

FAUW Forum

VOLUME 102

OCTOBER 2000

THE CANADA RESEARCH CHAIRS DEBATE AT UW

On September 20, 2000, the FAUW sponsored a public discussion on the Canada Research Chairs Program featuring James Turk, Executive Director of the Canadian Association of University Teachers, and David Johnston, President of the University of Waterloo. In her review of the session, published in the previous issue of the *Forum*, Catherine Schryer pointed out the various reactions and concerns of UW faculty members regarding the CRCP and UW's Strategic Plan for its implementation.

Given these concerns and the uncertainties associated with the program, continued discussion is essential. The Forum invited Dr. Turk and Dr. Johnston to submit condensed versions of their presentations for publication in this issue. We thank both of them for accepting the invitation: Dr. Turk's article begins on Page 3 and the UW administration's report appears on Page 5.

UNIVERSITIES AND GLOBALIZATION

"The result in all four nations, according to this collection, has been the creation of a university system increasingly subject to managerialism: financial accountability has become the major criterion of success; the main business of universities has become management, with many university presidents now taking the title "CEO"; and education is now seen as a private commodity rather than as a public good." Paul Malone reviews the book *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*, beginning on Page 11.

THE THERAN CHRONICLES

Pleiadean Directorate tries to understand humanity

As expected, reactions by UW faculty members to Inop Netti's shocking "Galactic Intelligence Report" on humanity, intercepted by *Forum* journalists and published in the September issue, were varied, including outrage, finger-pointing, denial, agreement, disagreement, lamentation and confusion. Unfortunately, sensors indicate that the most prevalent attitude on campus may be complacency, which has often been diagnosed as an advanced form of denial.

It has now been confirmed that Netti's report and tapes did reach their destination, the Pleiadean Directorate. However, as Professor Joseph Novak of UW's Department of Philosophy writes in this issue of the *Forum*, more damning evidence against humanity is to be found in Netti's tapes, which were never intercepted. Indeed, recent

monitoring of subspace channels by *Forum* investigators has revealed that the Directorate continues to exhibit its own form of shock, outrage and confusion at humanity's collective choice to devolute. Novak's controversial report appears on Page 8.

However, the astonishing story does not end here. The *Forum* has reason to believe that "Professor Novak" is, in fact, another undercover agent for the Pleiadean Directorate. *Forum* investigators have seen meetings between "Novak" and Netti in public places, presumably to avoid suspicion. There are also unconfirmed reports that Needles Hall agents have found shreds of paper in a trash dumpster beside the Humanities building with the salutation, "CommonSensically yours, Avkon."

FAUW Fall General Meeting
Wednesday, December 6 2:30 p.m., MC 4021

Inside this issue:	
Editorial	2
Canada Research Chairs	3
Strategic Research Plan for UW	5
The Netti Tapes	8
Book Review	11
Flexible Benefits	14
Pension and Benefits Report	15
President's Message	16

EDITORIAL

Jim Kalbfleisch's resignation as Vice-President, Academic and Provost, effective 1 January, 2001, certainly leaves a hole in UW's administration (*KW Record*, 7 October; *UW Gazette*, 11 October). Such a vacuum could not come at a more critical time for UW, given some important endeavours scheduled for the near future. Two significant events immediately come to mind: (1) a major fund-raising campaign and (2) the first stage of the Canada Research Chairs Program which includes the implementation of UW's "Strategic Plan." Add to these, among other important topics, the current radioactive issue regarding UW's Pension and Benefits plan (*UW Gazette*, 4 October) and there is already more than a full plate for the next VPAP.

This is an opportune time for UW's President to consider a restructuring of administration suggested by many in the past, namely, the separation of the positions of (a) Vice-President, Academic and (b) Provost. One could simply argue that as the management of UW continues to become more "complex" (or so we are told), each of these difficult and time-consuming positions will have to grapple with an increasing number of issues. However, this argument ignores a much more fundamental problem. Let us examine UW's Policy 48 that defines the responsibilities of these two positions:

The Vice-President, Academic is responsible for overseeing and upholding policies and for maintaining the intellectual quality of the University. In particular, the Vice-President, Academic should foster an environment which promotes excellence in teaching and research and shall work with the Vice-President, University Research and the Graduate and Faculty Deans and other senior officers to develop long-term academic goals.

The Provost carries operational and budgetary authority and responsibility for the day-to-day operation of the University. The scope of the Provost's responsibilities will be defined by the President.

The questions that must be asked are, "Are these two positions, the one concerned with academics, and the other with finances, not only philosophically but operationally opposed to each other?" and "Is there not a conflict of interest when they are amalgamated into a single administrative position?"

A simple "nuts-and-bolts" example: Suppose that Professor "X" is awarded a six-million dollar research grant. The duty of the Vice-President, Academic, is to facilitate the production of as much high-quality research

from that money as possible. This includes the hiring of research assistants and purchasing of new equipment. However, wouldn't the Provost like to see as much of that lovely money as possible directed to administrative coffers for the "day-to-day operation" of the University? And wouldn't each such cent taken from the grant have an adverse effect on the quality and quantity of Professor "X"'s research, as well as on the training of qualified personnel?

The recent public discussion on the Canada Research Chairs Program revealed a number of concerns that generally boil down to the question of academics vs. finances. There is also little doubt that UW will, with further government "encouragement" embark on many other endeavours to attract corporate support. "Caveat emptor," once again: Will academics play a back-seat role to the lust for finances? The list of possible conflicts goes on and on, permeating virtually every academic activity on campus. For this reason, is it not imperative that our academic side be represented by a fresh, strong voice that occupies the office of Vice-President, Academic and nothing else but Academic, in Needles Hall?

It is also most likely that a Vice-President, Academic, free to perform only VPA-like duties will be able to interact very effectively with the Vice-President, University Research to increase the amount of research funding coming to UW. In other words, the VPA position should pay for itself many, many times over. This settles the question of financing another administrative position. What may be even more important, however, is the philosophical statement behind the restoration of the position – a reassurance to UW's faculty that there is substantial room for academics near the summit of UW's administration. *ERV*

FAUW Office

Room 4002, Mathematics & Computer Building

Phone: 888-4567, ext. 3787

Fax: 888-4307

E-mail: facassoc@uwaterloo.ca

FAUW Website

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

CANADA RESEARCH CHAIRS

James L. Turk

Executive Director, Canadian Association of University Teachers

Introduction

The Canada Research Chairs Program raises disturbing questions about the future of post-secondary education in Canada. It promises \$900-million over five years to cash-starved universities, but it exacts a price in return.

Before discussing that price, we need to put the Canada Research Chairs Program in context. That is one of the gradual restructuring of Canada's post-secondary institutions driven by government funding cuts and corporate desire to shape university research and teaching. The funding cuts have been dramatic. The federal government cash contribution to post-secondary education has fallen this year by 34% since 1992 – from \$2.9-billion to \$1.9-billion. As a share of the economy, this is the lowest level of cash investment in post-secondary education by Ottawa in more than 30 years.

In Ontario, overall provincial spending on post-secondary education has dropped 12 percent during the same period when measured on a constant dollar, per capita basis. Worse yet for universities, Ontario's operating grants to universities in 1999/2000, on a constant dollar and per capita basis, have fallen 31 percent from what they were in 1992/93.

As well as less funding, provincial and federal cash has had more strings – targeting it to certain faculties or certain government priorities. Granting councils have increasingly introduced strategic programs and partnership arrangements that steer university research priorities to outside, often commercial interests. The Canada Foundation for Innovation, with \$1.8-billion in federal cash, requires researchers to find 60 cents from a “partner” for every 40 cents of public money – effectively giving “partners” veto power over what research gets done with public money.

There is also growing pressure for universities to narrow their focus – to emulate the corporate restructuring of the 1990's with an emphasis on “selective excellence.” Cornell University President Emeritus Frank Rhodes glowingly describes this as the “de-Harvardization” – seemingly oblivious to the interdisciplinary cross-fertilization that is vital to a healthy and intellectually stimulating university environment.

Finally, the academic profession itself is being pressed to restructure itself. Government funding preferences and administrative directives are breaking the link between

teacher and researcher that defines the uniqueness of university academic practice. Increasingly university administrators are turning over instructional responsibilities to faculty who are hired to only teach – an underclass that is badly paid and denied prerequisites necessary for normal academic life, such as academic freedom and a role in collegial governance. Powerful forces are undermining university pay structures – pressing for academics' salaries to be based on market demand for each specialty. This is creating rifts in the profession and a pay structure that bears no relation to the importance of each specialty in the intellectual life of the university.

The Canada Research Chairs Program

In this context, the \$900-million Canada Research Chairs program looks less benign. It is a powerful tool being used by the Government of Canada to accelerate the restructuring of post-secondary education along the lines described above. Four effects of the program will be particularly pernicious:

1. The Matthew Effect: To Those Who Have, More Shall Be Given

The federal government has decided to allocate the 2000 Chairs based on each university's share of money from Canada's three granting councils. This allocation formula means that 12 universities get two-thirds of all chairs – leaving the remaining 60 or so universities to divide up the rest. Such gross inequality propels Canada in the direction of the American model of university education – with a handful of excellent giants at one end and a huge number of less than adequate institutions at the other. A distinguishing characteristic of Canada's university system is the consistence of its quality, made possible in large part because it is a public system. While there are some exceptional universities, all Canadian universities afford students the opportunity of getting a good quality education.

The grossly inequitable distribution of the Canada Research Chairs helps undermine Canada's consistent quality and moves us toward the pear-shaped reality of our American counterparts.

2. Realigning Disciplinary Priorities

(Continued on page 4)

About 54 percent of full-time Canadian academics are in the social sciences and humanities; just under 29 percent are in the natural sciences and engineering; 18 percent are in health sciences. For some years, the federal government, at the behest of industry, has been bemoaning this reality. The Canada Research Chairs program has been designed to change the disciplinary balance.

Only 20 percent of the Chairs will be allocated to the social sciences and humanities; whereas 35 percent will be given to health sciences; and 45 percent will be allocated for natural sciences and engineering. This will begin to change the face of Canadian universities – despite the interests of students (the majority of whom have opted to study social sciences and humanities) and despite the interests of the faculty (the majority of whom have dedicated their teaching and research lives to social sciences and humanities).

3. “Stars” and “Drones”

The Canada Research Chairs Program is also accelerating the trend to dividing faculty into a small camp of “stars” to whom enormous resources will be dedicated and the remainder with whom the university will have to make due.

This is a major problem. All academics are committed to a meritocratic system – all having shown their intellectual prowess through a gruelling process of graduate study, followed by rigorous assessment required to receive an academic appointment, then further assessment for tenure after a probationary period unparalleled in any other profession. But a university achieves excellence only if the academic staff can be part of a scholarly community – a community fatally divided by consigning the majority to the category of necessary but under-resourced and under-appreciated drones.

The federal government has made a conscious choice not to put \$900-million into desperately needed core funding for universities that would help all faculty and students. Instead, they gave it all to a program that rewards a few and gives nothing to the rest.

As Nobel Laureate Torsten Wiesel, President Emeritus of the Center of Mind, Brain and Behavior at Rockefeller University recently noted, “No-one seemed to understand that you can’t create good scientists by gutting the universities and only funding the top end of research. You have to start from a solid base or the entire system will be flawed.”

4. Undermining Academic Governance and University

Autonomy U

Academic governance and university autonomy are among the most jealously guarded attributes of the university. They are at the heart of what protects the quality and integrity of our institutions. Yet both are fundamentally compromised by the design of the Canada Research Chairs program which gives an external government panel veto power over who is given a chair. This, then, is an external veto over all external chair appointments.

Under the Program, the university is to use its normal internal hiring/appointment process to select nominees for Chair positions. In almost all cases, the university’s ability to hire any of its external nominees will be dependent on those individuals being awarded a Chair. But that final decision does not rest within the university community: it rests with the Canada Research Chairs Steering Committee. The Program Secretariat has set up a College of Reviewers who will recommend to the Steering Committee whether or not a university’s nominee should be granted a chair’s position. The decision of the Steering Committee is final.

The federal government is not prepared to trust internal university decision-making processes. In its Canada Research Chairs: Questions and Answers, the government makes clear that not only will final decisions be made externally, they will not be a rubber stamp: “the Program Steering Committee is fully prepared to have a high rejection rate if necessary, in order to ensure that the program supports only the highest calibre of award winners.” So much for academic governance and university autonomy.

Conclusion

The federal government could have designed the program in ways that avoided many of these problems. The inequitable distributional aspects of the program could have been lessened if chairs had been awarded based upon the number of full-time faculty in each of the three disciplinary areas and based on each university’s share of faculty in each area.

Regular university decision-making processes could have been trusted, rather than distrusted, for making final decisions about who should be given chairs. The federal government accepted the universities’ strategic plans as decided by each university. They could have done the same for chairs.

Better yet, the federal government could have put the \$900-million to help restore core funding for universities

so that universities could decide priorities and initiatives for themselves.

But the federal government has made crystal clear to CAUT that it intends to have the very outcomes about which we complain. They want to shift priorities away from social sciences and humanities toward the natural and health sciences and humanities. They want to increase the tiering of universities, with only a handful of full-fledged research universities. They want to increase the differential among faculty – with a small core of research stars and a larger group of workers who will increasingly bear a heavier teaching load. And, they want to intrude on university autonomy to make universities more responsive to government and commercial directives.

When the program comes up for review at the end of three years, CAUT will document the impact that the program has had on our universities. In the meantime, the best we can do is to try to (1) assure the greatest awareness possible about the nature of the program and its effects and (2) persistently assert faculty prerogatives in decision making about the program at each university.

LEADERSHIP IN INNOVATION: A STRATEGIC RESEARCH PLAN FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

*Carolyn Hansson, VP University Research, UW
David Johnston, President, UW*

Universities right across the country have weathered sweeping cuts to operating funding and research grants over the past decade. With limited funds at our disposal, we've experienced great pressure to remain competitive and to attract and retain world-class researchers. While the Canada Research Chairs Program is not the solution to all of our funding problems, it certainly begins to encourage the rebuilding of a critical mass of researchers to help Canadian universities achieve their goals.

In the February 2000 budget, the federal government announced an injection of \$900 million over five years to the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) supplementing the original investment of \$800 million. A further \$500 million investment was announced in the October 18, 2000 mini-budget. The CFI was established in 1997 to fund the modernizing of research infrastructure at universities, research hospitals, and other not-for-profit institutions. In part, this year's injections are designed to meet the infrastructure needs of the Canada Research Chairs initiative. Without additional funding of this kind, the CFI awards were originally slated to end in 2001.

According to the Finance Minister's February, 2000 budget speech, funding will be provided through the granting councils to establish and sustain 2,000 Canada Research Chairs by 2004-05. The program's key objective is "to encourage the building of a critical mass of world-class researchers to help Canadian universities achieve research excellence."

To qualify for the granting funds, universities must sub-

mit comprehensive plans outlining their research priorities and strategies to the Canada Research Chairs Secretariat. Applications for individual positions will then be evaluated against the strategic plans. The University of Waterloo has prepared such a plan, approved by our Senate Research Council. The plan builds on a similar plan we earlier submitted to the CFI as required to support our CFI applications with input from the departments and faculties. This outlines major thrust areas for research, describes the foundations for substantial research growth and then identifies specific issues within the thrust areas on which new research will be carried out.

Objectives

The overall research goal of the University of Waterloo is to be a global leader in the development and implementation of a knowledge-based society in the twenty-first century. Specifically, we want to put our competitive advantages to strategic use – our high quality undergraduate and graduate students; our extensive interactions with user sectors through the co-operative education program and through partnerships with industry; and the depth and breadth of our scholarly preparation.

We wish to become noted for our research in "knowledge exchange", connecting and communicating with people technologically, cognitively and comprehensively. In this way we can extend our reputation as the most successful institution at producing the "leaders of tomorrow."

We want to develop an early passion for research by involving our undergraduate students in research activities

(Continued on page 6)

and to accelerate a global presence through increased international collaboration and through higher international graduate student enrolments.

We plan to strengthen basic research in all disciplines and, wherever possible, facilitate interactions between those engaged in basic research and those with strengths in the application of fundamental knowledge.

We want to stimulate interdisciplinary research on societal problems, and increase the collaborations between researchers in science, mathematics and engineering, and their colleagues in the humanities and social sciences.

We want to move the impacts of our research outside the walls of the university, increasing its impact on the public decision-making process. We also want to ensure the timely and effective dissemination and application of research results through publication and commercialization.

We want to maintain the University of Waterloo as a satisfying place to work and study by providing excellent facilities and collegial working environments. Consistent with this, we will conduct research to reexamine what is taught and how it is learned. We will endeavour to attract increasing numbers of high quality graduate students and post-doctoral fellows and encourage and enhance the entrepreneurial spirit in our students and our faculty.

This is no modest set of objectives. However, our interactions with the non-academic community through the placement of more than 10,000 students each year in co-op jobs have given our researchers an unparalleled opportunity to understand the needs of the private sector, the community and governments. This understanding allows us to generate world-class research results, and will help us to attain our desired objectives.

Major Thrust Areas for Research

We have selected five major research thrust areas that are broadly similar to those underlying our applications to the Canada Foundation for Innovation. They are Information Technology; Environment; Health; Materials and Systems; and Innovation, Society and Culture. There is great scope for overlap in these areas. They by no means represent all the fields of endeavour in which the University of Waterloo will continue to conduct quality research.

Some examples of our foundations for growth and focus for innovation are:

Information Technology

Computing and information technology have always been prominent at the University of Waterloo, both as objects of research and tools for teaching and learning. We will

continue to conduct research in these fields to craft new tools on how to learn and disseminate knowledge in all disciplines.

Environment

Since our inception we have excelled in basic and applied environmental research. The University of Waterloo will continue to emphasize the integration of theory and practice toward the interrelation of human and ecological concerns. Currently our environmental research focuses on the atmosphere, the earth's surface and subsurface, aquatic systems and habitats. We will expand our capacities in several key areas, including water treatment and supply; understanding ecosystems; atmospheric quality; and building sustainable communities.

Health

Our health researchers have made impressive findings in prevention of illness and injury, evaluation of health status, and enhancement of quality of life. We also are home to the only English-speaking School of Optometry in Canada. We will extend our achievements by developing the data management capabilities essential to the advancement of health informatics and health policy; stimulating investigations into disease/injury prevention and health promotion; and expanding on contact lens and low vision research.

Materials and Systems

We have established research in this area as a high priority, and we will continue to be a major supplier of materials science and engineering professionals at all levels. We will expand our materials research expertise and capacity by focusing on four broad initiatives: giga-to-nano technologies; infrastructure renewal; materials synthesis, processing, characterization and modification; and establishment of a high magnetic field laboratory as a national facility.

Innovation, Society and Culture

We intend to be a world leader in the analysis of the process of technological innovation from conception to development, including implementation, diffusion, adaptation and social ramifications. One key part of our institutional mission is the study of cultural forces and social pressures that provide context for technological change. To do this, we hope to create an interactivity centre to research the cultural and social impact of innovation on human knowledge and understanding; expand research in child development; and establish an online arts and business centre.

We will employ various measures to evaluate our success in meeting the objectives of this research plan, including: scholarly output; growth in research capacity; training of highly qualified personnel; knowledge and technology transfer; and original contributions.

The University of Waterloo is committed to the aggressive pursuit of funds to undertake world-class research. While the CRCP is a good place from which to expand research activity, we will continue to seek funding from governments, from industry partners and from granting councils, paying particular attention to the needs of those areas that typically do not attract private sector support.

The foundations of research excellence are already in place at the University of Waterloo. With the proper levels of support, we will be able to realize our goal of becoming a global leader in the development of a knowledge-based society.

Your Council of Representatives

The Council of Representatives will meet with the FAUW Board of Directors on Thursday, November 23 at 7 p.m. in Needles Hall 3004. If you have any questions or concerns that you would like to have discussed, please contact your representative. If your department/school does not have a representative, please consider serving in this capacity. The Council normally meets twice yearly, in November and March; these meetings provide an opportunity to exchange information and ideas in an informal setting. Please contact Alicja Muszynski (x5187) or Pat Moore (x3787) for more information.

Accountancy. (vacancy)
 Anthropology & Classical Studies. Harriet Lyons
 Applied Mathematics. Kevin Lamb
 Architecture. (vacancy)
 Biology. Jack Carlson
 Chemical Engineering. (vacancy)
 Chemistry. Peter Chieh
 Civil Engineering. (vacancy)
 Combinatorics & Optimization. (vacancy)
 Computer Science. Kenneth Salem
 Drama & Speech Communication. Bill Chesney
 Earth Sciences. Tom Edwards
 Economics. Ken Stollery
 Electrical & Computer Engineering. (vacancy)
 English. Victoria Lamont
 Environment & Resource Studies. (vacancy)
 Fine Arts. (vacancy)
 French Studies. (vacancy)
 Geography. Peter Deadman
 Germanic & Slavic Languages
 & Literatures. Zinaida Gimpelevich
 Health Studies & Gerontology. Steve McColl

History. Karin MacHardy
 Kinesiology. (vacancy)
 Management Sciences. (vacancy)
 Mechanical Engineering. Roydon Fraser
 Optometry. David Williams
 Philosophy. Judy Wubnig
 Physics. (vacancy)
 Political Science. (vacancy)
 Psychology. Barbara Bulman-Fleming
 Pure Mathematics. Pl. Kannappan
 Recreation & Leisure Studies. (vacancy)
 Sociology. Alicja Muszynski
 Spanish & Latin American
 Studies. Maria del Carmen Sillato
 Statistics & Actuarial Science. Winston Cherry
 Systems Design Engineering. (vacancy)
 School of Planning. (vacancy)
 St. Jerome's University. Vera Golini
 Library. Christine Jewell

“WHY THIS ATTRACTION FOR SUCH STUPIDITY?” ASKS THE PLEIADEAN DIRECTORATE

Joseph A. Novak, Department of Philosophy

Deep space transmissions have been intercepted by a science fiction student known to me which tell of quite a disturbance in the intellectual field around the Pleiades after the report of Inop Netti was received by his superiors in the Directorate. Although only parts of the transmissions have been decoded, reconstructions of these fragments have indicated that agent Netti's report was only at first taken to be a humorous tease about the struggling start of Earth's civilization. Members of the Directorate soon realized the situation was quite serious as he described and in need of more attention. Netti had sent ample documentation along with his reports and after a review of the books, musical scores, pictures, tapes, etc., the Directorate realized that Netti's claims were basically accurate but that there were also other causes at work which gave reason to believe the deteriorated terrestrial situation might be worse than first analysis indicated. I wish to pass on some insights from what this student gathered from the transmissions.

Although the Directors realized that the expression “common sense” has carried various meanings in the language and thought of the members of the Third Planet, they quickly captured the sense which Netti was trying to communicate. It did not mean an individual's assemblage of various sensory impressions into a single sensory notion nor simply a widespread interpersonal agreement about how things are to be done. Rather, it was common in the sense of an earth philosopher of the old Greek tradition, Heraclitus, who noted that a person's ephemeral sensations, reactions, and ideas were peculiar to him/her but universal and true ideas were common to all. It is an idea, then, akin to the notion of wisdom, *sophia*, or *sapientia* which the high traditions of the earth have looked to with admiration – in short, the ability to discern the right way of evaluating situations and people, the acuity of mind in sorting through reasons offered for adopting alternatives, the moderation of behaviour to insure physical, emotional, and mental well-being, as well as the recognition of patterns underlying things and society that are more permanent than trends of theory. In short, it is the kind of insight that one finds in the wisdom books of various human societies.

The Directors came to see that not only have the current generations of humans rejected many of the Enlightenment principles, but they have also discarded the wisdom

books of earlier traditions they inherited. These books were not intended to provide details about making individual decisions but rather were to be sources of key principles for leading life. The Directors have come to think that it is not simply the rejection of many of the positive Enlightenment ideas but actually the further rejection of some of the older accomplishments of earlier thinkers as well that has produced the crisis.

Although roots of the crisis can be traced back over a hundred years, the mid-20th century saw the beginning of the aggressive rejection of the accumulated wisdom of the past. Teachers were told that language instruction no longer need include the study of grammatical forms and principles or even a systematic study of the sounds represented in a language – mere speaking and reading, it was believed, would suffice for children and adolescents to acquire a knowledge of a language. The study of the more ancient languages then became difficult for the students and gradually the works by the great poets, historians, dramatists and orators of their past were no longer studied. Thereby the experience and principles, ideas and conjectures, that had guided humanity on its slow and plodding path to the Enlightenment and even to many intricate and interesting achievements before the Enlightenment faded into oblivion. Students were encouraged to study “more relevant” things, but as the Directorate easily saw, the concept of “relevance” needs a referential terminus in any given use of it. Since students were never told what that term was they simply focused on their own wants and desires – which were most often crude and simplistic.

A seasoned approach to wise living was undermined greatly by something which, in itself was a wonderful development – the widespread use of the so-called mass electronic media. Televisions and radios enabled people everywhere to receive information and images and sounds about people and events everywhere on the planet. One would have thought that the accumulated knowledge of the past transmitted through these media would soon help every person to become wiser and lead a better life. However, this great scientific and technological advance became a stumbling block on the road of humanity's expected improvement. The Directorate saw how one type of modulation of radio waves had at first been dedicated to the programming of great music but

then gradually was given over, more and more, to the broadcasting of loud and base songs and tunes. These caught the ear especially of the young who, in listening to the writers of these tunes and lyrics, began to see them as their teachers, moral guides, and role models. The Directorate instantly recognized that such a state was undesirable but then realized it was completely catastrophic since the composers of these songs were themselves young people, often teenagers who were given over to drinking, drugs, unbridled sexual desires, violence, and suicide. As one of the Directorate said, "Surely anyone can see that this goes against common sense; even one of the earth's great philosophers told them that they must watch their music and not believe the bards."

Not only did the interest in the truly great composers begin to weaken, but the interest in famous national popular composers began to fade (more and more of the frequency modulated broadcast channels were taken over by the new "music"). The interest in folk tunes that extended

Leaders of educational communities
began to see themselves as corporate heads
directing companies.

back a long time in various ethnic and national groups also began to wither. Something similar happened in the case of dance. It became hard to distinguish groups in terms of their sounds and movements – even though people kept obstreperously insisting on the importance of a confused concept known as "multiculturalism." A single style began to emerge everywhere – "global pop" some have called it. (One of the directors, however, more contemptuously referred to all the musical samplings he heard as "schlock rock").

The end of the twentieth century saw new lows in the abuse of this otherwise quite wondrous electronic medium. People with little or no insight came to occupy positions as news commentators, broadcasters, and interviewers. They assumed an importance far beyond their worth – the way they reported events and the words of political leaders as well as the amount of time they allotted to events reported and the number of issues they excluded – all these factors began to direct the thinking of the people. Wisdom became identified with fame in the media world. Even politicians appeared on talk shows in which they sang, played musical instruments, told jokes. However, there were also serious interviews with popular young singers whose confused and silly opinions were presented as the utterances of great thinkers. Political rallies, even those initially organized with serious intent, often assumed the air of rock concerts or entertainment

events and were widely covered by the media.

Much of this was fed by monetary profit-making which in turn itself was fueled by the abysmal attitudes endorsed by music and media. An economic model began to emerge which tried to eliminate many of the age old distinctions operative in human behaviour. All human occupations came to be seen not merely as potentially having economic outcomes but as being essentially economic activities. Activities formerly considered noble, such as teaching or tending to the ill, became reduced to affairs of the wallet. The practice of medicine came to be thought of as work in the "health industry." Leaders of educational communities began to see themselves as corporate heads directing companies. Doctors were told by insurance companies what diagnoses to accept and which to reject: patients were simply paying customers who deserved as little service as possible so that corporate profits could be increased. Professors came to be seen as employees who were to insure that students be pleased as customers. The corporate leadership would set the standards to make sure the professorship produced happy and satisfied – albeit not necessarily truly educated – "students." Even governments became hostage to this perspective as large international firms dictated what policies nations should follow to insure "global success," regardless of the wishes of the citizens.

Despite this overwhelming trend toward globalization, the theory of multiculturalism came to be adopted by many. It was clear why the politicians promoted the idea – it got them votes from many different linguistic and racial groups who were duped into thinking that it was a code word for a policy genuinely supportive of their well-being. Why academics accepted it the Directorate found almost impossible to understand. Perhaps it was the

Professors came to be seen
as employees who were to insure
that students be pleased as customers.

widespread acceptance of relativism – the acceptance of which generally lowers one's critical skill and leeches away the desire for finding truth. However, it seemed clear to the whole directorate that since people on the third planet, for the most part, use the same means of communication (radio, television, telephone, satellites, etc.), wear the same fabrics, use the same modes of transportation, eat the same foods (or at least things that passed for foods, e.g., Fast Food), live in dwellings of much the same construction, etc. etc. , it was very hard to maintain that there really were – at least at the end of the 20th century – any integral cultures left. Of course, none

of the proponents of multiculturalism ever articulated the identity conditions for a culture and consequently the Directorate could see nothing but folly in speaking of “multiculturalism.” Perhaps at one time, on planet Earth, when groups were dispersed and separated from each other, the totality of each group’s distinctive behaviour could be referred to as a culture. But that situation no longer obtained. Moreover, as one of the Directorate pointed out, “culture” was a term that classically had referred to the cultivation of the mind – the pursuit of truth – and that was something in which multiculturalists had little interest.

Still, there was yet a deeper problem. Not only had people come to believe that they could not find out truth about the world – and thereby abandoned the ideal of the Enlightenment (and the ideal of much of the Western tradition before that) – but they also came to believe they could not know the truth about themselves. Early in the 20th century a man began to write that people’s behaviour was really the result of uncontrollable powers within them, that motivation for their actions could be found

Truly such a planet is doomed for its inhabitants have rejected the very basic constituent of human and intellectual activity, namely, the notion of responsible agency.

primarily, if not totally, in the sexual desires, that sons wanted to have sex with their mothers, that women wanted to have men’s sexual organs. The Directorate found it amazing and almost amusing that people would take such things seriously. They were happy to discover that finally toward the end of the century this man’s theories came in for more severe scrutiny, that women justifiably complained loudly about his ideas, and that some of earth’s scholars had revealed that, in addition to endorsing such a puerile theory, he had falsified his data and prescribed addictive drugs to his patients. One of the directors upon reading the documentation chuckled and then she exclaimed, “Astonishing how a whole century could be hypnotized by a man who was a jerk, a liar, and a junkie!” His name did not come through the transmission clearly but it sounded something like “fraud.”

But why this attraction for such stupidity? Of course, it seemed to license all kinds of sexual activity. Young people and students especially liked to find the world a lab in which they could “test out” a theory with a focus like this. Still, the theory’s acceptance puzzled some of the directors, although one of them pointed out that acceptance of such a theory became for many people an easy way to avoid responsibility. They could claim that they were not responsible agents – actions arose from some

other forces within them. Later other theoreticians even began to speak as though each person was not a “self” but merely a “text” constantly being rewritten and revised: Life is a fiction with no characters.

“But who would write the story, if there are no agents?” queried one of the Directorate. The other members of the Directorate stared at him in a silence that echoed the self-evident response along with its attendant horror. Truly such a planet is doomed for its inhabitants have rejected the very basic constituent of human and intellectual activity, namely, the notion of responsible agency. The transmission seemed, at first, to have an omission here, but then it became clear that what seemed to be a break was only that recorded silence of a stunned Directorate.

The only remaining segments of the transmission seem to discuss the future assignment of Inop Netti. Although some on the Directorate thought that he should be granted his request of a well-deserved holiday, others thought that his report had contributed so much to the understanding of the situation of the third planet, that he needed to be kept on the job.

THE FAUW FORUM

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

Opinions expressed in the Forum are those of the authors, and ought not to be perceived as representing the views of the Association, its Board of Directors, or of the Editorial Board of the Forum, 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

BOOK REVIEW

Paul Malone, Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures

Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives

**Ed. Jan Currie, Janice Newson
Sage, 1998, n.p.**

Universities and colleges everywhere, it seems, are nowadays under constant political and financial pressure: forced not only to do more with less, but also increasingly to incorporate “saleable” training, often while being prompted to jettison all but a skeleton complement of the academic subjects. Universities that fail to act accordingly risk the charge of being “blind to market forces.” It is in the context of this trend that Jan Currie (Associate Professor in Education at Australia’s Murdoch University) and Janice Newson (Associate Professor of Sociology at York University in Toronto) have edited the collection *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*, which focusses on this process in Australia, the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada, in an attempt to give a more varied view of the phenomenon of globalization and its historical context than either the advocates or the critics of globalization usually offer.

According to Currie’s introduction, “globalization is the concept of the 1990s, as postmodernism was the concept of the 1980s.” Although the term can refer neutrally to the wider horizons created by instantaneous communication, the concept at issue in this volume is “a conception of globalization that combines a market ideology with a corresponding material set of practices drawn from the world of business”– the particular practices singled out here being managerialism, accountability, and privatization(1).

The application of these techniques to universities has had several repercussions: an increase in commercial research and a corresponding decrease in curiosity-driven research; the internationalization of higher education by selling programs to overseas students; the sale of intellectual work to industry; and the outsourcing of services – the end result being a “shift from scholar to entrepreneur” (4-6). Entrepreneurialism is rewarded in an atmosphere where such entities as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) rhetorically construct the globalized world as one of unstoppable, neutral and superhuman “change,” populated by states withered to the status of “night watchman” and multinational or transnational corporations that transcend regulation (26-7).

This mythic vision – described as a repackaging of

neoclassical economics (i.e., rationalism) and neoliberal politics (i.e., minimalism; 29) – turns globalization, with its attendant emphasis on the market, into a juggernaut to whom we must bow obediently from the sidelines or be crushed. The point of this collection of essays, however, is to demonstrate that globalization is not, in fact, external to human agency; and that the worldwide responses to globalization, though characterized by certain commonalities, are disparate, reflecting particular nations’ historical and cultural contexts.

Universities formerly run on a basis of collegiality and consultation (admittedly also often problematic mechanisms in practice) are now governed by presidential fiat, rationalized by the claim that the urgency of the market requires faster responses than are possible otherwise.

One particular commonality, for example, is the fact that all four of the countries under examination have spent the decades since the economic crisis of the 1970s pursuing small-c conservative, essentially nostalgic policies, characterized by cost-cutting on the one hand and expansion of entitlement programs (health care, social security, basic education) on the other. However, since none of the four viewed higher education as such an entitlement, this area became a focus for economization, with costs shifting increasingly onto the students’ shoulders. In this atmosphere, education came to be seen by the state as a form of “wealth creation” via the production of intellectual property (55-6).

The manner in which individual countries responded to this situation, however, varied markedly. In the UK, the reaction was swift: three days after coming to power in 1979, Thatcher’s conservatives simply cut £100 million from the universities’ budgets (59). The Australians, by comparison, had emerged from more than half a century of the so-called Australian Settlement (a social contract between state, labour and capital which prioritized high wages over government social programs, requiring tariff-based protectionism to safeguard high levels of employment) into a shaky social democracy when the crisis hit; the first reaction was to attempt a new version of the Settlement, but this foundered on the contradiction between the economic flexibility that was the Australians’ goal and the restrictive managerialism

successive governments imposed on both labour and education. Only after the late 1980s, when the managerial path won out, was there a fully coherent, and thoroughly neoconservative, policy (30-41). The US, with its large number of private and state (rather than federal) universities, could not act unilaterally as the British had; however, funding policies over two decades disadvantaged the humanities relative to applied science fields, and new laws (e.g. the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980) permitted universities to profit from federally-funded research. The student, meanwhile, was increasingly treated as a client or consumer (61-4). The 1980s saw many American universities turning ever more to corporate sponsorship, spin-off companies, and the commodification of their athletics programs (213-33).

In Canada, the “soft” federalism that allowed our postwar universities a great degree of autonomy in better times, and facilitated a relatively smooth and swift transition from elitism to egalitarianism (and from teaching to research) between 1945 and the 1970s, provided a mechanism by which the federal government could abdicate its previous funding role and devolve it onto the provinces. Foreseeable results include an increasing breakdown of the boundary between colleges and universities, a greater use of most universities as large-scale vocational schools, and the development of a small class of “national universities” able to attract both government and corporate funding on a level that ensures their continued functioning as full research institutions (77-98).

All four of these nations ultimately behaved in accordance with the idea that globalization brings inevitable and irresistible change requiring either adaptation to market forces or extinction. There are, of course, counterexamples: the French, for example, have thus far resisted cost-cutting in higher education, and recent proposals for reform are aimed at inefficiencies within the system, with a minimum regard for global market forces (123-37). The Norwegians at the University of Oslo, meanwhile, living in an oil-rich and staunchly social democratic milieu, are actively interested in pursuing closer links with the market-driven corporate world, but seem to have little idea how to go about it and face almost no political or social pressure to do so (99-121). The National Autonomous University of Mexico, as a third example, has resisted the processes of globalization in part because of its ongoing opposition to whatever government has been in power – even while it has escaped some of the concomitant pressures to adapt owing to Mexico’s near-total failure to profit from the provisions of NAFTA (275-93).

However, the intriguing thing about the four nations at the centre of this study is not that they all accepted the inevitability of globalization, but rather that they all

ultimately responded with very similar strategies. Given the choice between two ideal responses – which this book labels *Neo-Fordian* or “New Right” (characterized by laissez-faire economics, for instance, combined with an educational emphasis on particular skills as required by the job market at the time) and *Post-Fordian* or “Left Modernizer” (denoting, among other qualities, state intervention in economic matters and an educational emphasis on flexibility; 23-33) – all four nations have overwhelmingly pursued the former course (in Australia’s case, after some initial waffling).

The result in all four nations, according to this collection, has been the creation of a university system increasingly

The question is:

If the process of managerialism exists and continues as Currie, Newson, and their colleagues posit, are we, the faculty, going to have any voice left in the debate?

subject to managerialism: financial accountability has become the major criterion of success; the main business of universities has become management, with many university presidents now taking the title “CEO”; and education is now seen as a private commodity rather than as a public good (141-151). Universities formerly run on a basis of collegiality and consultation (admittedly also often problematic mechanisms in practice) are now governed by presidential fiat, rationalized by the claim that the urgency of the market requires faster responses than are possible otherwise (154). At the same time, individual academics are measured by performance indicators which both demand a constant output of quantifiable research results and become the basis of a system of reward and punishment: more valued researchers can receive more funding and less teaching workload than colleagues whose research is equally voluminous but less valuable; likewise, universities with a higher percentage of valued researchers can be funded more generously than less “cost-efficient” competitors (173-191). The irony here is that managerial intrusion on university activities can disadvantage even those researchers who would indeed be rewarded by the commercial market (184).

Near the end of the book, one brief chapter of particular interest to the University of Waterloo outlines possible trajectories for the development of distance education (DE) under globalization. The technological improvements which are the basis of the entire phenomenon are, of course, also of great benefit to DE, and especially to those “mega-universities” that cater to over 100,000 DE students apiece. The problem, as outlined in the chapter, is that the mega-universities in

particular remain heavily bureaucratic (partly of necessity) and inflexible, stuck in neo-Fordist – and sometimes plain old Fordist – methods. Whether smaller DE institutions can find their way to post-Fordism (in this chapter even more than elsewhere considered synonymous with progressive thinking) remains to be seen, but the chapter's subtitle, "Mega-Ambivalence," signals the authors' lack of optimism (241-56).

At this point, it might well go without saying that this extremely interesting collection exists in partial response to the Neo-Fordist policies of our own present provincial government, whose leadership regularly complains that the universities are failing to provide adequate numbers of productive citizens (i.e., computer programmers and engineers) – and this despite almost equally regular statements from the business world extolling the virtues of flexible employees. It might be equally obvious that this book is calculated to get a cool reception from anyone who believes, as our government apparently does, in both the inevitability and the beneficence of the global market.

University administrators and professors, of course, also have the right to advocate globalization and support adaptation to the exigencies of the market. Those members of the university community who advocate managerialism, accountability and privatization, however, would nonetheless do well to keep in mind that globalization need not be seen as requiring cookie-cutter responses; the evidence presented in *Universities and Globalization* shows that even the states and administrations that have accommodated themselves to this process have not done so in a uniform and monolithic manner, demonstrating, as Currie and Newson intend, that globalization is not a phenomenon beyond human agency.

At the same time, advocates of resistance to these processes would do well to keep in mind that the pressures attendant upon globalization are not, as the essays in this collection sometimes imply (and as suggested by certain extraterrestrial observers), an entirely unprecedented attack upon centuries-old traditions. In the Anglophone countries, at least, demands that university education be above all economically relevant date back at least two centuries. The *Edinburgh Review*, for instance, complained in 1808 that English universities ought to teach more than merely classics, divinity and mathematics in order to prepare their students to function competitively in the nineteenth century; to which the Oxbridge administrations replied that the mental rigour necessary to learn Latin verb declensions and mathematical proofs provided in itself a flexible education – the neo-Fordist/post-Fordist debate foreshadowed!¹ It was only gradually in the course of the nineteenth century that this ongoing conflict produced the

university as we recognize it in the British Empire and the United States. As late as the 1850s, for example, modern foreign languages were available at both Canadian and American universities only as non-credit courses, and only when the student was willing to pay the instructor (seldom with the title of professor) out of his own pocket.² Many more examples could be furnished; suffice to say that the present shape of the university is itself bound by national and historical contexts, and if the process of globalization is not inevitable, then certainly neither is the continuation of the Canadian university in its current configuration. I leave it to the reader to decide whether the processes described in *Universities and Globalization* are occurring close to home. In any case, whether you agree or disagree with the basic premises of the collection, the debate on the proper form and function of the university in the twenty-first century is not going to end anytime soon. The question is: *If* the process of managerialism exists and continues as Currie, Newson, and their colleagues posit, are we, the faculty, going to have any voice left in the debate?

¹ Peter R. H. Slee, *Learning and a Liberal Education: The Study of Modern History in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Manchester, 1800-1914* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1986), 8-13. In general, continental universities provided a broader curriculum much earlier.

² Robin S. Harris, *A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1976), 47-8; Lawrence W. Levene, *The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History* (Boston: Beacon, 1996), 39.

FORUM EDITORIAL BOARD

Edward Vrscaj, Applied Mathematics, Editor

Andrew Hunt, History

*Paul Malone, Germanic & Slavic Languages
& Literatures*

Jeffrey Shallit, Computer Science

David Williams, Optometry

John Wilson, Political Science, ex officio

Pat Moore, Faculty Association Office, Production

FLEXIBLE BENEFITS

Frank Reynolds, Statistics and Actuarial Science

The recent increases of 20 and 30% in the premia for our health insurance coverage have brought the spectre of flexible benefits before the Pension and Benefits Committee. While it appears that there is a very small chance that such a scheme would be implemented in the foreseeable future, this article seeks to set out the basics of flexible benefits and their implications.

What is a flexible benefit plan?

Under a flexible benefit plan, the employer provides an amount for each employee which the employee can use, together with the employee's own money, to purchase benefits. Normally, the plan covers health, dental and life insurance and may cover vision care, long term disability, short term disability, holiday, education savings plan, long term care, pensions, a health care spending account, and a variety of other benefits.

For each benefit, a variety of (usually 2 - 4) levels of coverage are made available, each at a different cost. For some benefits, the employee may even be able to decline any coverage at all. Unused credits may be paid in cash. Normally, the employer's contribution in the first year will equal the cost of the benefits for which the employer previously paid.

What are the advantages of a flexible benefit plan to the employee ?

The big advantage to the employee is the ability to direct the benefit dollars to the areas where the employee's needs are greatest. As well, the benefits available may increase, e.g. a previously unavailable vision plan may be an option. Finally, benefits available through a spouse's employer (e.g. health and dental) need not be duplicated.

What are the advantages of a flexible benefit plan to

(and there is good reason to expect this will occur), we will have to restructure the benefits package. Government cut-backs in health care spending; increased work loads; changing practices among health practitioners, and the availability of new and more expensive drugs likely have contributed to the rising costs, and may contribute to future increases.

In my column next month, I will continue this discussion, and indicate some meeting times where you can discuss

the employer?

Cost control. The employer's motive for introducing a flexible benefits plan is first and foremost to limit its increases in the cost of benefits. Secondly, it may be to increase the array of benefits available without any cost to the employer. Typically, the employer will limit the increases in its contribution to the increase in the cost of living. If salaries rise faster than the cost of living, the cost benefits such as life and disability will rise with salaries and the extra cost will be passed on to the employees. If the cost of benefits such as health and dental rises faster than the cost of living due to increased usage, new products, or cost shifting by the Crown, the employees absorb the extra increase.

This has a double effect. When the benefit is paid by the employer, normally (life insurance is an exception), there is no tax implication for the employees. If the employees make a contribution to the cost, the contribution must be paid out of after tax dollars, effectively nearly doubling its cost.

Finally, the long term effect of passing cost increases to the employees means that the employer is providing a smaller and smaller portion of the total benefit package and the employees more and more.

Summary

Flexible benefits offer a chance for increased benefits, and in the short run possibly increase the take-home pay for some. In the long run, they mean less take-home pay for everyone.

the issue with members of the Faculty Association Pension and Benefits Committee.

THE PENSION AND BENEFITS REPORT

*Sandra Burt, Department of Political Science
Chair, Faculty Association Pension and Benefits Committee*

The Faculty Association Pension and Benefits Committee

The following people have agreed to serve on the Faculty Association's Pension and Benefits Committee: Sandra Burt (Chair), Len Eckel, Hannah Fournier, Ian Macdonald, and Jock MacKay. This Committee will meet about once a month to discuss some of the central issues that are on the University Committee's agenda and to suggest new issues.

The Benefits Issue

The major issue that has been the subject of recent University Pension and Benefits Committee and university-wide meetings is the status of our benefits package at the university. Many of you attended the recent public meetings called by Jim Kalbfleisch to discuss possible changes in the benefits package. Those present at the meetings tended to focus on the issue of long-term cuts in benefits rather than the three specific cuts proposed in the notice circulated prior to those meetings. There was widespread concern that the benefits package could be eroded in the future.

Some very important points were raised at those meetings. Some of those present noted the important connection between benefits and compensation, and complained that Waterloo was lagging behind some other universities on both counts. Others suggested that cost-saving measures could be adopted in other areas of the budget to remove the need for benefits reduction. Still others discussed the importance of meaningful consultation by the University Committee with the university community before making a decision to reduce benefits.

The University Committee met on Monday October 16, and agreed to recommend to the Board of Governors that two (a cap on dispensing fees, and nine month dental recall) of the three cost-saving proposals be adopted. The current semi-private hospital coverage would be retained. The Committee also committed to addressing the issue of rising benefits premium costs within the next twelve months. To this end, the Faculty Association Pension and Benefits Committee will be setting up a consultation process, to encourage broad discussion of the issue.

It became clear at the recent public meetings that many people do not accept the proposition that benefits premiums are a problem. This was the sentiment

expressed by Frank Reynolds in his article in the September issue of the *Forum*. The University Committee has been comparing our benefits package with those available at other institutions, and has concluded that we are better off than some, in some areas, and not as well off in others. The comparisons are muddied by the fact that we have one plan for all employee groups. So, for example, York faculty members have better coverage for some paramedical services (e.g., an annual \$10,000 upper limit for a registered psychologist), but the custodial and trades workers have no dental coverage for major restorative or orthodontic work. In some universities, as indicated by Frank, members pay part of the premium. In others, like Waterloo, members do not pay any of the premium. In addition, the Benefits Summary on p. 11 of Frank's article reflects provisions for active faculty only, as they were in 1999. Some of the universities included in that summary are currently reviewing their benefits package.

The process of averaging premium costs over several years is problematic. Depending on which years you include in the calculation, the average percentage increase will vary. In addition, such averaging isn't very useful. The university has to deal with the current increases for current budgets. The increases in premiums negotiated in May 2000 are 22% for health and 13.7% for dental programs. The biggest shift on a percentage basis in active employee health claims from 1992 to 1999 has been in paramedical and other services (from 15% of \$1,365,000 in 1992-93 to 22% of \$2,400,00 in 1999-2000) and travel (from 3% to 8%). On a dollar basis, prescription drugs increased from approximately \$940,000 to \$1,560,000 in this period.

With respect to the use of a premium stabilization reserve, as mentioned in Frank's article, it is my understanding that any excess funds from years of low claims were used only for years of unexpected high claims, and not to reduce future premiums.

But, it is certainly true that the benefits package is related to compensation. The University Committee does not take part in compensation negotiations. Over the next year, we have an opportunity to consider the larger issue of the relationship between compensation and benefits

PENSION AND BENEFITS REPORT

(Continued from page #)

For if substantial premium increases become the pattern

(Continued on page 14)

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

*John
Wilson*

I am flying on only one wing these days – something to do with too much arthritis in my left shoulder so I have a new one (installed by a graduate of AHS) – and this will therefore be a mercifully short report.

Change is everywhere about. The resignation of Jim Kalbfleisch as of the end of this year brings to an end an important era in Waterloo's evolution as far as the Faculty Association is concerned. I know he has friends and enemies in all corners of the University (who does not?) but speaking only for myself I have come to admire him more and more. The better part of my life over the past four years has been dominated by working with him – first in the development of the Memorandum of Agreement, then as a continuing member of the Faculty Relations Committee, and finally now as President of the Association. I have not always agreed with him, but I have never once found him to be moved by anything but what is best for the University and its people. I know I am going to miss him very much.

As you would expect, the machinery for what I will call a change in governance has already been uncorked. President Johnston is actively consulting with people in all parts of the campus both about the appointment of an interim replacement for Jim and for the longer term about the possible reconstruction of the central administrative machinery along the lines suggested in 1994 by the O'Sullivan Report. Several members of your Board are involved in these exchanges.

At a lesser level we have no reason to believe that the negotiations with the administration over articles for addition to the Memorandum of Agreement dealing with redundancy, layoffs, and economic exigency will be affected by Jim's resignation, although they may not be concluded by the end of this year. Other pending changes – such as those recently discussed in the Pension and Benefits Committee and less sweeping suggestions currently before the Faculty Relations Committee – are likely to pass unscathed. We have two articles in this

issue dealing with aspects of the benefits question – one by Sandra Burt, who is the chair of the Association's Pension and Benefits Committee and leader of our group on the University Pension and Benefits Committee, and another by Frank Reynolds.

If these changes at the local level were not enough the Prime Minister has decided to spend \$200 million (that's what it costs) of our money to have an election not constitutionally required until the summer of 2002 with the aim, I would guess, of avoiding any change at all. Members may want to know that the Student Federation has decided to prepare some very attractive non-partisan lawn signs for use with the federal campaign. They are worth checking out.

Let me finally remind you of three meetings occurring at or near the end of this term. On the evening of Thursday, November 23 the Association's Council of Representatives will meet. Our hope is that every department and school will have a member on this group, but there are always opportunities to participate. If you are interested please let Pat Moore in the Association Office know. On the afternoon of Wednesday, December 6 the fall general meeting of the membership will occur, when there will be reports on the many different activities in which we are involved. And on Thursday, December 7 from 4.30 to 6.00, FAUW will hold again the reception for all new faculty members of the last two years which has been so successful in the past.

People will notice from these observations that there is always lots to do. We are always in need of volunteers to help in Association committees and to be our representatives on University committees. If you are interested in helping out in this way please either send me a message or let Pat Moore know, and we will get back to you as quickly as we can.

DATES TO REMEMBER

FALL GENERAL MEETING, Wednesday, December 6, 2:30 p.m., MC 4021

COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES MEETING, Thursday, November 23, 7:00 p.m., NH 3004

RECEPTION FOR RECENTLY HIRED FACULTY, Thursday, December 7, 4:30-6:00 p.m., DC 1301

HAGEY LECTURE, Wednesday, January 24, 2001. Michael Ignatieff will speak on "Human Rights and the Rights of States: Are they on a collision course?" Further information will appear in the next issue of the *Forum*.