, Great West Life Assurance Company.

We urge you to attend this important initiative led by two of Canada's experts on mental health in the workplace.