

THE FAUW WELCOMES NEW FACULTY MEMBERS

FAUW President Roydon Fraser (Mechanical Engineering) encourages new members of the UW community to “discover what UW can do for you and what you can do for UW” (Page 3). He then outlines some important functions of the FAUW and also summarizes a number of matters that the FAUW is continuing to pursue with UW’s administration.

Prof. Fraser, an experienced member of the FAUW Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, is shown in the photo at the right, participating in a faculty panel on balancing teaching, research, service and life outside the university. More pictures of the welcoming events for new faculty, held on September 9, 2004, appear on Page 15.



CURRICULUM REFORM AT HARVARD What Can UW Learn from the Harvard Report?

Brian Hendley (Philosophy) examines the 69-page report issued by the Harvard College Curricular Committee, with its 57 recommendations for changes in the undergraduate curriculum of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard. Although UW “can take some comfort in the fact that we already do some of the things they are recommending,” Prof. Hendley concludes with the statement, “we could do better in educating all of our students to be concerned, informed and effective citizens.” A summary of the principal recommendations is also reprinted from Harvard’s website. (Page 5)

ADMINISTRATIVE MOBBING AT U OF T

Paul Malone (Germanic and Slavic Studies) reviews a new book by Kenneth Westhues (Sociology) that deals with the case of former University of Toronto professor Herbert Richardson. This “substantial volume” by Westhues, acknowledged as an expert in the sociological study of workplace mobbing, is “well written, well documented” and “makes for a lively and engaging read despite its essentially rather depressing subject matter”. (Page 12)

Inside this issue:

Letter to the Editor	2
President's Message	3
What's New from Harvard	5
Stalin, Mao Tze Tung and Chang Kai-Chek Must Be Turning Over	8
The University Transformed – for Better or for Worse	10
Book Review	12
Forum Quiz	16

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

A Faculty Association's duty is to negotiate the terms and conditions of employment for its members. The recent contentious arguments concerning the content and editorial practices of the *FAUW Forum* seem to me to be a diversion from the real issues facing the FAUW today.

In my experience, the administration of a university is only too happy when faculty members are fighting amongst themselves; that means they are not fighting for improved terms and conditions of employment. I suggest the pages of this journal could be used far more productively to inform members of current academic employment issues and to encourage discussion of how we at UW might address them.

Here are a few examples of what other Faculty Associations have negotiated for their memberships and what we might want to negotiate too. You can probably add your own examples:

- vision-care coverage. I have worked at four different institutions and UW is the only one not to have such coverage for its employees.
- improved tuition coverage for us and our dependents. If any of us worked down the road at WLU, not only would our dependents qualify for free tuition at that institution for graduate and undergraduate studies, but they would also qualify for a tuition *scholarship*, portable to a different university. That is an excellent model we might want to imitate.
- bargaining rights for sessional employees of UW. At the moment, in the Faculty of Arts, a graduate student is paid more to teach a single course than a sessional employee is. The growing use of sessional employees to replace full-time faculty members is a crisis facing higher education across Canada. Even if we don't want to negotiate better pay for sessional employees because it is fair, perhaps we should want to out of our own self-interest.

- "compression increases" when salary floors are raised. Everyone is happy with the increase in salary floors recently negotiated by FAUW; however, some members with several years in rank now find themselves paid the same as newly promoted members at the same rank. Years of seniority should surely be recognized in salary.

Whenever I have discussed the limited bargaining position of the FAUW with other members of the association I have told that we are limited *because* we are not a union. This argument, with all due respect, seems to me to be a red herring. Many non-unionized associations across Canada bargain collectively on a whole range of issues; what they lack is the right to strike. There is no reason why we cannot broaden the scope of our negotiations. Organization like OCUFA and CAUT can be of enormous help in this regard.

The other reason for the limited bargaining position of the FAUW, I have been told, is the "culture" here at UW. This culture is reflected in a laudable desire to work collegially with the administration, not adversarially. While this tactic has been effective on a whole range of issues, it seems to me we should now discuss whether it is always the most effective way of proceeding on all fronts. Bargaining hard for certain kinds of improvement does not mean that discussions must be uncivil or combative. We can preserve collegial relations with the administration while making it clear that we are prepared to fight for what we think is fair. What we as a membership need is to be united in our desires and aspirations.

I want to make it clear that I appreciate what the FAUW has currently negotiated for us on our behalf; our recent salary increases, for example, have indeed been excellent.

However as we look towards to future, I think the FAUW should identify new priorities which will unite, not divide, the membership.

Kate Lawson
Department of English Language and Literature

A note from the Editorial Board

In March, a faculty member suggested that the Forum reprint the article 'Funding 'wasted on third-class universities', that originally appeared on the website of telegraph.co.uk.online. The suggestion was made by Prof. Robert Macdonald of the Department of Mechanical Engineering – in his words "to gauge opinion" – and the article appeared in the April 2004 issue of the Forum. Unfortunately, Prof. Macdonald was never able to see the result of his suggestion. Just as the issue was being printed, the KW community received the news that Robert, while visiting Trinidad, was the victim of a street robbery and was subsequently shot. He was flown back to Canada but lost his life a few days later.

On a number of occasions, in the form of letters to the Forum, e-mails exchanged with the Editor and the contribution mentioned above, Prof. Macdonald demonstrated his belief in academic discussion and debate. We at the Forum hope that others will honour the memory of Robert Macdonald's academic spirit and pick up the torch that he left behind.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Roydon Fraser

Department of Mechanical Engineering



The campus is energized with the arrival of a new crop of students this fall. Less obvious but critical to the long term health of the university community are the energy and re-vitalization provided by our new faculty and staff who have joined the UW community over the past year. I hope our new faculty took advantage of the University's welcoming events held on September 9. On a personal note, I would like to extend my sincerest welcome to all the new members of the UW community and to encourage you to discover what UW can do for you and what you can do for UW. Welcome.

One important function performed by your faculty association is to provide advice and support to faculty members who have concerns with their terms or conditions of employment. For those who find themselves in an appeal or grievance situation, this assistance can be invaluable. UW faculty are not unionized and hence grievances are up to the individual to pursue, not the faculty association; this is called individual carriage. The stress of pursuing an appeal (such as for a negative tenure decision) or grievance can be substantial. A most important function performed by your association in these cases is to match the faculty member with a colleague. With the retirement of Ray McLenaghan and the coming retirement of Len Guelke, past chairs of the FAUW Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AF&T), we have a strong need for new committee members who are willing to serve on the AF&T Committee and/or be an appeal or grievance supporting colleague. If you have an interest or would like to learn more about what is involved, please contact Pat Moore (FAUW Administrator, x3787), Frank Reynolds (AF&T Chair, x 5540), or me (x4764).

The FAUW continues to pursue with the Administration several issues of concern. Three of the most active issues are the development of a policy for spousal hiring, revisions to the policies for Dean and Chair

appointments, and clarification of the status of faculty liability protection.

Currently spousal hiring is governed by a set of guidelines. In order to be competitive in hiring faculty, UW engages in spousal hiring in a limited number of cases. The spousal hiring guidelines are relatively new and were put in place as UW gained experience with the pros and cons of how to implement a spousal hiring program. Your faculty association believes all faculty hirings should be governed by UW policy and, to this end, we are working on moving the spousal hiring guidelines into policy. Accompanying this revision of policy we are also discussing with the Administration the possible inclusion of exceptional case hirings which can bypass the need for advertisement but not the need for demonstrated merit.

The revisions of the Dean and Chair appointment policies are being pursued primarily to clarify how faculty members are to be involved in the processes, hopefully bringing more consistency to practices across campus.

Finally, there was a situation at York University in which the university refused to support a faculty member charged with libel. The libel charges were later dropped, but this case is disturbing because the faculty member was speaking on his area of expertise. Your faculty association feels it is imperative that you know what protection the university will and will not provide you in a case of libel related to your university work. I look forward to being able to communicate to you your level of liability protection in the near future.

If you drive to work you will be discovering soon the first in a new set of proposed parking fee increases. The university is pursuing a policy of matching the market price for parking, which means that over the next several years there will be roughly a doubling of your parking fees. FAUW's position is that any increase must go into improving parking services, not into the general university coffers, and that a clear business plan needs to be produced to demonstrate that this money is needed and to identify the benefit it will deliver to faculty and the university community at large. Over the summer the administration agreed to having all fee increases be applied to parking improvements. There is also a promise of a more detailed business plan. It is not uncommon for new faculty to be assigned a parking lot far from their office, a situation that will only get worse as the university continues to expand on the south campus by replacing parking spaces with buildings. Future options for these fee increases include the possibility of a parking

structure on the south campus or shuttles from a north campus lot. FAUW looks forward to communicating the parking services business plan to you in the near future.

A brief mention of an issue that is important for anyone who has their exams printed by the Registrar's Office: It is the FAUW's position that under no circumstance should a faculty member be asked to pay for the cost of printing their exams should they miss a Registrar's Office deadline. If you miss a deadline you will, of course, miss the support and all the checks provided by the Registrar's Office. If you have been asked to pay for the cost of printing an exam please inform us. FAUW

would like to know if this is an isolated or a widespread problem.

Finally, I would just like to make all new faculty aware that you are not members of FAUW just because you have FAUW fees deducted from your paycheque. You must sign up to become a member and have a voice in FAUW. Contact Pat Moore (ext 3787) to see if you are a member or for information on how to sign up. FAUW needs and welcomes the input from all UW faculty members.

I hope everyone has an enjoyable and productive fall term.

Reception for FAUW Volunteers

On June 6, 2004 the Faculty Association held a reception to thank all the volunteers who served on FAUW committees, the Council of Representatives and the Board of Directors during the past three years. Catherine Schryer was honoured for her service as Association President from 2001 to 2004.



Former President Catherine Schryer and current President Roydon Fraser

The following article originally appeared in the May 13, 2004 issue of the *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*.

WHAT'S NEW FROM HARVARD

A review of *A Report of the Harvard College Curricular Committee* (April, 2004)

by Brian Hendley
Department of Philosophy

When Harvard speaks, the rest of us listen. After fifteen months of deliberations, a committee of professors, administrators, undergraduate and graduate students has issued a 69-page report with 57 recommendations for changes in the undergraduate curriculum of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard. The report advocates more direct student-faculty contact, greater opportunities for studying abroad, less specialization, greater exposure of all undergraduates to courses in scientific thinking and quantitative reasoning, more interdisciplinary study, and increased participation of undergraduates in faculty research projects. All in all, it details a blueprint for a revitalized liberal education in the arts and sciences.

Previous curriculum revisions at Harvard have had a widespread impact. Under Charles Eliot (1869-1909), Harvard embraced the elective system and most North American universities quickly followed suit. His successor, Lawrence Lowell (1909-1933) created a framework for the concentration and distribution of undergraduate courses that led to the development of majors and minors in most liberal arts curricula. When James Conant (1933-1953) championed a general education for undergraduates consisting of required courses in the broad areas of humanities, social science, and natural sciences, most universities added their own breadth and depth requirements. Harvard adopted a Core Program in 1978 that emphasized broader approaches to knowledge. More recently a Freshman Seminar Program was established with faculty-lead seminars limited to 12 first-year students each.

Now the news is equally challenging. Despite this long tradition of institutional support for a common core curriculum and a broader education for all its undergraduates, the committee contends that there should be less focus on specialization at Harvard, and recommends that the choosing of one's major be delayed till the end of the first term of second year. They would also like to see more science and quantitative reasoning courses as part of a general education requirement, more emphasis on foreign languages and study abroad, more attempts to bring undergraduates into the research enterprise, increased inter-disciplinary offerings, and Freshman Seminars required for all first-year students. As the *Report* concludes: "it marks a step back from specialization as the hallmark of excellence in undergraduate education, and instead asks faculty to focus on the broad education of our undergraduates" (p.56). The stated goal is that "The world should view Harvard College as an

institution committed to outstanding instruction within a research environment" (p.55). Harvard should lead the way back to a renewed commitment to an undergraduate education in the liberal tradition.

Permit me a touch of cynicism here. While it is laudable to want to create a culture "in which everyone teaching at Harvard College is committed to pedagogical excellence, improvement, and innovation" (p.55), I suspect this is a losing battle in these days where we seek ever more quantifiable measures to recognize research output through journal and departmental rankings, citation indices, and making public the results of frenetic research grant competitions. To say, as the *Report* does, that "More attention should be paid to the dissemination of information about the important role that excellent teaching plays in the appointment and promotion of faculty" (p. 55) is to paper over the more fundamental problem of how to keep the rewarding of good teaching on a par with the need to be (and to be seen to be) an active researcher. The current ethos of the academic profession seems pointed in the direction of being successful at peer-reviewed research. After all, it is inevitably the top researchers who get the job offers that take account of "market conditions" and include higher salaries, reduced teaching loads, and a fast track to tenure and promotion. Although Waterloo has had a long and salutary tradition of making Distinguished Teaching Awards, bragging rights among our fellow research-intensive universities (the so-called G 10 in Canada) seldom refer to the number of outstanding teachers on the payroll. In its eagerly awaited annual ranking of Canadian universities, *Macleans* gives few bonus points for faculty teaching awards.

So what can Waterloo learn from the *Harvard Report*? We can take some comfort in the fact that we already do some of the things they are recommending. We have a Certificate in University Teaching Program for graduate students and we support graduate student teaching awards. The newly created Teaching Excellence Council composed of twenty award-winning teachers from across the faculties seems like a good way to help direct efforts to advance teaching and learning. We currently offer courses in business and professional ethics to students in all six Faculties, as well as a broad spectrum of interdisciplinary courses, and we run a number of well-established programs for study abroad.

There is also a small program of first-year seminars in the Faculty of Arts (10 per year as contrasted to

Harvard's 102 or University of Toronto's 90), covering topics such as "War In Literature and Film", "Biotechnology: Friend or Foe?", "Cliques, Crowds, and Individuals", and "Environmental Controversies." Attendance is limited to twenty first-year Arts students per course, with an emphasis on face-to-face contact with a senior faculty member, student class presentations, and a final essay. Over the past four years students and faculty have been enthusiastic about the experience of teaching and learning in such small groups, though it requires a lot of work by all concerned. I think such courses should be made available in all six of our Faculties, though the operating costs are indeed daunting.

Substantial moves toward providing a broader undergraduate education at the University of Waterloo often run afoul of our institutional structure. At Waterloo we have six distinct faculties (no Faculty of Arts and Sciences for us), each with its own admission and graduation requirements. This makes it difficult for students or even for faculty members to move across disciplinary boundaries, particularly for Arts students to gain access to courses in Math or Science. New programs like those in Cognitive Science are a step in the right direction toward bridging the gap between humanities, science, mathematics, and social science. Though sepa-

rate from the University, the Perimeter Institute is drawing worldwide interest from scholars in diverse fields to come to Waterloo.

We still seem more successful at supporting interdisciplinary research than we are at promoting general education and face-to-face teaching. Our extensive co-op operation inclines our students to want to specialize early and get a job quickly. Budget limitations cry out for larger classes and the hiring of more part-time instructors. Unlike Harvard, we do not have a substantial endowment to fund extensive curricular reforms. At Waterloo we can be justifiably proud of what we have accomplished, not the least because we are so new and innovative. It is good, however, to consider also what we are missing in seeing to it that *every* Waterloo undergraduate receives a solid grounding in quantitative reasoning, post-high school science, history, politics, moral reasoning, written and spoken English. The fact that a curriculum Committee at Harvard feels the same way about their esteemed institution is no cause for celebration. The University of Waterloo does well in supplying Canadian society with workers for the new knowledge economy, but we could do better in educating all of our students to be concerned, informed, and effective citizens of the world.

For information, the following has been reprinted from <http://www.fes.harvard.com/curriculum-review/report.html>

A Report on the Harvard College Curricular Review

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

In an age of specialization and professionalization, Harvard College reaffirms its commitment to a liberal education in the arts and sciences. We believe that such an education should enable students to develop multiple perspectives on themselves and on the world, and give them the knowledge, training, and skills to provide a foundation for their lives. We aim to construct a curriculum that expands the choices open to our undergraduates as it prepares them to be independent, knowledgeable, and creative individuals.

While the principles of liberal education have informed successive curricula at Harvard, different times call for different emphases. The following are our major recommendations. For a copy of the full report, which includes additional recommendations, please see

<http://www.fas.harvard.edu/curriculum-review/>.

- We recommend that we enhance significantly the opportunities for our students in international studies and in the sciences, two areas in which the world has changed most dramatically since our last general review of the undergraduate curriculum.

Every Harvard College student should be expected to complete an international experience, defined as study, research, or work abroad, and – no matter their level of proficiency upon entering Harvard – to continue study in a foreign language.

Every Harvard College student should be educated in the sciences in a manner that is as deep and as broadly shared, as has traditionally been the case in the humanities and the social sciences.

- We recommend that the current system of general education (the Core Program), which has emphasized approaches to knowledge of different academic disciplines, be succeeded by a new system of general education.

In a series of new, integrative "Harvard College Courses," Harvard's faculty should take on the responsibility of defining what we believe our students will need to know and – equally critically – how they may best learn, so that their education in fast-changing fields may continue well after graduation. Such courses should expand the

horizons of both faculty and students; introduce bodies of knowledge, concepts, and major texts; develop and reinforce critical skills in reasoning and in written and oral expression; and prepare distinctive course materials for use in, and possibly beyond, Harvard College.

Students should also have the opportunity to fulfill their general education requirements through a selection of courses within large areas of knowledge. One possibility for defining these areas is to build on our current divisional structure with requirements in the humanities, social sciences, life sciences, and physical sciences. The international and science components of the overall requirements within general education should be significantly strengthened.

- We recommend that Harvard's concentrations (majors), some of which may comprise half or more of an undergraduate's program, should entail fewer requirements, and that the timing of concentration choice, which now takes place in the freshman year, should be delayed to the middle of the sophomore year. A later timing of concentration choice combined with a more flexible general education requirement would provide students greater opportunities for intellectual exploration before committing to in-depth work in a concentration. The purpose and structure of each concentration should be examined by the Educational Policy Committee following this review of the curriculum.
- We recommend that the Dean of Harvard College create an office to coordinate all aspects of academic advising.
- To build a strong sense of community in Harvard College, we recommend that freshmen be assigned to their upperclass House upon arrival.
- We recommend that Harvard College undergraduates be provided with an expanded range of capstone experiences and encouraged to encounter the major intellectual controversies of the day through advanced work on topics that cross traditional disciplinary boundaries.
- To enhance student choice and opportunities, we endorse the proposal of the University Committee on Calendar Reform to synchronize the calendars of the several Faculties of the University, and to liberate January as a month for experimental programs, in and beyond the curriculum.
- We recognize that a liberal education is above all a shared endeavor of students and faculty. Therefore, we recommend that Harvard emphasize smaller classes across the curriculum and throughout students' undergraduate careers, beginning with the requirement of a small-group, faculty-led seminar in the first year, such as a freshman seminar or its equivalent, and continuing with junior seminars in all concentrations. The faculty should therefore grow significantly in size over the course of the next decade.

As the review enters the next phase, please address comments to the review's e-mail address:
curr-rev@fas.harvard.edu.

4-26-04

FORUM EDITORIAL BOARD

Edward Vrscaj, Applied Mathematics, Editor
Paul Fieguth, Systems Design Engineering
Paul Malone, Germanic & Slavic Studies
Jeffrey Shallit, Computer Science
Pat Moore, Faculty Association Office (production)
Roydon Fraser, Mechanical Engineering, ex officio

FAUW MEMBERSHIP

Although all regular faculty members have monthly deductions for the Faculty Association, membership in the Association is voluntary. We urge all faculty members to join FAUW and have a say in how it is run. If you have not yet completed a membership form and would like to join, the form is available at www.uwfacass.uwaterloo.ca or from the FAUW Office. If you are unsure whether you are a member, please call the FAUW Office at x3787.

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

STALIN, MAO TZE TUNG AND CHANG KAI-CHEK MUST BE TURNING OVER

Arnold Ages

*Distinguished Professor Emeritus
Department of French Language and Literature*

In the last year of my university teaching career I had the opportunity of reading with my second year French majors the wonderful novel *La Condition Humaine* (*Man's Fate*). Published in 1933 by André Malraux (who later became a minister in the first government of General de Gaulle and who was responsible for the cleaning of Paris's public buildings), *Man's Fate* deals with a communist insurrection in China in 1927 as the nationalist forces of the Kuo Min Tang, under Chang-Kai Chek, are approaching Shanghai.

Malraux devotes his book to chronicling the several members of the communist underground who are working to thwart the nationalists' thrust into the port city. The author is clearly more sympathetic to the communist cadres in their fight against Chang Kai-Chek. Malraux waxes eloquent not so much about the ideological purity of the Chinese communists but rather discourses at length on the dignity of humankind that the latter seek to encapsulate in their own courageous but misguided sacrifice for the cause. Malraux won France's most distinguished literary prize, the Goncourt, for this novel.

The novel is graphic in its depiction of the violence occasioned by the nationalists and their communist adversaries. Malraux focuses particularly on the fate of the communist cousinhood – which is defeated. Some of the most disquieting scenes in the novel focus on the imprisonment of the communist cadres and their sequestration, interrogations and executions. In a scene too difficult to imagine but not too difficult to have occurred, the nationalists murder their communist enemies by throwing them alive into the steam engine of train anchored at the stations where they are imprisoned.

It was undoubtedly the cruelty of Chang Kai-Chek's forces which in part galvanized Mao Tze Tung's communist cadres into a coherent fighting force which twenty years later overran China in 1947 and expelled the nationalists, who made their way to Taiwan and some other islands off the Chinese coast. From the day it took power the "Democratic People's Republic of China" became a fearful foe of the West. During the famous Kennedy-Nixon debates in 1960 a disproportionate amount of time was spent on the fate of two islands off the Chinese coast, Quemoy and Matzu, garrisons of the Chinese nationalists. The issue was whether the United States should intervene if the communists invaded the islands.

In reading *Man's Fate* with my students in 2003 it

was very difficult to communicate to them the terrible events of the 1930s and 1940s in China, because for them China is today the epitome of the entrepreneurial nation and the symbol of capitalist excess. A recent program on National Public Radio in early March indicated that China today is swimming in luxury goods, electronic gadgetry, fashion goods, computers, plasma technology and internet services. Automobiles, once a rarity, have become so common in the large cities that gridlock is now a feature of daily life. China has become, after the United States, the cynosure of capitalist aspirations.

Asked to explain the gap between communist ideology and the business ethic driving the country, a political commentator on the aforementioned program replied: "The answer is simple: the communists have become the capitalists." When Mao Tze Tung died, his victorious communist regime had reached the apogee of ideological Puritanism. A little more than two decades after his death, he must indeed be turning over in his grave at the repudiation of his life work. Chang Kai-Chek, however, must be doing somersaults in his sepulcher now that he realizes that his loss in 1947 was only in one battle. The real victory, a vigorous and expanding capitalist China in 2004, was his.

Speaking of posthumous experiences, Stalin in his grave and Lenin in his mausoleum must be hyperventilating at what is going on in the Soviet Union. Kerensky, the Menshevik liberal, on the other hand, must be breathing far more easily in the other world. Since the collapse of the communist regime a scant decade ago, Russia has become a wide open capitalist society with the benefits and evils attached to that term. Free elections, which Stalin and his successors regarded as a protracted moral plague, occur more or less regularly now in Russia. Imports from the West, once banned as capitalist contamination, are flooding Moscow and the other large cities. In the capital, every major international fashion, electronic, automobile and food outlet is represented and high-end luxury goods abound.

Until the 1990s Russians were forbidden, except under specific circumstances, to journey abroad lest they be infected with the virus of freedom. In the last decade and a half, so it would seem to tourists in Europe and North America, half of the Russian population is on the move outside the borders of Russia, imbibing the pleasures of capitalism not yet available at home. Shop in any mall in the greater Toronto area and Russian seems to be the favored second language. In Prague there are so

many Russian tourists that vendors have to know that language to succeed.

During the Brezhnev years, even at the height of communist orthodoxy, the following joke was circulating in the Kremlin: Brezhnev brought his mother to visit him in Moscow and arranged for her to come to his dacha outside of Moscow. Mrs. Brezhnev was overwhelmed by her son's magnificent summer home with all the luxurious accoutrements it possessed. After conducting a tour of his dacha, Brezhnev asked his mother what she thought of his life. "Shaa [be quiet] Leonid," she replied, "the communists might come back."

This suggests that already at the height of its power the Russian communists were already succumbing to the allure of the capitalist ethos. By 2004 that allure has completely overtaken the former commissars and

apparatchiki. The regime change which accompanied the fall of communism changed far more than government structures. It altered completely the ideological shackles which had crippled the intelligence and resourcefulness of the Russian people. Who would have believed at the height of the Stalinist anti-Semitic doctors plot that fifty years later President Putin would appoint a Jew as prime minister?

While China and Russia are enjoying the benefits of capitalism, they are not yet cultivating the full fruits of democracy that are anchored in the traditions of the English-speaking nations. That will come, as it did for the latter, through the winnowing and harrowing experience that comes from trial and error in the political sphere.

FAUW FEES REDUCED

At the Annual General Meeting in April, members approved a motion to reduce the mil rate used to determine Faculty Association fees from 4.75 to 3.00 effective July 1, 2004 for a period of one year. Because of the delay in the calculation of faculty salaries this year, the reduced rate first appeared on the August pay. Arrears adjustments for UW faculty will be made in September; most of the adjustments for St. Jerome's faculty appeared on the August pay.



The Board of Directors were able to put forward the motion to reduce the mil rate because of the healthy state of the Association reserves. The FAUW mil rate, which was third lowest in Canada at 4.75, is now the lowest rate used by a Canadian faculty association.

FAUW BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2004-2005

Roydon Fraser
Mechanical Engineering, x4764
President

Melanie Campbell
Physics, x6273
Vice President

Catherine Schryer
English Language & Literature, x2118
Past President
Chair, Status of Women & Equity Committee

Metin Renksizbulut
Mechanical Engineering, x3977
Secretary/Treasurer
Chair, Compensation Committee

Sandra Burt
Political Science, x3603
Chair, Pension & Benefits Committee

David DeVidi
Philosophy, x5701

Danine Farquharson
English, St. Jerome's University, 884-8111, x223
President, St. Jerome's Faculty Association

Troy Glover
Recreation & Leisure Studies, x3097

Paul Malone
Germanic & Slavic Studies, x3202

Frank Reynolds
Statistics & Actuarial Science, x5540
Chair, Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee
Chair, Mandatory Retirement Committee
Chair, Political Relations Committee

Anne Fullerton, Library, x6917
Official Visitor to the Board

Reprinted with the author's permission from the May 2004 Faculty Focus, the newsletter of the University of British Columbia Faculty Association

THE UNIVERSITY TRANSFORMED – FOR BETTER AND WORSE

*by Rick Coe
President, CUFA/BC*

During the last few years of the 20th century, I remember hearing UBC Professor Bill Bruneau assert that the golden age of Canadian universities had ended. Universities have certainly undergone major transformations in the 30+ years I have been a professor – whether for better or for worse I leave you, dear reader, to judge.

I suspect many younger faculty would have difficulty imagining universities in the golden, or at least olden days. I'm not saying the olden days were necessarily better, but they were surely different. What follows is written from my perspective, in broad strokes, and is inevitably based on generalizations.

Imagine a 40-Hour Workweek

Most faculty members, even those still working toward tenure, were once able to fulfill their responsibilities in something resembling a normal workweek! How could this be? Well, for openers, a smaller quantity of research was required for tenure, promotion, and merit (and the research was judged on the merit of the knowledge produced, far more than on the number of grant dollars brought into the university).

The current workload, especially of younger faculty, is not an inevitable fact of life – it was created by increasing the quantity and intensity of our work, by what blue collar workers call a speedup.

In many ways, I think university teaching is better than it used to be. For most of us, however, this also means teaching is a lot more work these days. Custom courseware is in many cases far superior to a textbook, but compiling it is significant work. Whatever its virtues, PowerPoint allows faculty to do work formerly done by graphics technicians. Unless your marking is done by computers, TAs, or tutor markers, today's larger classes mean more marking.

For all its virtues, web-based instructional support means doing almost all the work of traditional instruction plus preparing and mounting the virtual materials. Personally, I think the technical aspects of computer-based instruction should be done as it is in other institutions (including businesses) – by technicians, who would surely mount my materials on a web site in a small fraction of the time it would take me. Most of these technological advances can improve instruction and learning, I just can't remember which duties I was told I could "downsize" to create the time for all this extra work.

The amount of paperwork (actual and virtual) we do has increased radically over three decades. One of the virtues of paper was that we never had to learn new

computer programs in order to pass data on to the administration. In the days before word processors and budget cuts, universities actually hired typists and clerks to prepare and duplicate manuscripts, grants, etc. I even remember, in the 1980s, handing in copies of my updated CV, publications, and student evaluations to my department tenure committee – without having to spend a day writing a report summarizing and spinning that material, let alone having to file it electronically (often using software still full of bugs).

I certainly wouldn't want to return to typewriters, I just want to point out that the work previously done by those long-gone typists is now done by faculty (unless, of course, your research grant pays for your own support staff). Much of the administrative work previously done by clerks has also been passed to faculty members.

Extra Tasks for Faculty Are 'Free'

A senior administrator at one of BC's universities once told it straight (in a private conversation). If he assigns more work to support staff, he said, he has to find dollars to pay for the extra hours, he said, but if he gives the work to faculty members, it's free! University administrations tend over time to download work onto faculty members, for the extra hours we then work doesn't cost a cent.

I believe ethics committees are important and necessary; but they make more paperwork for us. At some universities, moreover, they sometimes impede research, whether by creating bureaucratic delays or by impeding researchers whose methods do not fit the medical/scientific model. Once again, I do not remember anyone telling me that I could do less of something else in order to make time for all these added tasks.

Service also takes a lot more of my time than it did three, or even two, decades ago. I suspect bureaucratization, though it could also be democratization (if your department or school functions more democratically than it used to). I also see far more directives coming down from various levels of administration and more micro-management by everyone from associate deans up.

The Corporate University

Many extra hours and much of the increased intensity of work is, I think, a consequence of the market-oriented corporate university. The 21st century university has more managers (a.k.a., administrators), from associate deans up. Managers generally want more control, so they often find a corporate-type chain of command more convenient than

collegial governance and are often strongly inclined to micro-management – all of which means more paperwork, more committee time, and less faculty control of our own work.

I don't know how widespread this is, but I have been told that at least one Dean's office, which always had the power to veto hiring decisions, is now represented directly on appointments committees, where it can prevent candidates it considers unsuitable from being proposed in the first place. And the universities' criteria increasingly focus on potential grant dollars, especially of the sort where the university gets a cut.

This last is a personal peeve of mine. I cannot grasp the logic that says our research will be evaluated not on the quality and quantity of new knowledge I produce, but on the number of grant dollars I use to create that knowledge. I believe that in some parts of the university, especially in the sciences and applied sciences, grant dollars do correlate with accomplishment to some level of significance, and dollars are assuredly easier to count. But shouldn't we be evaluating research outcomes directly rather than by counting grant dollars, which are merely a means to our research ends?

Product Development

I remember being shocked when the language of business became the language of management in universities, producing misleading metaphors (in the extreme, students became our customers) and bringing with them inappropriate values. Nowadays, I worry about the sheer quantity of product development (a.k.a. "applied research" provincially and "innovation" federally) that has moved from corporate research divisions into our public universities.

I am not opposed to applied research, let alone innovation – much of my own work is in an applied field. I am not opposed to applied research that leads to useful products. But it scares the bejesus out of me when I hear certain politicians say that a significant part of BC's universities' base funding should come from product development, contract teaching, and donations.

Basic undergraduate instruction should be funded by a combination of government grants and tuition fees. Funds from donations, product development, etc. should be reserved for research infrastructure, graduate students, capital costs, scholarships, perhaps even special undergraduate programs, and the like.

We can already see terrible side effects created by universities' dependence on private funding. The most extreme example is research funded by pharmaceutical mega-corporations under contracts that allow the corporations to suppress any research findings that don't serve their business interests. Were there suppressed research findings showing the harm anti-depressants could do to children? (I'm told there were.)

However illegal under contract law, can it ever be wrong for a medical researcher to inform participants of preliminary results indicating that the experimental medication is a threat to their health? Can it ever be right to make major changes to curriculum because a corporation

has made a large donation to a program? I myself favour federal regulation because I'm not sure individual universities have what it takes to resist unethical funding.

However much politicians may violate it in practice, BC's University Act guarantees the autonomy of our public universities. Universities also need autonomy from profit-motivated corporations, which they cannot have if they are dependent on corporate money. As UBC Professor J. Bakan reminds us, corporations are required by law to act in the self-interests of their shareholders, not in the public interest unless the public interest overlaps with shareholders' interests.

I see virtues in many of the ways universities are changing. But I fear that 21st century universities may find it increasingly difficult to act in the public interest (not to be conflated with popular or political desires) or the interests of our students-let alone in ways that are fair to faculty.

Faculty members' work in a university should not require excessive stress or excessive hours (a.k.a., unpaid overtime). Academic quality control depends on real collegial governance and significant faculty control of their own work. I fear where corporate chain-of-command governance, micro-management, an increasing lack of autonomy from both political and commercial pressures, excessive workloads, a burgeoning of student-faculty ratios, and the like might take us.

While taking advantage of the many potentials for improvement in this new century, we need to defend what has long made our universities excellent. I am very grateful for the good life I have had as a university faculty member; but I am not sure I would recommend an academic career to my children.

Richard Coe is president of the Confederation of University Faculty Associations of British Columbia and professor of English at Simon Fraser University. The Forum thanks Prof. Coe for permission to reprint his article.

FAUW Office

Pat Moore, Administrator

Room 4002, Mathematics & Computer Building

Phone: 888-4567, ext. 3787

Fax: 888-4307

E-mail: facassoc@uwaterloo.ca

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

BOOK REVIEW

by Paul Malone

Department of Germanic & Slavic Studies

Administrative Mobbing at the University of Toronto: The Trial, Degradation and Dismissal of a Professor during the Presidency of J. Robert S. Pritchard

by Kenneth Westhues

Edwin Mellen Press, 2004

Kenneth Westhues' substantial volume about the case of Herbert Richardson, former University of Toronto professor and founder (and still president) of the Edwin Mellen Press, is well-written, well-documented in its dealing with the case at hand and in the main makes for a lively and engaging read, despite its essentially rather depressing subject matter. It also turns out to be less daunting than it first appears, given that almost a quarter of the book is in fact devoted to nine "essays in response," which are varied in their relevance and interest and will not be reviewed further here.

Westhues, Professor of Sociology at UW, is acknowledged as an expert in the sociological study of workplace mobbing, a phenomenon that occurs when a worker is felt by at least some of his or her colleagues and/or bosses to be so thoroughly out of place, for any number of possible reasons, that integration or reconciliation is impossible and the expunging of the offending worker comes to be seen as the only possible recourse. It can occur in any workplace and has analogues in other milieus in which human beings interact as well, which can take either nonviolent or extremely violent form: Westhues mentions, for example, both the Amish practice of *Bann und Meidung* or "shunning," and the practice of lynching in the American South (39). It is essentially what happened with unusual forthrightness to a now long-dead uncle of mine, who worked for Petro-Canada back when it was Pacific Petroleum: he was called into his manager's office once he reached a certain age and informed that he had the choice between early retirement and having his job turned into "a living hell." The original message sent to Herbert Richardson by his superior was only slightly more subtle (171-3).

The core of the problem – as Westhues clearly sets it out – was that Richardson, a brilliant Harvard-educated Presbyterian theologian and ordained minister, took a position at the Institute of Christian Thought in the University of St. Michael's College, Toronto in the 1960s. St. Michael's, affiliated as a church college with the University of Toronto, was "arguably at the time the most prestigious Catholic university in North America" (69) and after the Second Vatican Council of 1962-65 a new spirit of ecumenical outreach had permeated the Catholic Church to such an extent that even so clearly Protestant a thinker as Richardson could be welcomed onto the faculty. Over the succeeding decades, however, two major conflicts developed, grew and festered: on the one hand, Richardson's passionate but erratic and undisciplined

teaching style became increasingly incomprehensible to those in charge of the ever more bureaucratized management of the U of T; while, on the other, the backlash within the Catholic Church to Vatican II, and the move back to a more conservative and less ecumenical vision of the Church, made Richardson's rather anomalous position downright tenuous. He had been hired as a square peg and the hole was becoming not only rounder, but deeper.

It certainly did not help that he had openly championed the rights of the Unification Church, founded by the Reverend Sun Myung Moon, to recognition as a genuine religious denomination rather than as a cult – without, to be sure, endorsing Moon's claim to messiahship or joining up himself – nor that he had taken positions opposed to those of the Catholic Church on such contentious issues as abortion and surrogate motherhood. Finally, in the interests of maintaining the doctrinal purity of St. Michael's, Richardson was openly encouraged, then pressured, to quit. Not far from retirement after two decades of service, Richardson was willing to negotiate for reduced responsibilities and pay, but unprepared simply to walk away. The ensuing struggle lasted a total of seven years, from 1987 to 1994, and ended in Richardson's being brought before an internal tribunal convened under York University Law professor John Evans, disgraced and dismissed after being found guilty of several forms of gross misconduct – charges that Westhues demonstrates quite convincingly, based on the documentary evidence, to be at best flimsy. In the context of a secret tribunal, they would have been unnecessary; in an open court of law, they might very well have been dismissed (and indeed two of the four major charges were abandoned as untenable early on); but in the only semi-public arena of an administrative tribunal within the workplace, where information could more easily be controlled by citing privacy rules, the remaining charges were more than sufficient to justify Richardson's termination, irreparably damage his academic reputation and ensure his humiliation in the digested version of the events presented in the public press.

The reader may be wondering – as I certainly did – about the appearance of a university president's name in the subtitle. Despite his prominence there, Pritchard is in most conventional ways quite peripheral to the book's "plot," but he bears the ultimate responsibility since, as Westhues points out, he is the one who signed the actual letter of dismissal (53). At the very least, it's certainly the calculated opposite to titling the book, "The Dismissal of Professor Herbert Richardson."

This book is at its best in describing the stages of Richardson's career against the backdrop of changes in the atmosphere and administrative culture of St. Michael's and the University of Toronto. Westhues is able to sympathize with much of Richardson's background and output, even

when he clearly does not agree with it. “Compare and contrast” pages interspersed throughout the chapters function as sidebars, presenting examples of situations and contexts at other institutions where events occurred similar to those that befell Richardson – sometimes ending more happily, sometimes far more tragically. This is an interesting and useful strategy, though it is difficult not to feel that the necessarily brief format of these sidebars often renders the accounts more tantalizing than informative. Anyone interested in the ongoing process of managerialization in our universities will find this an absorbing read, however, since the wealth of other examples in the book make quite clear that this is not a problem specific to Toronto. The writing style is also lively and personal, even folksy.

Where I find the book least satisfying, however, is in its picture of the broader historical and cultural context of the Richardson case. Here, I simply am not convinced by the description on offer, particularly in the chapter entitled “Cultural Context” (73-91), of the ongoing secularization of society in North America. Westhues, sometimes following Richardson’s own arguments, appears to bracket out American-style “civil religion” (98-102), fundamentalism (109, 135) and non-Christian spiritual traditions (109) from consideration, and concentrates on the decline in “mainstream” denominations such as Catholicism and Presbyterianism; gains in the popularity of the former movements are mentioned but, whether these gains are long-term or short-term, they are not seen as in any way compensating for the drop-off among the mainstream Christian churches.

Likewise, I am not convinced by the underlying equation, which runs throughout the book, of postmodernism, secularism and relativism (I have to confess that I do not even see postmodernism as a coherent movement, but rather as an increasingly unhelpful label for a collection of sometimes complementary and sometimes contradictory tendencies). In Westhues’ book, despite the clear focus throughout on the essentially religious differences growing between Richardson and his nearest employers, recourse is constantly made to amorphous “elites” who are ultimately responsible for the entire problem. These are sometimes labelled “a loose network of elites with a common relativist consciousness,” sometimes “postmodern elites” (80f., 109), and sometimes “secular elites” (e.g., 218), but their alleged rise to power in the course of the 1960s and 1970s is held to be “the relativist cultural revolution that would later bring [Richardson], and many others, down” (106). No member of these elites is ever identified as such as far as I can tell, though Richardson, like Orwell, is said to have prophesied their coming (106; 80-1). In opposition to these trends, Westhues appeals to “Enlightenment ideals” so frequently (e.g., 90; 101) that the reader might be forgiven for coming to think that the Enlightenment *philosophes* were an entirely Christian debating club, all members in good standing of the Knights of Columbus. However, to my way of thinking, the secularization that Westhues decries, to the extent that it has occurred, is as much a product of the Enlightenment as

the academic freedom and logical thought that he praises (Peter Gay didn’t call the first book of his two-volume study of the Enlightenment *The Rise of Modern Paganism* for nothing).

Partly as a result of this difference in opinion, when Westhues describes one of the postmodern cultural revolution’s knock-on effects as being the swelling of the university professoriate with ivory-tower thinkers forced to turn out useless books and articles so that “‘Publish or perish’ became the watchword of anyone aspiring to an academic career [in the 1960s and 1970s]” (136), I must confess puzzlement, since the pressure to publish and the infamous phrase describing it seem to date back much further. In an article in *The Scientist*, the earliest datable reference seems to have appeared in a 1942 sociological study, *The Academic Man*, by Logan Wilson: “Situational imperatives dictate a ‘publish or perish’ credo within the [academic] ranks.” Even here, the phrase “publish or perish” appears in quotation marks, “rais[ing] a question whether he was citing or coining the phrase,” whose origin may in fact be pre-World War II.¹ The pressures of the ’60s and ’70s may have exacerbated this situation greatly, but they surely did not create it. And when Westhues writes:

Like the college and university administrators, the [Evans] tribunal ignored altogether what appears to me to have been the original, foundational reason: intolerance of Richardson’s Calvinist scholarship by the parochial Catholic elite at St. Michael’s and by the church hierarchy. This reason had to be kept off the table, since secular elites in the press and education would not accept it. Public and academic media would have condemned the college for violating a professor’s academic and religious freedom. Its legitimacy as an institution of higher learning would have suffered, even among lay Catholics. (218)

...then I am really confused. If even lay Catholics, who during the Church’s period of retrenchment might be expected to take St. Michael’s side or at least question the degree of their support, would be put off by the real reason for Richardson’s sacking, how would it play to a Protestant audience, lay or otherwise, who also might believe in the primacy of academic freedom – men like Richardson himself? Aren’t there Jews, Muslims and Hindus who feel that academic and religious freedom are of vital importance? Of course there are; Westhues mentions a few himself. (Moreover, it seems to me that the press, far from not accepting such a story, would have a field day for its own reasons with a headline such as “Catholic College Turfs Prot Prof.”)

Finally, it does not seem to me that any of the named agents in Richardson’s downfall – and there are a good many of them – qualify as “postmodernist” or “relativist” in their thinking, though several of them are certainly secular in terms of their public functions and the thoughts they express in the documents cited (they may be avid churchgoers in their private lives). Indeed, some of these agents are priests of the Roman Catholic Church, which comes in for generally harsh criticism in the book despite being neither postmodern nor relativist. All of them,

however, seem to operate within pretty clearly marked moral standards of right and wrong, even when Westhues (or I) may not agree with those standards or approve of these agents' sometimes selective consistency in adhering to them (and Westhues is expert in parsing some of these inconsistencies).

In conclusion, I would like to respond to the engaging personal style of Westhues' book by recounting a personal reaction of my own. As Westhues describes it, the turning point in an episode of workplace mobbing is often a single "incident," which allows the mob to cohere around an apparently obvious and egregious wrongdoing. In Richardson's case, this incident took place on 30 October, 1991, three years into the mobbing crisis – almost at the halfway point – when he visibly and vocally lost his temper in a class, shouting at his own teaching assistant and telling him that he was fired. The class went on, but several students afterward complained to the administration, which Westhues describes as "fair enough" (215). In a less negative environment, had such an incident occurred, it might have been a fairly simple matter to remedy, involving a meeting with the students and an apology on Richardson's part; in a less negative environment, of course, the incident might never have occurred at all, since the ongoing accumulation of stress under which Richardson was attempting to work very likely played a part in his losing control. In any case, there was no way that the administration was going to allow this event to be repaired: they simply did not inform Richardson that any complaints had been lodged until a full semester and a half later, when they were preparing to charge him with misconduct. It was only almost a full year later, in September 1992, that Richardson was given the opportunity to respond to the complaints, which he did in a letter of self-abnegation to the vice-dean which, at least in the section quoted by Westhues (226), is signal in its refusal to blame the event on the stress he was under (not that such a claim would have played well to his audience, but I doubt many people could have withstood the temptation nonetheless).

Pivotal as this event was, however, in the scale against evidence of Richardson's generally excellent teaching, the charge of misconduct on this basis was ultimately struck. As Westhues describes it, "the incident was not the sort of thing you fire a professor for, certainly not one who wins the respect of hundreds of students a year" (215). Certainly, the administration's failure to give Richardson an earlier chance to address the issue smacks of bad faith; Westhues, however, insists on blaming the central role of this event on "the postmodern panic over men's violence against women, the alleged dominance and humiliation of powerless males by powerful males." As Westhues describes it:

It was female students who complained about the blow-up on the night of October 30. Their complaints and self-reported fears were of "violent, abusive behaviour." One said that because the arrangement of desks blocked the classroom exits, she was afraid that "if the professor had become physically violent, I would not have been able to remove myself from the room." (219)

This may certainly have been an overreaction; from a distance of time and space, it hardly seems that a fifty-nine-year-old Presbyterian minister, however agitated, would be likely to physically assault one (or more) students. However, I would argue that anyone, regardless of gender, who finds themselves in a confined space with an extremely angry individual, regardless of age, might not be imprudent to check the escape routes. I don't see postmodernism at work here, only common sense. Westhues – rightly, I think, condemns the manner in which the administration used the students' complaints and their later testimony against him; however, I confess to being disturbed by his apparent refusal to lend any credence whatsoever to their "self-reported" expressions of fear and his desire to see these expressions as no more than evidence of a "postmodern obsession" (220). This is particularly true given the testimony of an older male student in the same class, a Salvation Army man, who said of the event, "I imagine that some people would be intimidated by that, fearful of it. I did not talk much with people afterwards. I was in a hurry to go home" (Evans tribunal report, quoted on p. 223). This is in many ways an excellent and useful book – but after page 223, I confess that I had trouble getting back into it.

In his final chapter, Westhues offers possible solutions for the problem of mobbing, which is generally counterproductive, wasteful and costly for all concerned – the Richardson case certainly cost the University of Toronto far more than it would have spent had it come to terms with Richardson, though obviously the costs to the individual were proportionately much greater. Westhues suggests that education about how mobbing works will be more effective in preventing its occurrence than simply passing legislation against it, though he admits to diverging from other experts in the field in this respect and names some experts who do promote legislation (304). His most concrete suggestion, however, at the very end of the book, is that universities (and other workplaces) should not engage in quasi-judicial tribunals at all: such problems should either be solved by administrative processes open to revision, or, when the charges are serious enough, taken outside the university milieu and tried in an open court subject to due process (313-4). Whatever quibbles I may have about Westhues' description of the wider context, Richardson appears from the evidence presented here to have been railroaded and Westhues' proposals for minimizing the possibility of such occurrences in the future seem to me practical enough to appeal even to the secular technocrats among us.

¹Eugene Garfield, "What is the Primordial Reference for the Phrase 'Publish or Perish'?" *The Scientist* 10[12]:11, 10 June 1996.

<www.the-scientist.com/yr1996/june/comm-969619.html>

NEW FACULTY WELCOMING EVENTS

New faculty members were invited to a day of welcoming events on September 9, 2004, organized by the Teaching Resources and Continuing Education Office (TRACE) and the Centre for Teaching Through Technology (LT3), with support from the Associate Vice-President, Learning Resources & Innovation, the Associate Provost, Academic & Student Affairs, and the Vice-President, Academic & Provost. The activities culminated in the evening with a barbecue, co-sponsored by the Faculty Association and the University, at President David Johnston's farm. Thanks to Darlene Radicioni (TRACE Office) for the photos.

Scenes from the barbecue

David Johnston (UW President), Verna Keller (Trace Office) and Ehsan Toyserkani (Mechanical Engineering), winner of one of the door prizes.



Amit Chakma (Vice-President, Academic & Provost) with new faculty members and their partners.

Board members Catherine Schryer and David DeVidi, with David's wife Jane Forgay (Library), Bruce Mitchell (Associate Provost, Academic & Student Affairs), and a new faculty member.



FORUM QUIZ

The following photograph was taken near UW's Math and Computer Building on Monday, August 26, 2004, two days after the all-day orientation program known as Student Life 101 took place. (SL 101 was created "to relieve student and parent anxiety and reassure them that UW is a warm and friendly place", as quoted from <http://newsrelease.uwaterloo.ca/news.php?id=4125>.)



What is the explanation for the above scene?

- 1) The storm of the previous day actually nurtured some funnel clouds.
- 2) Several profs were informed that they did not meet their Faculty publication quotas.
- 3) A focussed outburst of energy by a group of UW's "Millennial Students" (for definition, see <http://www.millenialsrising.com/>).
- 4) During a recent lecture at UW, Uri Geller convinced the audience that he has graduated from spoons.

PART B (Bonus Marks)

If you think that 3) is the correct answer, then which of the following characteristics of "millennial students" most accurately accounts for the above scene:

- a) Very busy in extracurricular activities.
- b) Eager for community activities.
- c) Talented in technology.
- d) Demanding of a secure, regulated environment.
- e) Respectful of norms and institutions.
- f) Conventionally minded, verging on conformist thinking.

These attributes, along with others, appeared on a UW information sheet entitled, "Information About Millenials: Who (sic) you'll be addressing on Campus Day." They were taken from the on-line publication, *Millenials Go To College*, by Neil Howe and William Strauss, (<http://www.lifecourse.com/college/>).

The Forum thanks Zoran Miskovic, Applied Mathematics, for submitting this quiz and Simon K. Alexander, Ph.D. student in Applied Mathematics, for the photo.