

NOTRE DAME U SENATORS ANGRY OVER “LACK OF CLOUT”

What do UW Senators think about UW’s Senate?

Earlier in the year, the Faculty Senate at the University of Notre Dame became so frustrated in having little power or influence in university governance that it voted to dissolve itself. As Alex P. Kellogg reported in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, the new chair of the senate opined that a huge division has developed between the faculty and administration and that the morale of the former is very low because it is not being heard. Kellogg’s article is reprinted on Page 3 of this issue.

In response to the *Chronicle* report, the *Forum* invited forty-nine faculty representatives who have served on UW’s Senate to comment on the *Chronicle* article based upon their personal experiences and assessments of UW’s Senate. (The invitees were chosen from the May 2000 and 2001 lists of members of UW’s Senate.)

Two paragraphs from the letter of invitation, sent on 15 June 2001, are printed after the *Chronicle* article at the bottom of Page 3. Pages 4 and 5 are dedicated to the replies received from the invited senators. Readers are invited to comment on the response.

THE EXPANDING ROLE OF LIBRARIANS

“Less than a decade ago, few of us would have anticipated the pervasive nature of today’s World Wide Web. ... The traditional role of librarians as book custodians is being superseded by roles more closely aligned to faculty interests and concerns.” Thus begins the article “Breaking Free From the Traditional View of Academic Librarians”, by Amos Lakos, Carol Stephenson and Paul

St.-Pierre of UW’s Library. In their conclusion: “Librarians share more in common with faculty than with other campus groups. Although the case has been made for several years, representation by FAUW has not been legitimized by the administration and remains an unresolved article in the FAUW Memorandum of Agreement.”

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

Editor’s Notes	2
Faculty Senate at Notre Dame	3
Replies from the UW Senators	4
Breaking Free From the Traditional View of Librarians	6
Things You May Not Know (cont’d)	12
From the Professor Files	13
President’s Message	16

ALSO:

- *Don’t miss the Forum Quiz, p. 2*
- *FAUW Pension & Benefits Committee Members Wanted, p. 14*
- *CAUT and Gender Equity, p. 14*
- *FAUW Board of Directors 2001-2002, p. 15*

EDITOR'S NOTES

The invitation to UW Senators to comment on UW's Senate represents the first of a series of more aggressive (in the most positive sense of the word, of course) attempts by the *Forum* to increase the level of academic discussion on campus. Near the end of July 2001, invitations were also sent to all members of UW's Department of Philosophy (including faculty at Conrad Grebel College and St. Jerome's University) soliciting articles for a special "philosophical" issue of the *Forum*. I have already received one article – with thanks – and look forward to receiving others for possible publication in the next issue of the *Forum*.

Regarding the previous issue of the *Forum*, there was a flurry of response to the "Things You May Not Know" page. People expressed concerns about the authenticity of some of the "things", offering other explanations. The replies are summarized on Page 12. We would like to continue this list and invite readers to submit personal favourite "things" for future issues. (Please don't forget the "Professor Files" as well.)

In addition to Tom Fahidy's commentary (Page 9), several informal replies to the "worm in the brain" article by Richard Mitchell were also received (note the use of the passive), including:

"Fantastic article. I laughed myself silly."

"I would take you up on your offer to list examples of the 'worm' on campus, but the list would easily fill up an issue of the *Forum*."

"He (Mitchell) doesn't understand the use of the passive voice."

Does anyone dare to "analyze" the matter further, perhaps taking up the baton from Peter Hoffman? (Page 10)

ERV

FORUM QUIZ

The following photograph shows a slogan featured on some prominent signs on campus.



This slogan represents:

- the motto for a new funding drive for the School of Optometry,
- the new logo for "WatPark", UW's Technology Park,
- the new motto of UW's Keystone Fund,
- a mission statement for UW's Co-op Education and Career Services,
- None of the above.

Answer on Page 8.

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>

Reprinted with permission from The Chronicle of Higher Education (from the issue dated 18 May 2001)

FACULTY SENATE AT NOTRE DAME, ANGRY OVER LACK OF CLOUT, VOTES TO DISSOLVE

By Alex P. Kellogg

The Faculty Senate at the University of Notre Dame has voted to dissolve, frustrated that it didn't have any real power or influence. But the senators may have exceeded their power with the vote, so the body may survive after all.

The 15-to-11 vote to dissolve was taken by the Faculty Senate for 2000-1. But members of the Faculty Senate for the new academic year voted to keep the body alive, despite the vote to eliminate it.

The senate's power is limited to making recommendations on academic matters. Eliminating the body would require the approval of the university's Academic Council, president, and board.

The vote to dissolve was the culmination of years of festering dissatisfaction among faculty members with what they view as an insufficient voice in the decision-making process at the university, according to Jacqueline V. Brogan, the new acting chairwoman of the senate. Ms. Brogan was among those on the new board who voted to rescind the vote to dissolve.

"There is a huge division between the faculty and administration now," said Ms. Brogan, a professor of English. "The morale of the faculty is very, very low and has been for some time, precisely because we're not heard."

The new, 2001-2 Senate voted 10 to 6, with three abstentions, to reverse the decision to dissolve.

Questions arose about whether the proper procedures had been followed, however, since all new members were not present and thus a plurality and not a true majority of the senate had voted for the reversal. Members agreed to resolve the

issue at the next senate meeting, which will be held this week.

Administrators did not immediately respond to the move and have not made a formal statement about the dissolution. They have however, discussed it in private.

"We can't seriously consider dissolution of the Faculty Senate unless there's some alternative vehicle for the faculty voice. The long-term health of the university depends on there being a vehicle for the faculty to voice their concerns," said Carol A. Mooney, vice president and associate provost of the university.

Ms. Mooney denied there was a growing rift between faculty members and the administration or that the faculty lacked any real structural power. "The senate has right of agenda to the Academic Council," meaning it can present resolutions for consideration, she said. "That in and of itself is significant."

At least one member of the senate expressed his dissatisfaction with the decision to dissolve.

"I believe that an existing senate that goes to work restructuring itself is a better place to start from right now than no senate at all," said John H. Robinson, an associate professor of law who served on both Faculty Senates and who voted against the dissolution. "If you get rid of the only voice that the faculty at Notre Dame has, to think that thereby you'll be vesting the faculty with a better voice is sort of funny logic."

Copyright 2001, The Chronicle of Higher Education. Reprinted with permission. This article may not be posted, published, or distributed without permission from The Chronicle (<http://chronicle.com>)

FROM THE EDITOR'S LETTER OF INVITATION TO THE SENATORS:

Dated 15 July 2001

"I am writing to those faculty representatives to Senate whose names have appeared on the 1 May 2000 and 1 May 2001 lists. To those who joined Senate as of 1 May 2001 and who have participated in only two Senate meetings so far: I understand if you do not feel comfortable in submitting responses. On the other hand, I especially encourage those whose terms have recently expired to take some time to share their thoughts."

"Please feel free to write about any topic that you judge to be relevant to the question of the role of Senate at UW. For

example, are you satisfied or unsatisfied with Senate's role in the decision-making process at this university? Were there any affairs that you judge to have been particularly well handled in Senate? Or were there matters that could have been handled in a better way? Do you consider Senate meetings as "time well spent"? Is there sufficient time available for discussion of important issues? Are there any issues not yet discussed in Senate that you think should be? Would you encourage or perhaps discourage newer faculty members to seek election to Senate?"

AND THE REPLIES FROM THE INVITED UW SENATORS . . .

1. Thanks for the invitation to submit a response to “Faculty Senate at Notre Dame, Angry. . . ,” but I’ll decline for lack of time and interest. I do hope you get a good response from others; I would be particularly interested in hearing the views of faculty who have been around long enough to be able to describe the evolution of Senate.

THE FUTURE OF SENATE?



BREAKING FREE FROM THE TRADITIONAL VIEW OF LIBRARIANS

Amos Lakos, Carol Stephenson, Paul St-Pierre

UW Library

Less than a decade ago, few of us would have anticipated the pervasive nature of today's World Wide Web. It has had a profound impact on all aspects of higher education and scholarship, including the library. The role of the physical library as the primary aggregator and purveyor of scholarly information is being challenged. The traditional view of librarians as book custodians is being superseded by roles more closely aligned to faculty interests and concerns. This article highlights three such areas:

- Librarians as partners in the teaching and learning process
- Librarians as advocates for access to information resources integral to the support of teaching and research
- Librarians as researchers, creators, and contributors to the profession of library and information science

Partners in teaching and learning

As the Internet infiltrates everyday life, many people have come to believe that the Web makes information easier to find, diminishing the importance of libraries and librarians. In fact, the converse is true: While information sources have indeed multiplied exponentially, this has made the selection of *appropriate* materials more challenging. Self-publications of dubious quality compete with rigorous scholarly works, and a multitude of electronic publishing houses presents a bewildering array of interfaces. A major emphasis of librarianship, explicitly stated by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), is to promote information literacy, defined as "a set of abilities requiring individuals to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate and use it effectively"¹. Librarians pursue this objective by acting as facilitators between users and the corpus of knowledge. By providing instruction and consultation on the structure of the information environment and the effective use of retrieval technologies, we attempt to instill systematic search practices and critical evaluation skills, helping users find *better* information *faster*.

UW Librarians are integrating information literacy more directly into the curriculum by striking up innovative partnerships with faculty. In one such collaboration, a group from the library teamed up with Carolyn MacGregor's Systems Design Engineering 348 course (User-Centred Design). Acting as consultants, students evaluated the library's web gateway, applying formal usability principles to make constructive suggestions about its improvement. This

has been a rich learning experience for all involved: The students have familiarized themselves with library resources and the practical issues surrounding the management of a complex information space, the library has benefitted from valuable user feedback, and both groups have learned about more effective design methodologies.

In another effort, Bill Oldfield, a systems librarian seconded to the Centre for Learning and Teaching through Technology (LT3)², works with faculty to develop and integrate instructional technologies into teaching and learning.

Advocates for access to information resources

In 1996, a handful of Physics societal publishers mounted full text versions of their journals on the Web. Today, journals without a Web edition are rare and probably endangered. Waterloo now has full text access to over 6,000 E-journals, and additional linking from research databases directly to full text has brought the idea of a scholar's portal one step closer to reality. But this has not come without costs. Subscription prices for journals continue to soar and consume close to 70% of library materials budgets. A handful of publishers control the marketplace and attempt to impose inflated pricing schemes and restrictive access licensing.

Librarians are launching bold initiatives to protect unfettered access to the research literature. This year, Waterloo and other academic institutions worldwide banded together to protest the 3-month embargo of online access to key sections of the journal *Nature*. As a result, the publisher softened its position and announced new licensing options with immediate access to all content.

Closer to home, Waterloo and 63 other Canadian institutions, with support from federal and provincial governments, have demonstrated an unprecedented collective approach to ensuring access to the research literature. The Canadian National Site Licensing Project (CNSLP)³ has leveraged Canadian universities' buying power and influenced the publishing marketplace into providing cost effective licenses to electronic resources. As a result, the UW library has guaranteed three-year access to key scientific journals and databases. The project was recognized by the Canadian Association of University Business Officers (CAUBO)⁴ with the National First Prize in the 2001 Quality and Productivity Awards. Faye Abrams, a UW librarian, is on the CNSLP negotiating team. She is currently seconded to the position of

Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL)⁵ Projects Officer and continues to coordinate and manage the development of new electronic resource sharing initiatives for Ontario universities.

Librarians are also collaborating with scholars and societies to wrest control of scholarly communication from the dominance of large commercial publishers. The UW Library is a member of the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC)⁶, a global alliance of research institutions, libraries and organizations encouraging competition in the scholarly communications market. SPARC promotes the development of high quality, more affordable journals. Librarians are also engaging with scholars in the development of open archive projects, such as PubMed Central⁷ and HighWire Press⁸. UW librarians are actively involved in discussions about the future of scholarly communication and inform faculty on options and issues of publication in the electronic environment.

Researchers, creators, and contributors to the profession

The involvement of librarians in research, scholarship, and creative work may not be widely recognized at UW but these efforts have received international acclaim.

The Scholarly Societies Project⁹, created by Jim Parrott, Liaison Librarian for Computer Science and Electrical & Computer Engineering, is the world's most comprehensive free Internet database on scholarly societies. His research has ranged from consulting historical manuscripts in verifying the origins of societies, to using UNICODE in adding non-English language societies to the Web site.

Amos Lakos, Liaison Librarian for Accounting and Political Science, is widely respected as a key speaker and writer on the culture of assessment and organizational change. He was recently appointed adjunct faculty member with the Association of Research Libraries Office of Leadership and Management Services (ARL/OLMS)¹⁰, and is a co-creator of the ARL/OLMS Workshop "Creating a Culture of Assessment in Libraries." His other research interests include the assessment of learning outcomes, web usability and the potential of portals for libraries. He recently co-authored a paper with Chris Gray from the Library Systems Department, "Personalized Library Portals as an Organizational Culture Change Agent: Reflections on Possibilities and Challenges," published in *Information Technology and Libraries*¹¹.

As the recipient of the 2000 Ontario College and University Library Association (OCULA) Award¹², Susan Moskal, Government Documents and Data Librarian, was recognized for her contributions to the profession of academic librarianship. She was also the Waterloo lead in developing the innovative TriUniversity Data Resources Project (TDR)¹³

which received a CAUBO Award for Quality and Productivity in 1999.

Anne Fullerton, Librarian for Chemical Engineering and Biology, has many teaching and research projects to her credit. She has recently written an internationally recognized article, "Information Literacy in Science and Engineering Undergraduate Education: Faculty Attitudes and Pedagogical Practices", published in *College and Research Libraries*¹⁴. The article, co-written with Gloria Leckie, a University of Western Ontario professor, was selected as one of the top 20 instruction articles in 1999.

Future directions

Librarians are committed to the University's teaching and research mission. As partners in the learning process, we are promoters of information literacy. In support of research, we ensure continued access to necessary information resources, and have a strong voice, alongside faculty, on issues of change in scholarly communication. Our research and continuing professional development contribute to the discipline of librarianship and benefit the entire academic community.

Librarians share more in common with faculty than with other campus groups. Although the case has been made for several years, representation by FAUW has not been legitimized by the administration and remains an unresolved article in the FAUW Memorandum of Agreement. Faculty associations represent librarians at over 90% of Canadian universities. It is time to reconsider the UW administration's long-standing and unique view of grouping librarians with staff. Waterloo's thirty librarians are willing and enthusiastic to shoulder the responsibility of full participation in academic affairs. Recognition as information professionals will permit us to maximize our contribution to the University's mission, helping it maintain a superior position in this competitive Information Age.

References

1. Association of College & Research Libraries. Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. 2000.
2. UW Centre for Learning and Teaching Through Technology.
3. Canadian National Site Licensing Project.
4. Canadian Association of University Business Officers.
5. Ontario Council of University Libraries.
6. Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition.
7. PubMed Central.
8. HighWire Press.
9. Scholarly Societies Project.
10. Association of Research Libraries, Office of Leadership

- and Management Services.
11. Lakos, A & Gray, C. (2000) Personalized Library Portals as an Organizational Culture Change Agent: Reflections on Possibilities and Challenges. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 19(4): 169-174.
 12. Ontario College and University Library Association.
 13. TriUniversity Data Resources.
 14. Leckie, G.J. & Fullerton, A. (1999) Information Literacy in Science and Engineering Undergraduate Education: Faculty Attitudes and Pedagogical Practices. *College & Research Libraries*, 60(1): 9-29.

ANSWER TO *FORUM QUIZ*

e) It is the slogan of a construction company.



FORUM EDITORIAL BOARD

Edward Vrscay, Applied Mathematics, Editor

Paul Fieguth, Systems Design Engineering

Paul Malone, Germanic & Slavic Studies

Jeffrey Shallit, Computer Science

David Williams, Optometry

Catherine Schryer, English, ex officio

Pat Moore, Faculty Association Office, Production

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR



Richard Mitchell's dissertation ("Less Than Words Can Say", *Forum*, Summer 2001) about the contumelious use of English by those who should know better, points (perhaps unwittingly) to the dual nature of this language. While it allows just about any structural peccadillo in idiomatic style, it imposes rather rigid grammatical rules on a "proper" sentence. Other languages are much more flexible, as a comparison with e.g. Russian will show. In English, the expressions "home going am I", "going I am home", "I home going am", etc., are in the sub-pigeon category, whereas in Russian they make perfect sense. (In fact, the pronoun "I" is not even needed.) English is wonderful, however. In what other language can you give the advice: "make every second count" meaning that the recipient of the advice should (a) act diligently and use time efficiently, or (b) engage in sexual congress with as many European members of nobility (roughly equivalent to the rank of an English earl) as possible?

Tom Fahidy
Department of Chemical Engineering

Jeanne Kay Guelke leaves out an important point in her letter regarding grade changes: Advanced level courses are significantly more difficult than the honours level courses that they replace. To discuss the grading issue in terms of bright students studying regular curricula who "didn't work very hard in a particular class or who misunderstood some of the course material" creates a false analogy. The curriculum is not regular, and the reason that marks are low is neither laziness nor misunderstanding. The course is simply more difficult than an honours level course.

The elite students are not the reason that the grades given in advanced courses are higher than the literal percentages. The real reason is that advanced level grades replace honours level grades on students' transcripts, but the levels of difficulty of the two types of course are radically different. It's the calibre of the course material, not the calibre of the students, that has led to advanced level grading practices.

This letter is not about the issue of who is allowed to set grades, nor whether advanced level courses should exist, an issue Dr. Hoffman covered admirably. I simply want to make it clear that fairness, not elitism, is the motor driving advanced level grading.

Yaacov Iland, B.Math. '01
Joint Honours, Computer Science and Pure Mathematics

In the continuing aftermath of the Lipshitz affair, some serious (if ludicrous) allegations are now on the table. As such, a reply is required. It is unclear whether these accusations arise only in the fevered imagination of one faculty member who is somewhat removed from the situation, or whether they are actually part of a campaign to vindicate the person who lost his grievance case.

Jeanne Kay Guelke writes:

- (i) "... professors of talented math students are not ... expected to grade such students objectively according to the results they actually produce in class ..."

One might still hope that she believes this to be an evil plot by the Dean, which is largely being resisted by stalwart instructors.

But she later writes:

- (ii) "One wonders how those universities' graduate officers will feel about transcripts from University of Waterloo if such grading practices continue."

Taken together, this is tantamount to an assertion that this kind of academic dishonesty is what the enriched section instructors have been engaging in over the years (with Prof. Lipshitz as the exception, in his one attempt, after 30 years here, to teach such a section). An accusation like this is serious, and some reasonable evidence would be expected from the accuser.

As far as I can tell, her only evidence comes from the details of the academic freedom grievance case which generated this discussion. At this point, it is unfortunately necessary to remind (or inform) people of the following. The administration defended itself essentially on grounds to do with whether it had the authority to mess with marks. No detailed attempt was made from that side to refute claims by the Lipshitz side of impeccable conduct of the course. So there is no evidence at all here to support Prof. Guelke's accusation.

My previous letter did express a dislike of the 'Dean's average mark guidelines', or whatever they are called, which

include an 80% minimum in enriched sections, and 65% for regular sections. Perhaps Prof. Guelke, instead of bothering with evidence, had in mind an argument that any enriched section instructor (who came in with a class average over 80%) would automatically be guilty of that academic dishonesty. (There would be no trouble finding plenty of evidence for such averages having occurred.) Leaving aside its highly questionable logic, it is clear that such an argument has nothing at all to do with “elitism”. (By the way, the *OED* definition of that word is completely different from hers.) The argument above would apply just as well to an instructor of a *regular* section who came in with a class average over 65%. Were this a convincing argument (decide for yourselves!), an overwhelming majority of Math faculty members should be hanging their heads in shame, both the instructors involved, and fellow-travellers who haven’t been blowing the whistle on this ‘odious’ practice.

Quote (ii) above makes it clear that Prof. Guelke has a firm belief that students coming from the enriched sections in the Math Faculty are leaving here with inflated transcripts. At least she deserves credit for being straightforward and not engaging in innuendo on this point. I’ll let the complete lack of evidence for this speak for itself. But I surely hope that any of these students who (perhaps accidentally) see her letter also see this one. We can probably count on those former enriched section students, who are tenured faculty members at McMaster, UBC, UCLA, etc., not running across this exchange of letters. Actually there is one former student in that category who has seen her letter, but as an FRSC who is the current Director of the Fields Institute, I’m confident that his skin is sufficiently thick that he’s not too upset.

On a related issue, although very much above average among honours students, the typical student enrolled in the enriched section is certainly not at the level of a future FRSC. There are those who now recommend (it seems for after-the-fact vindication) that those sections be restricted to an even higher level than at present. This would make teaching them unviable economically. And, in any case, it would deny the opportunity for study at a higher level to students who do derive considerable benefit from that.

Of course I’ve engaged in a bit of name-dropping two paragraphs above. This is to point out, for those not familiar with the situation, that the ambassadors for Waterloo from the enriched sections do just the opposite to what Professor Guelke fears. Because of these people, the academic reputation of this place is (if anything) higher than it deserves to be. If she had been correct in the content of statement (ii) above, it really would be amazing how our grade transcripts, our reference letters, and the students themselves have managed to continually pull the wool over the eyes of our colleagues at Berkeley, Chicago, MIT, etc. for more than 25 years! Most of those students just can’t wait to get at research

problems; they usually pass their comprehensives far earlier than their classmates do.

It is regrettable that accusations bordering on libelous had to remain unanswered for several months, due to the timing of issues of this newsletter.

Peter Hoffman
Department of Pure Mathematics

A FINELY TUNED EDITORIAL BALANCE or, How I learned to stop worrying and start analyzing

Ironies abound in the Summer 2001 issue of the *Forum*.

By far the longest article (“Less Than Words Can Say”, p.3) is a chapter from the chief of the grammar police concerning English usage.¹ Would he bring charges against the perpetrator of the following excerpt from an earlier issue of the *Forum* (also by an English prof): “Both have promised that they will continue to provide . . . myself with advice and direction.”

On closer examination, that chapter was evidently designed by its author to savage a former friend of his, one who had the nerve to aspire to becoming a “deanlike-object”, as we sometimes say. In this case, the job lusted after was “assistant dean pro tem”. More generally, it was an attack on anyone who might have *deanlike-object aspirations*. Now the same issue contained a mildly self-congratulatory article (p.15) written by a nominator. The nominee (whom the nominator had nominated) was an ultimately successful candidate for a provincial award. That excellent person, ironically enough, has recently been best known around here as an *Associate Dean*. But that’s only a small example of the exquisitely tuned editorial balance with which the reader was entertained.

That excerpted chapter was also somewhat American², shall we say – but not nearly so much as was the interview, for an American journal, of an American professor, concerning grade inflation at an American university. Two of the prime sources of this disease were identified as American affirmative action policies, and avoidance of the draft into the American armed forces. But I imagine this article appeared largely to balance out an earlier letter (bottom of p.2). According to that letter, the only important issue (arising from the Lipshitz affair) was the invasion into Canada of an American word-usage, in this case “institutional academic freedom”. But all is not lost.³ On p.16, we are assured that the Association and the UW administration are on the verge of an historic agreement. In exchange for God knows what, the admin guys (a non-sexist usage, I trust) appear to be all primed up to agree to cross their hearts and promise never to use the phrase

“academic freedom” when they really mean “management rights”.

Looks like we’re all the way back to [English usage](#) here. But let’s not get into an infinite loop!

Would it be necessary to stay up half the night, worrying about this word usage, had the Association (of which the letter-writer was president at the time) not blundered into a hopeless grievance case with a bag of our fee money for its lawyers to waste? Actually I’ve begun to suspect that the local water supply has in recent years become infected with the (POO-BAHS LIKE US DON’T NEED NO OBJECTIVE EXPERT ADVICE)-virus; not needed by the Association before blundering into that case⁴; not needed (as far as I can tell) by the UW admin before blundering into what looks like a very bad contract with PeopleSoft⁵; and not needed by the City of Waterloo before blundering into a rip-off contract with MFP to finance RIM Park.

It doesn’t require a particularly suspicious mind to wonder whether the consternation about “institutional academic freedom” has less to do with welfare of faculty, and more to do with the covering of a part of the anatomy not distant from the part which “analyze” might be mistaken to refer to. The word “mathematics” as misused in elementary education refers to little more than the programming of eager young minds to carry out arithmetical calculations. But I don’t expect the Canadian Math Society to enter into negotiations with the provincial department of education to rectify this use of language. Perhaps we could hear more about what is so pressingly urgent about the Association’s negotiations with the Administration on this matter.

Moving right along to that interviewed American professor (who seems to be turning into a cult hero for the *Forum* readership), is there any factual basis for the following statement of his: “We should stop giving our students the same grades they used to get in high school.” At least this gets us down to a specific grade-inflation criterion, and away from gossipy innuendo. Local data on something like this are what I challenged our anti-grade-inflation brigade to come up with in a previous epistle. But there were no takers.

Since the Math Faculty has been getting bad press in recent issues of the *Forum* from people ignorant of the facts, let’s have a look at some such facts along lines parallel to Prof. Mansfield’s thinking. (Well, at least his article identified causes – U.S. affirmative action and military draft – which are superbly relevant to this university!)

Here’s a UW fact, exactly opposite to what Mansfield claims for Harvard. Let’s look at the average mark, for each of the past 25 years, in both of the Year 1 algebra courses in the

Math Faculty, required of all honours students. *We’d undoubtedly find that NOT EVEN ONCE in those 50 occurrences has that average been within 10% of the Grade 13 math averages of the incoming students.* Now I haven’t done the spadework to actually check this out, but I’m absolutely confident of it; in fact, change that to 35 years and 15%. (So it’s possibly an opportunity for those who go on at length, but vaguely, about the evils of grade inflation, to discredit me.) I’m fairly certain that the same statement would hold for the two calculus courses these students take. But more caution is maybe needed on that one, especially for years further into the past, when the ancestors of the born-again anti-grade-inflators⁶ had influence over those courses.

So let’s have some *facts* from the other side!

Or maybe this writing binge is just an antidote to the worm-in-brain caused by marking 187 exams in Mathematical Logic. As the colonel from Dr. Strangelove might put it, those letters to the *Forum* editor are really getting our precious bodily fluids flowing. Of course the article title, and the references to editorial balance above, are jocular (and a pathetic attempt by me to make the first part of this article appear to have some unity). Clearly the editor has done an admirable job injecting life into the *Forum*. I just hope he doesn’t return this article with a request for me to analyze it.

¹ I’m still wondering about that word “analyze” he uses. I could conjecture a meaning, but not in polite company. Or perhaps an academic just can’t resist displaying his knowledge of arcane spellings. Might there be a less precise verb “orificize”, of which “nostrilize” etc. are more precise counterparts?

² But hopefully “analyze” isn’t actually pronounced beginning with a long A.

³ I am aware that the negation is misplaced relative to the quantifier in this turn of phrase – just in case the grammar police come after me.

⁴ How many of the numerous former and present instructors of the enriched sections were consulted before launching this case?

⁵ Shall we join those earlier bamboozled universities in their class-action suit (against PeopleSoft), despite not getting references from them concerning the software, at a time when it might have helped?

⁶ Does $x \in \{\text{ancestors of born-again } x\}$? In plain language, is a born-again man one of his own ancestors? It would seem so.

Peter Hoffman
Department of Pure Mathematics

THINGS YOU MAY NOT KNOW (continued)

From Bill Power, Chemistry:

Item 8 is incorrect. “Mind your p’s and q’s” comes from typesetting, since, in reverse, p’s look like q’s and vice versa. When sorting the letters after the type had been set, the setters were cautioned in this way to ensure they remembered to think of the mirror images of these two letters in particular. By the way, the terms “upper case” and “lower case” also has this origin, coming from the physical locations of the cases of letters typesetters would use. Capital letters were in the upper case, while small letters were below them.

From Peter A. Buhr, Computer Science:

At least several ... are incorrect, putting the entire list in question.

The OED cites no rule in English law about wife beating with respect to “rule of thumb”. Please show me this law.

The origin of the name Jeep is very questionable, and the one given is only one of many.

Minding your P’s and Q’s comes from printing.

From Lee Dickey, Pure Mathematics:

You included in your list of “Things you may not know”, an item about the origin of “the rule of thumb”. I had heard this wife-beating derivation before, perhaps in the 70s or 80s. But more recently, I have heard the assertion that the wife-beating derivation was propaganda that originated in feminist writing of the mid- to late 20th century, and that it is without foundation. Of course this assertion may have been counter propaganda manufactured more recently by the fertile mind of someone else.

Our beloved OED did not help me much. Perhaps one of the readers of *FAUW Forum* can shed some light on the matter.

From Barbara Yeaman, Dean’s Office, Faculty of Environmental Studies:

I have an ongoing interest in phrases that we commonly use without knowing their original source, and thus enjoyed “Things You May Not Know” in the latest edition of the newsletter.

I have one to add. The phrase “spic and span” originated when people ate with their hands, but some began to use a spoon and a spike (the forerunner of the fork). These people were thought of as fastidious and called the “spike and spoon” people, which in the vernacular of the time softened to “spic and span” thus the current meaning.



FROM THE PROFESSOR FILES

Take a simple math problem, subject it to 30 years of “new, improved” teaching methods and you have “Outcomes-Based Education”

1960 Problem

“A logger sells a truckload of lumber for \$100. His cost of production is $\frac{4}{5}$ of this price. What is his profit?”

1970 Traditional Math

“A logger sells a truckload of lumber for \$100. His cost of production is $\frac{4}{5}$ of this price – in other words, \$80. What is his profit?”

1970 New Math


“A logger exchanges a set L of lumber for a set M of money. The cardinality of set M is 100, and each element is worth \$1. Make one hundred dots representing the elements of M. The set C of costs of production contain 20 fewer points than the set M. Represent the set C as a subset of M, and answer the following question: What is the cardinality of the set P of profits?”

1980

“A logger sells a truckload of wood for \$100. His cost of production is \$80 and his profit is \$20. Your assignment: Underline the number 20.”

1990 Outcomes-Based Education

“By cutting down beautiful forest trees, a logger makes \$20. What do you think of this way of making a living? (Topic for class participation: How did the forest birds and squirrels feel?)”



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 removed from the mailing list.

ISSN 0840-7320

ANNOUNCEMENTS

FAUW PENSIONS AND BENEFITS COMMITTEE: Members Wanted

The Faculty Association is seeking members with an interest in the pensions and benefits of faculty who are willing to serve on the FAUW Pensions and Benefits Committee now, and possibly on the University Pensions and Benefits Committee in the future as a representative of the Faculty Association and its members.

The FAUW Pensions and Benefits Committee is concerned with faculty pensions and all other benefits which fall under the purview of the UW P&B Committee. The FAUW P&B Committee consists of members of the Association appointed by the FAUW Board and includes the three FAUW nominated members of the UW P&B Committee. Generally, it is desirable that nominees to the University Committee have experience on the FAUW Committee prior to being nominated by the Association Board.

If you are interested in joining the Committee or would like more information, please contact Pat Moore in the FAUW Office (x 3787) or Ian Macdonald, Chair of the FAUW P&B Committee (x 3596).

CAUT AND GENDER EQUITY

CAUT has as one of its objects the advancement of equity and human rights in the profession. (See "About CAUT" on its web page at <http://www.caut.ca>). Gender equity is one element of this object. In order to facilitate this element (and the overall object), CAUT, through its equity officer and through its Status of Women's Committee (SWC) and Equity Committee, is seeking to establish communication networks with faculty members at all Canadian Universities who would like to participate in a dialogue and in the development of strategies to advance gender equity in the profession.

One means is to join CAUTeq, which is an unmoderated listserv open to all faculty (including retired faculty) interested in exchanging ideas and learning about equity issues and activities on or off campus. This could facilitate the exchange of ideas as well as opinions, papers and the development of strategies and tools for promoting gender equity. To be added to the listserv contact your faculty association or Rosemary Morgan at morgan@caut.ca, indicating your desire to be on the listserv. Please include your University, e-mail address, and phone number. You will then be sent a welcome and information flyer on how to use the listserv.

Another avenue would include participation in the bi-annual CAUT SWC Conference. The next Conference is scheduled for October 24-26, 2002 at the Delta Montreal. The 2002 Conference will have as its theme *Gender Equity: From Graduate Student to Professor Emerita* (addressing means of overcoming barriers to entering and advancing in the profession, pay and benefits, employment equity, and pension/retirement issues).

If you are interested in any or all of these suggestions, or if you have further suggestions, please contact Rosemary Morgan, Legal Counsel & Equity Officer, at morgan@caut.ca or call her collect at (613) 820-2270, x 324.

FAUW BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2001-2002

CATHERINE SCHRYER

President

Department of English
x2118
cschryer@uwaterloo.ca

FRED McCOURT

Past President

Department of Chemistry
x3024
mccourt@uwaterloo.ca

EDWARD VRSCAY

Vice President

Department of Applied Mathematics
x5455
ervrscay@uwaterloo.ca

RAY MCLENAGHAN

Secretary/Treasurer

Department of Applied Mathematics
x5456
rgmclena@uwaterloo.ca

MIEKE DELFGAAUW

Faculty of Environmental Studies
x3740
mdelfgaa@uwaterloo.ca

LEN GUELKE

Chair, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

Department of Geography
x3064
lguelke@uwaterloo.ca

CONRAD HEWITT

President, St. Jerome's Faculty Association

St. Jerome's University
519-884-8111, x228
cghewitt@uwaterloo.ca

IAN MACDONALD

OCUFA Director

Department of Chemical Engineering
x3596
ifmacdon@uwaterloo.ca

BILL POWER

Department of Chemistry
x2944
wppower@uwaterloo.ca

METIN RENKSIZBULUT

Chair, Compensation Committee

Department of Mechanical Engineering
x3977
metin@uwaterloo.ca

FRANK REYNOLDS

Chair, Political Relations Committee

Department of Statistics & Actuarial Science
x5540
fgreynol@uwaterloo.ca

Ex Officio Director

JEANNE KAY GUELKE

Chair, Status of Women & Inclusivity Committee

Department of Geography
x6833
jkg@uwaterloo.ca

Official Visitor to the Board

CAROL STEPHENSON

President, Librarians' Association (LAUW)
x6912
cjstephe@uwaterloo.ca

Administrator

PAT MOORE

x3787
facassoc@uwaterloo.ca

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Catherine Schryer
Department of English

GREETINGS AND SALUTATIONS

If you are a new faculty member at the University of Waterloo – welcome. If you are returning to the University for another semester – welcome back.

The FAUW faces many challenges and opportunities this year. During the next few months we will be attempting to complete Articles 15, 16 and 17 and have them accepted into the Memorandum of Agreement. In some ways these articles ask us to deal with the unthinkable – program terminations and layoffs. Over the last year, the Board debated the wisdom of developing policies to handle these situations. However, in the end we decided that good, clear policies that protected the core values of research and teaching were definitely needed if future crises situations ever developed. Since then the Memorandum of Agreement negotiating team, headed up by Fred McCourt, has spent many hours crafting a draft agreement to handle these exigencies, exigencies which we hope never occur. Of course, your input will be sought once we have a draft that both the FAUW and the administration feel is workable.

Besides developing these challenging articles, we are continuing our work to preserve academic freedom. On this issue we are pressuring the Administration to find a resolution to the problem of student evaluation and grading. As many of you know, we maintain that grading is part of our professional responsibility and mandate. Grading is an expression of our formal, professional expertise and thus constitutes an aspect of academic freedom.

Other, less visible work, also continues. In this regard, the Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF and T) Committee, under the direction of Len Guelke, has quietly been doing admirable work supporting faculty all across campus if they find themselves in difficulties with their Chairs or Deans. Over the last year the AF and T has assisted in the mediation of several potentially troublesome situations. Because of its strict policy of confidentiality, the AF and T has been able to do this work quietly and yet competently. As President of the FAUW, I stand at arm's length from this committee and remain unaware of the details of individual cases. However, toward the end of the Winter

semester and over the summer, I received several letters from faculty who had been assisted by the AF and T. All praised the professional and confidential way that their cases had been handled. We are fortunate to have such a hard working committee attending to our concerns.

This year, too, we face the challenge of continuing to develop the FAUW itself. Over the last few years, many faculty members who participated in the FAUW have retired, and yet the work of the organization—especially the work of the AF and T committee and the Pensions and Benefits committee—has increased dramatically. We need faculty both to join the Association and to participate on its committees. The benefits of participation are many: the chance to meet faculty from all across campus; and an opportunity to find out how the university really works. In my case, for example, I discovered a research partner on a FAUW committee. Last year the two of us put together a successful grant proposal. In fact, I contend that the FAUW is just about the only place that faculty can explore interdisciplinary interests. Other faculty have told me that they have learned valuable skills by joining the Pensions and Benefits (P and B) committee. Most of us do not have the time to teach ourselves the intricacies regarding pension plans and the details we need to invest our own money. The P and B committee teaches its membership these skills, skills that they find useful in other areas of their lives. If you want to participate in any of our committees, please contact Pat Moore (x 3787) and we will find a place for you!

Finally, this year we plan on improving the lines of communications within the organization. Specifically, we are looking carefully at the role of the Department representatives. We realize that we need to hear much more about what is happening in various departments. Last year we experimented with asking our Department representatives to prepare brief reports on events and concerns in their areas for the Council of Representatives meeting. We plan to develop this initiative even further, so if you have issues or concerns contact your Department representative. Again, contact Pat if you don't know who your representative is and she will let you know.

I look forward to working with all of you this year and hope to meet you at various FAUW events.