University of Waterloo

FAUW FORUM

Faculty Association Newsletter

Summer 2006 / Volume 132

ISSN 0840-7320

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Roydon Fraser, Mechanical Engineering

Welcome to the new era of no mandatory retirement. Also, welcome to the new era when Ontario universities are subject to freedom of information legislation.

Elimination of Mandatory Retirement. On June 6 the UW Board of Governors approved changes to the Memorandum of Agreement and to the pension and benefits plans that enabled the University to eliminate mandatory retirement at age 65 for all faculty and staff. This change became effective June 7, 2006.

The FAUW has been working towards this goal for some time now and we are glad that a collegial agreement could be reached before the provincial legislation required action in December 2006.

The elimination of mandatory retirement does not affect faculty who previously signed contracts to retire, including those who opted to exchange one week of vacation for a one-time 2% salary increase within the last three years of employment: these contracts are binding. Also, those few remaining faculty who were grandparented and eligible to retire at age 68 are still eligible to do so under the same rules as existed before the elimination of mandatory retirement.

There were three key pieces included in the negotiations to eliminate mandatory retirement:

- The first was how to deal with the 2% salary/vacation conversion option. This issue was dealt with during salary negotiations. The option is still available provided one agrees to retire by the end of the academic term in which they turn 66. This is a slight improvement as it extends the eligibility period beyond the age 65 retirement limit that previously existed.
- The second key piece of the negotiations was to make the necessary changes to the Memorandum of Agreement (M of A). Much thanks should go to Metin Renksizbulut and Bruce Mitchell for their dedicated efforts here. There is only one M of A clause that was agreed to that the FAUW would prefer not be present, and that is Article 11.3.2 that refers to Normal Retirement Date (as defined in the University of Waterloo Pension Plan) as age 65. The Normal Retirement Date technically has no impact on when a faculty member can choose to retire. In fact, the clause immediately following 11.3.2 states that a faculty member can retire when he or she chooses. There is, of course, the psychological effect of having the Memorandum of Agreement contain a suggested normal retirement date. Hopefully, however, faculty members can see past the suggestion and choose a retirement date as they see fit.
- The third key piece was that the Pension and Benefits (P&B) Committee agree on the pension and benefit rules in an era of no mandatory retirement. The P&B Committee is a committee of the UW Board of Governors with representation from the administration, faculty, staff, CUPE Local 793 (representing Plant Operations and Food Services staff), and retirees. The Committee is responsible for the health of

(Continued on page 2)

Inside this issue:

(Continued from page 1)

our pension plan. On the positive side, the Committee managed to decide on reasonable new pension rules. On the negative side, I personally believe the P&B Committee was too focused on reducing pension risk to the financial detriment of faculty who decide to work beyond age 65. There is no value in returning to this debate at this time and I must admit that, overall, I am happy that we have managed to get all the pieces to fall into place to eliminate mandatory retirement at UW six months before the provincial legislation becomes effective.

A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement highlighting the negotiated changes is posted on the Faculty Association Web site at www.fauw.uwaterloo.ca.

Freedom of Information and Privacy Protection Act (FIPPA). Universities in Ontario became subject to freedom of information requests as of June 10, 2006. The implications for the UW and faculty are still uncertain. For example, there is the possibility that all your e-mails may be subject to information requests. Until more clarity is available, perhaps as a result of future requests, denial of requests, and litigation, the best advice is to treat e-mails as written documents that others may someday read. The Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) will be keeping the FAUW informed of any fallout from this legislation that impacts faculty. Stay tuned. The University has posted information about FIPPA at http://www.uwaterloo.ca/privacy/faq.html.

***Forum* Editor.** If you have an interest in helping to keep your fellow colleagues informed and in providing a forum for discussion, then *Forum* editor may be just the position you are looking for. The *Forum* is looking for a new editor to replace Vera Golini who has served as interim editor during the past several months. I want to thank Vera for stepping in and using her skills and past experience as *Forum* editor to produce our recent newsletters.

As an incentive to take on this role, the FAUW will offer to the new editor one of the teaching releases provided to the Association by the University. If you have an interest in serving as editor or just want to find out more before making a decision, please contact the FAUW office, Vera or myself.

Sessional Rates. One of the main opportunities for the Faculty Association to effect change is provided at the biweekly meetings of the Faculty Relations Committee which consists of five members of the FAUW Board of Directors and five senior administrators. Recently, the FAUW brought to the Administration's attention the fact that the compensation rate for sessionals was lower than that for teaching assistants. This meant that in many departments sessionals teaching a class were being paid less than the teaching assistants for that class. The situation was seen as inappropriate and was remedied by raising the sessional rate.

Closing. The fall will see the FAUW pursuing improvements to the merit review system and to the treatment of faculty members who are experiencing the onset of a disability or who have an ongoing or progressively worsening disability. The FAUW will also be pursuing workload issues (see article on page 5). We will be reviewing suggestions for FAUW priorities made by those who responded to the 5-minute survey circulated with the November 2005 *Forum*. If you did not respond to the survey or if you have other ideas for where the FAUW should be focusing its efforts, please let us know.

I would like to wish everyone an enjoyable summer. Be sure to take time to relax.

Interim Forum Editor
Vera Golini, St. Jerome's University
(vgolini@uwaterloo.ca)
Production
Pat Moore, Faculty Association Office (facassoc@uwaterloo.ca)
Cathy Paisley, Faculty Association Office (cpaisley@uwaterloo.ca)

VISION FOR CHILD CARE ON CAMPUS: THE WATERLOO WAY?

by Troy D. Glover
Recreation and Leisure Studies

Balancing research, teaching, and service is one thing; balancing research, teaching, and service with childcare is quite another. Yet such is the reality of faculty with young children – at least for those who (can) choose to remain in the academy under such circumstances. With this in mind, I suspect my story resonates with others in a similar position.

My daughter was born only seven months after I started a tenure-track position at the University of Waterloo. Not surprisingly, the daily routine my spouse and I had come to thrive on as faculty members with no children was altered dramatically with our daughter's arrival. Gone was the predictability of our working day. Gone were early morning workouts, followed by early arrivals at the office and early evening departures. Gone was the freedom of using our nights and weekends to catch up on or get ahead of deadlines that warranted our attention. Our lifestyle had changed, and a major readjustment had been thrust upon us.

Don't get me wrong; I wouldn't trade my life now for the one I had before. In fact, I've never been happier – my daughter is the light of my life. In retrospect, though, it strikes me there could have been ways to make the impacts of the adjustment to parenthood easier. For those committed to balancing family and career, family-friendly work environments are crucial to making the transition more manageable. The Administration at the University of Waterloo, in my view, would be wise to consider how it might improve its current family-related policies if it truly wishes to recruit a new complement of faculty and graduate students as it has stated in its Sixth Decade plan. One key feature of a family-friendly workplace is the availability of higher quality childcare.

My wife and I are both committed to being good parents; we're both committed to being good scholars. Even so, we weren't prepared for the challenge we were about to face

with respect to our work-life balance. Formal child care was unavailable to us until my daughter was 14-months old. FOURTEEN MONTHS OLD! At any rate, after a four-month maternity leave, my wife returned to work, which meant we balanced child care responsibilities between the two of us for the next ten months. It wasn't easy, especially since we were working full-time, but we muddled through. I'll spare you the details of how we managed to care for our daughter *and* do our jobs well, but I do want to emphasize an important source of our problem: insufficient childcare spaces on campus.

My wife and I are not alone in the predicament I've described. Across the Region of Waterloo, the supply of childcare spaces fails to meet the demand. Waiting lists are long, and there appears to be no improvement in sight. Stephen Harper's $100/month tax relief plan for child care does nothing for working parents, like my wife and me, who need spaces, not extra pocket change. The centres on campus – Hildegard Marsden (HMN), Klemmer Farmhouse, Paintin' Place, and the Early Childhood Education Centre (ECEC) – are excellent childcare providers with experienced, committed staff, but they don't have enough spaces, and there are only ten infant (18 months or younger) spaces on campus. Having full enrolments is not just a sign of commercial success; it is also a symptom of a problem left unaddressed. In short, under current constraints, parents are left scrambling for make-shift solutions to a problem that warrants institutional attention.

This problem is about to get worse as the UW Administration strives to achieve its targets for graduate student and new faculty recruitment. More parents with young children on campus means more demand for child care spaces. What will new faculty think when they arrive on campus, only to discover they are on their own in terms of finding solutions to their childcare needs? There has been no

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

discernable response from the Administration to this issue. Meanwhile, peer institutions, like the University of Toronto which was recognized as one of the top family-friendly employers in Canada, have recently built brand new childcare facilities to address the growing need for childcare on their campuses. Queen's University offers a $2,000/year subsidy to its full-time faculty and a $1,000 subsidy to its adjunct faculty with childcare needs. Surely, the folks in charge of UW must understand that if they want to attract good faculty, they're going to have to offer competitive services and amenities. A vibrant and well-functioning childcare system could be another jewel for the Administration to cite in its recruitment efforts, including those targeted at female recruits who are woefully underrepresented on this campus.

Given the pressing need to address the shortage of childcare, I joined a group of stakeholders who met on May 26, 2006 to discuss the future of childcare at UW. Participants included representatives of the FAUW, UWSA, FEDS, GSA, Engineering Science Quest and the childcare centres on campus. The results of this visioning session (http://www.fauw.uwaterloo.ca) were instructive. While participants listed strengths of the present system such as its University affiliation, high standards of provision, high-quality service offerings and volunteer support, they also underscored weaknesses such as lack of availability of spaces, aging infrastructure and insufficient resources for investment in childcare provision on campus. These problems, the group agreed, are inconsistent with the "Waterloo way." The University of Waterloo is synonymous with leadership and innovation, yet these terms do not embody the attention childcare issues have received on campus. It's time for this Administration to change its approach to this issue.

So what can and should be done? The visioning session gives us some direction**:**

- First, the University ought to adopt a "pod-system" of childcare provision. This system would have one central building or "hub" that would expand into "pods" – some existing (HMN, Klemmer, Paintin' Place, ECEC), some new (remember: Cambridge and Kitchener campuses require childcare services, too) – across campus. UBC, another peer institution and competitor for new faculty talent, provides an excellent example of the success of this model. The strength of a pod-system is that it allows existing providers to retain their autonomy, while coordinating services to meet the needs of stakeholders on campus (e.g., providing more infant spaces and offering flexible care, including drop-in and part-time spaces).
- Second, the pod-system should be operated under one umbrella structure called UW Childcare Services. This structure would simply act as a coordinator of services and provide information about childcare on campus, including a comprehensive web site that would list accurate information about cost, wait times, and the like. Imagine a system where faculty could add their child's name to *one* list from which the providers on campus could coordinate placements when spaces arose.
- Third, the University needs to actively invest in the growth and expansion of the current system. New spaces are desperately needed, and that means building new facilities or expanding existing ones. To finance this growth, childcare must be identified as a priority for the Keystone campaign and a centrally administered capital fund needs to be created.

These changes would go a long way in addressing the current problems facing our university community.

Clearly, there are constraints to achieving the vision outlined above. Nevertheless, I believe the disadvantages to the University are far more serious if this issue remains unaddressed. If inaction continues, the University will no doubt lose or fail to attract young, dynamic personnel, as well as promising graduate (and undergraduate) recruits. Moreover, faculty affected by lack of available childcare may, understandably, be less productive. This is not the Waterloo way! If Waterloo is to continue its tradition of excellence, the Administration must act now to address this urgent matter, for child care is a meaningful investment in the next generation of scholars who will lead Waterloo into the future.

Troy D. Glover is an Associate Professor in the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, Director of the Healthy Communities Research Network in the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences, and Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee at Hildegard Marsden Co-operative Day Nursery. He can be reached at x3097 or tdglover@healthy.uwaterloo.ca.

FAUW Office

Pat Moore, Administrator, x3787

Cathy Paisley, FAUW Assistant, x5158

Math and Computer Building,

Rooms 4002 & 4001

Fax: 888-4307

E-mail: facassoc@uwaterloo.ca

Website: http://www.fauw.uwaterloo.ca

WORKLOAD AND MERIT EVALUATION PROCESS SURVEY

by David DeVidi
Philosophy

Since I became a member of the FAUW Board of Directors almost two years ago, I've often heard the following message: While FAUW has done an admirable job negotiating salaries and handling other monetary issues, it has been less successful dealing with some other concerns about working conditions at UW. Two of the issues most frequently mentioned at our general meetings and in private communications to Board members are workload and the merit assessment process.

One aspect of the difficulty FAUW has in making headway on these matters relates directly to the way they are handled at Waterloo. For instance, at UW salary negotiations have traditionally been independent of discussion about other issues such as workload. This is a rather different system from what is in place at some other universities, especially ones where faculty are unionized and where a comprehensive collective agreement needs to be hammered out every few years. In that system there is often horse-trading involving giving up part of a pay raise in exchange for some measure that ameliorates workload or, possibly, a salary increase gets traded for benefits of some kind. (Of course, while the UW system makes it harder to make headway on some issues, it also has important advantages. This would be a suitable topic for a different article.) Another difficulty is that UW has a very decentralized administrative structure, so the workload and merit evaluation issues vary considerably within and across Faculties, for instance.

But another thing that has limited our ability to represent faculty interests effectively on the matters of merit evaluation and workload is a simple lack of good information. We simply don't know how workloads vary between academic units on campus, nor do we have a clear idea of how merit evaluations are handled in different units.

We are therefore going to be conducting a simple survey to find out this information. We will be contacting two people in each academic unit in order to gather basic information about workloads and about the process through which the unit arrives at its recommendations for annual merit evaluations for teaching, scholarship and service. The survey should not take long, so we hope you'll be willing to give us a few minutes of your time if someone calls on you. Thank you in advance for your collaboration.

Call for Forum Editor

If you have an interest in providing a forum for discussion and helping to keep your fellow colleagues informed …
then *Forum* editor may be just the position you are looking for!

The new editor will receive one of the teaching releases provided to the Association by the University.

Contact FAUW President Roydon Fraser (x4764 or e-mail: rafraser@engmail.uwaterloo.ca) or the FAUW Office (x3787 or e-mail: facassoc@uwaterloo.ca) for more information.

HOW ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE CASES ARE HANDLED

by Frank Reynolds
Statistics and Actuarial Science
Chair, FAUW Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

The Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) Committee consists of about 10 members. The Committee's mandate is to help members solve problems related to their employment at the University of Waterloo.

Usual Situations. Typically, the process starts with a member's call to the Association Office or directly to the Chair of the Committee. When possible, the problem is solved by providing the person with the relevant necessary information. In more complex cases, the Chair meets with the member to get a better understanding of the problem and to assess the best way to approach a solution.

Where the dispute involves tenure and/or promotion, the Chair, in consultation with the member, will normally appoint a Committee member (*academic colleague*) to actively assist the member in the preparation of the required material and/or appeal. If the matter goes to a hearing or an appeal, the academic colleague will accompany the person to the hearing and may even present the member's case. If proper procedures are not followed at the hearing, a grievance can be filed under the Memorandum of Agreement. Again, the academic colleague will assist in the preparation. Normally, the AF&T Chair will also be involved at this stage to assess the validity of the arguments and to consult with lawyers at the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) in Ottawa regarding the legal points and strength of the case.

Where the dispute concerns working conditions or an annual performance review, the AF&T Chair will attempt to mediate with the administrator involved. If the dispute is likely to be protracted, the Chair will assign an academic colleague to guide and help the member. The Chair's function is then similar to that of the preceding paragraph.

Occasionally, disputes will arise over the proper procedures for an administrative committee. If the academic colleague is unable to resolve the matter with the chair of the administrative committee, the AF&T Chair will step in to provide assistance.

Grievances and Arbitration. The vast majority of disputes are settled by discussion and mediation. Occasionally an administrator or administrative committee may act in direct violation of Natural Justice, the Human Rights Code, the Memorandum of Agreement or University policies, and refuse to correct the situation. When possible, these cases are handled by appeal tribunals under University policy, but, when this venue is not available, resort must be made to the grievance process. The grievance process, which is routinely used to settle disputes on other campuses, is basically an appeal to the Provost to intervene and correct the situation. It involves a simple statement of the problem and the requested/proposed solution. The Provost will meet with the member and his/her academic colleague in a collegial discussion of the problem, and may meet with others involved as well. If the Provost agrees in whole or in part with the member, a letter will be issued ordering a correction of the situation.

If the Provost does not agree with the grievance or the problems are so pervasive that no simple solution is realistically feasible, the grievance will be rejected. At this point the member has one last resort – arbitration. Under this procedure an arbitrator is selected from a panel agreed upon by the Administration and the Faculty Association. Each side hires a lawyer to present their case. Proceedings are under oath and normally last 3-5 days. Unfortunately, the lapsed time from the start of proceedings until their end can be 18 months or more and is rarely less than 6 months. Costs can run to $80,000 for each side and the member is responsible for his/her own costs.

Because of the cost, time, energy and feelings involved, the AF&T Committee rarely suggests that matters be carried to arbitration. When the academic colleague feels that arbitration may be justified in a particular case, he/she brings the matter to the attention of the AF&T Chair. The Chair then examines the case carefully and seeks the opinion of CAUT lawyers. If the case is considered weak or difficult to prove, a recommendation is normally made to the member that the case be dropped. Cases deemed to be stronger are taken to the full AF&T Committee for examination. If the majority of the Committee agrees that the case meets the criteria established by the FAUW Board of Directors for funding grievances, it will pass a resolution recommending that the Board approve partial funding.

The Chair of the AF&T Committee then takes the case to the FAUW

(Continued on page 7)

(Continued from page 6)

Board and outlines the pertinent facts, perceived abuses of policy and other anomalies. If and only if the Board agrees that there are significant issues involved and that there is a reasonable likelihood of winning the case, does it pass a resolution approving partial funding.

It is important to note that up to this point all discussions occur without the participants (other than the academic colleague and the Chair of the AF&T Committee) being aware of the name or even the Faculty of the member involved. However, once partial funding of an arbitration is approved and the notice filed, the case, including the person's name, moves into the public domain.

Problem Areas. In cases of serious breaches of our terms and conditions of employment, tribunal appeals, grievances and arbitrations are recommended. Here are several common examples:

- In tenure and promotion cases, information is sometimes brought before and considered by a department or Faculty committee without the member having been given the opportunity to study or to reply to the information. This is a clear violation of Natural Justice and requires a rehearing by a new committee.
- In some instances, the member believes that a member of the hearing committee has already formed a judgement or may have been exposed to unfavourable information about the member. This is called a "perception of bias". The member can, on discovering the problem, ask that the person be removed from the hearing committee or, if the hearing has already taken place, that a new committee be struck to hear the case *de novo*. It is very important to note that a "perception of bias" does not require that the member prove that bias does in fact exist but only that he/she describe circumstances that could give rise to a "perception" that bias could exist.
- Unique problems at times arise in conjunction with partially disabled members. Typically, a member is able to do research; however, undergraduate classroom teaching and service may be carried out only on a severely restricted basis. Under the Human Rights code, the Administration has a duty to accommodate the member. Note that there are no qualifications to this requirement. Problems arise when the Administration attempts to carry out this duty on the basis of "If it is not inconvenient to us or the students, and we feel it is suitable, we will grant the accommodation."

  Really unfortunate problems may result if the Administration attempts to use the member's reaction to a lack of accommodation as a basis for recourse to illegal discipline. A different type of problem arises when the member's co-workers see the accommodation as giving the person a "free ride" to do research while forgoing the other professorial duties.
- Generally speaking, the role of the academic colleague is not well understood. Occasionally, a committee chair or other administrator will take the attitude that the academic colleague is to be seen and not heard – even to the extent of effectively preventing the academic colleague from advising the member. This violates the principles of Natural Justice and often prevents the member from properly presenting his/her case. While normally the academic colleague is an observer of procedure and an advisor, there are situations where it is in the best interest of all concerned that the academic colleague be the primary presenter of the member's case.

Faculty Association Grievances. Occasionally an issue arises which affects a large number of our members and involves the basic principles of working conditions and the relationship with the Administration. In these cases a grievance can be filed by the Faculty Association. Normally, the FAUW Board will refer the matter to the AF&T Committee, which will meet to discuss the problem and possible solutions.

The Chair will obtain legal advice from CAUT. If the matter is serious and there is a reasonable chance of winning, the AF&T Committee will draft a grievance and recommend to the Board that the grievance be filed. If the Board approves the grievance, the President or his/her delegate (e.g., the AF&T Chair) has the responsibility for carrying the grievance. There is a very good chance that the grievance will proceed to arbitration as basic employment principles are involved.

The Role of CAUT. CAUT provides member associations with free legal advice by telephone. Normally this is used by the AF&T Chair to determine the legal principles involved in a dispute and for CAUT to express an opinion on the likelihood of success. CAUT lawyers are not available to the members directly and do not act as legal counsel at an arbitration. Having said this, in rare cases CAUT may decide that the issues involve principles that affect the entire Canadian academic community; in such cases CAUT provides legal counsel at no charge to the member association.

Conclusion. No process is ever perfect and the main objectives of the AF&T Committee are to see that members know their rights and to present situations in the best light for members.

I hope that you never have to use the services of the FAUW AF&T Committee. However, if you have any difficulties, please do not hesitate to get in touch with the FAUW Office (x3787) for assistance.

The rest of this issue is dedicated to articles dealing with recent news on higher education. The *FAUW Forum* would be pleased to receive feedback from readers. Happy summer reading!

The following article is reprinted with permission from the 14 March 2006 edition of The Daily Telegraph.

OLD EUROPE 'BEING OUTPACED BY ASIAN HIGHER EDUCATION'

by David Rennie

The most powerful economies of "Old Europe", including France, Britain and Germany, are struggling to keep up with a huge expansion of higher education in Asia, a new report has found.

The survey, by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, warns the members of the European Union to increase spending on schools and universities and tackle a crippling lack of social mobility within their societies, or put future economic growth in jeopardy.

"The time when Europe competed mostly with countries that offered low-skilled work at low wages has gone.

Today, countries like China and India are starting to deliver high skills at low costs," the report said.

There is "no way" that Europe can stop rapidly developing countries from producing "wave after wave of highly skilled graduates ... This is profoundly changing the rules of the game," said the study, compiled for the Lisbon Council, a Brussels-based think tank which aims to make Europe more competitive.

"France and Germany, which make up 35 per cent of the European Union's €11.6 trillion [£7.37 trillion] economy, are no longer among the world's leaders in developing knowledge and skills," the study says.

Of the world's top 20 universities, using the most widely cited index, only two - Oxford and Cambridge - are situated in Europe, the report notes.

It is not just down to extra funding, but universities should also become more flexible, and responsive to the needs of employers, it says. Higher education of even a short duration appears to produce dividends.

Countries that give individuals one additional year of education can boost productivity and raise economic output by three per cent to six per cent over time," the report says.

Britain has increased its numbers of university-level students markedly in recent years, but there is no data yet on whether the new students are receiving a quality education, the report's author, Andreas Schleicher, said.

But his survey points to spectacular growth in graduate numbers around the globe, not only in Asian nations such as China, Japan, and Korea, but in southern Europe, so that Britain's own expansion in student numbers merely allows it to maintain its relative position in the league tables.

Dr Schleicher said: "The United Kingdom has seen a lot of progress, but you need to look at the extraordinary progress of countries like Korea and Finland which were not even on the education map a few years ago."

In the 1960s, South Korea had the same gross domestic product as Afghanistan.

Today, 97 per cent of Koreans aged between 25 and 34 have received a high-school education – the best performance of any leading industrialised nation.

The report said that class distinctions – notably in Germany, France and Italy – make it much harder for poor European children to overcome their backgrounds and succeed, than is the case for similar children in the United States.

"Europeans from difficult socio-economic backgrounds don't receive the same educational opportunities as children from rich and middle-class families," the study said.

Dr Schleicher added that the same criticism holds true for Britain, which shows wide differences in the quality of education received by children from different backgrounds.

NEW FACULTY

We hope you will participate in the welcoming events on

Tuesday, September 5th** and **Wednesday, September 6th.

Activities will include a BBQ at President Johnston's Chatterbox Farm co-sponsored by the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo (FAUW).

The following article is reprinted with permission from the 12 June 2006 edition of Inside Higher Education (www.insidehighered.com).

YES, THE SKY IS FALLING

by Rob Capriccioso

"The sole superpower presently on earth may not have lost all of his clothes, but he has lost at least his shirt and probably more."

That's how John A. Douglass, a senior research fellow at the Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California's Berkeley campus, begins his new research paper, titled "The Waning of America's Higher Education Advantage: International Competitors Are No Longer Number Two and Have Big Plans in the Global Economy." He argues that declines in U.S. participation rates in higher education, particularly among younger students, combined with misguided political priorities, have put U.S. higher education in position to fall behind global competitors – perhaps dramatically so.

The paper, which is aimed at spelling out problems in American higher education as Douglass sees them, is adapted from a forthcoming book by the researcher called *The Conditions for Admission: Access, Equity, and the Social Contract of Public Universities,* from Stanford University Press.

"The academic research enterprise remains vibrant," writes Douglass. "But participation and degree attainment rates have leveled off and are showing signs of decline – seemingly more than just a bump or short-term market correction."

The postsecondary participation rate for individuals aged 18 to 24 in the U.S. is 34 percent, according to a recent study by the Education Commission of the States. Rhode Island has the highest rate at 48 percent; Alaska has the lowest at 19 percent. The paper notes that relative to most other economic competitors, significantly smaller proportions of American college-age students are entering scientific fields.

Douglass says that other nations are using government policy to match or exceed U.S. participation rates and to more fully integrate higher education into national economic and social policy. "They have many problems of their own," according to Douglass, "but it is the political will and trajectory of their efforts that offers a sharp contrast to the U.S." He notes that for the first time since the late 1800s, America no longer has the world's highest rate of young students going on to a postsecondary institution.

In recent months, members of the Bush administration – often pointing to Thomas Friedman's 2005 book, *The World is Flat*, and recent reports by the National Academy of Sciences and other panels – appear to have awakened to such concerns. Officials have focused on new efforts to bolster higher education, particularly in the fields of foreign language and math and science, but some budgetary cuts have had adverse effects on specific research and training programs.

The administration has also supported the work of Education Secretary Margaret Spelling's Commission on the Future of Higher Education, but many experts have been cautious about whether specific changes will be implemented after the report is released later this summer.

Douglass is somewhat skeptical about whether the recent federal attention will result in significant changes, given the country's other major issues. He points to "the debacle in Iraq, astounding increases in the national debt and lackluster exports, a school system perpetually struggling with finances and performance, out-of-control medical costs, and a growing disparity between rich and poor" as evidence that the government is not attuned to the issues facing higher education. "Perhaps it is appropriate to claim that those currently in control of both houses of Congress and the White House are pretty good at cutting government, but they don't know how to run it," he argues in the report.

Douglass says that interventionist efforts of national governments in the European Union to direct their institutions of higher education illustrate that lawmakers abroad often view higher education as a major policy issue in a way that U.S. politicos do not. He notes that in 2004, Prime Minister Tony Blair "risked a close vote in Parliament" to establish a new fees and financial aid policy in England.

"The contrast with the U.S. is stark; with the exception of political battles in America over admissions to a few selective public universities, higher education is not a high profile national issue," writes the researcher. "While EU countries are engaged in national and international debates regarding the future of higher education, setting goals for expanding access, considering and implementing alternative funding schemes, and negotiating cooperative initiatives between nations, such

(Continued on page 10)

as the Bologna Agreement, American higher education remains a second-tier political issue."

Douglass also notes that over time, the federal government has reduced the level of funding available for financial aid relative to the cost of tuition in both public and private institutions. Tuition at public higher education institutions has grown at a rate roughly equivalent to the rate of inflation in most other service industries, according to the researcher, yet the amount of aid provided by both federal and state governments, especially in the form of grant aid, has been well below the general rate of inflation. In turn, public institutions have attempted to make up for a portion of the decline in government investment and the impact of rising costs by raising tuition.

"The crisis of the publics – the underfunding and under-investment in public colleges and universities, which are the primary providers of postsecondary education – is not a mainstream political issue," writes Douglass. "For this and a variety of other reasons, the U.S. has become relatively complacent in maintaining its higher education advantage."

The following article is reprinted with permission from the 8 June 2006 edition of Inside Higher Education (www.insidehighered.com).

A SMALL WORLD

by Scott Jaschik

Of the many ways to educate international students, Fairleigh Dickinson University may have a new approach – and one that experts on international higher education say is worth watching.

The New Jersey university has just won approval from British Columbia to open a degree-granting campus in Vancouver. Students who enroll there won't be American or Canadian, but will be from other countries, primarily in Asia. Fairleigh Dickinson believes that there is a market of students who want an American-style education in North America who will find it attractive in many ways to be outside the United States. And the university can educate them for substantially less money than would be possible in New Jersey – while still earning money on the arrangement.

A few American institutions, most notably the University of Phoenix or institutions in New York State along the Canadian border, do try to go after the Canadian market. And many American colleges have campuses abroad, either for their own students' foreign study (Fairleigh Dickinson has such a campus in Britain) or for foreign students (a number of universities have set up shop in Qatar to educate Middle Eastern students). But the Fairleigh Dickinson approach is unusual in that it uses Canada as a setting to educate others. A spokesman for the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada said that he didn't know of any other college trying Fairleigh Dickinson's type of arrangement, and that it was too new for his group to be sure of its impact.

"We don't believe in academic colonialism," said J. Michael Adams, president of Fairleigh Dickinson. But the approach – four years in the making and following an extensive review from British Columbia officials – represents a different way for American colleges to fulfill "a global mission," Adams said.

Philip G. Altbach, director of the Center for International Higher Education, at Boston College, said he found the approach "very significant" as it might be a way for many colleges to enter the market for Asian students. Vancouver may provide a setting where Asian students can have less expensive access to American education, avoid the difficulties of obtaining visas to the U.S., and experience a range of Asian cultures in a city that is notably international. "For a lot of students from Asia, going to Vancouver may be like never leaving Asia," he said.

Adams said that about 12 percent of students at Fairleigh Dickinson today are from abroad, and that he doesn't want that number to shrink because of the creation of the Vancouver campus, and possibly others along the same model. But he and others at Fairleigh Dickinson said that a number of factors make it possible for the university to attract foreign students if it leaves New Jersey:

(Continued on page 11)

(Continued from page 10)

Cost. Tuition for two semesters at Vancouver will run about $16,000, compared to nearly $24,000 in New Jersey. That's because the Canadian campus will not have athletic facilities or dormitories. Students will also save on housing through programs that will place them with families in the region – generally from their home countries – who rent rooms out and provide home-cooked meals.

Visas. Even with improvements in the system in the last year, many students from Asia report difficulty in obtaining visas to come to the United States. And others can obtain visas but don't want to study in the U.S. "Many are not comfortable or feel that they are not going to be welcomed," said Christopher Capuano, a psychology professor who is leading the effort to create the new campus.

Location. For many students from Asia – particularly those not going to Ivy institutions – a campus on the Pacific Rim is more desirable in terms of distance and culture. And for an American institution – even in the East – exploring a new approach like this one, Vancouver is a lot closer than Asia.

The new campus will only offer two bachelor's degrees: in business management (with a range of concentrations) and information technology. About 125 students are expected to be admitted to the first class, in the fall of 2007, and enrollment is expected to grow to 500. The curriculum will be identical to that offered in New Jersey. Ten full-time faculty members – some of them tenure track – will be hired to teach in Vancouver while New Jersey-based faculty members will also teach some courses, generally on a short-term basis. Other campuses that may be opened along this model will also probably have only a few majors, generally pre-professional in nature.

Faculty members at Fairleigh Dickinson's New Jersey locations have been assured that there will be no diversion of funds to Vancouver and that the program will be making money within a few years. Joel Harmon, a management professor who is president of the Faculty Senate, said that body has taken no stand on the new campus, so he couldn't comment on his views of it. But he said that administrators were correct in saying that professors had been involved in the planning process, that some were excited about it, and that others were concerned.

To win support from British Columbia, Fairleigh Dickinson not only had to provide extensive information about its programs, but it won support from local institutions. A spokesman for the University of British Columbia confirmed that his campus – which attracts many top international students – had no objections to the Fairleigh Dickinson outpost, and considered that the institutions were going after different international markets.

Altbach, an expert on international education, said that made sense and that institutions like Fairleigh Dickinson – with good programs in areas like business, but without worldwide name recognition – might find this a desirable model. "If this works out for Fairleigh Dickinson, others are going to try this," Altbach said.

University officials have stressed that they anticipate making money off the program, but that their motives are primarily educational. Capuano noted that while many American college are opening up campuses abroad, many of them focus on full-paying students. Fairleigh Dickinson plans to offer scholarships that will average 30 percent of tuition.

"Our primary motive is to engage in activities that further the mission of the university in global education, not to make money," he said. "Clearly we're doing that too, and that is a motive, but it's not the first one."

Capuano said this model would allow for constant involvement of the university's existing professors, a great talent pool of those who would find Vancouver a desirable place to work, and a range of connections – between the students, faculty members, Vancouver, and the main Fairleigh Dickinson campuses. "The idea is that this isn't an island off by itself," he said.

FAUW FORUM

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

Opinions expressed in the Forum are those of the authors, and ought not to be perceived as representing the views of the Association, 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.

The following article is reprinted with permission from the 5 January 2006 edition of Inside Higher Education (www.insidehighered.com).

A TENURE REFORM PLAN WITH LEGS

by Scott Jaschik

In 1998, a group of provosts of research universities circulated a document calling for bold reforms of the tenure process. Traditional publishing was becoming an economic sinkhole, they argued. Junior professors couldn't get published. University presses and journal publishers were losing too much money. Libraries couldn't afford to buy the new scholarship that was published. Somehow, they argued, the system needed to change – with less emphasis on traditional publishing and more creativity about how to evaluate professors up for promotion.

The document was widely discussed (and praised) by provosts. It went nowhere.

Charles Phelps, provost of the University of Rochester and one of the organizers of that effort, said that the fundamental reason the plan went nowhere was that it didn't flow up from the scholarly disciplines. And that's why he's enthusiastic about a proposal being drafted by the Modern Language Association to fundamentally change how English and foreign language professors are reviewed for tenure. What the association is doing is "right on target," he said, and from discussions with fellow provosts, he predicted that English departments would receive similar receptions in other administration buildings.

"The thing that is first and foremost to me is that these changes will happen when they come from the learned society in the relevant discipline – and the field buys into the idea of changing things," Phelps said.

There is nothing sacred about the way professors in any one discipline are evaluated, he said. Engineering professors recently approached him about having patents be used in evaluating their tenure bids – and Phelps agreed, provided that there are appropriate reviews of the scholarly value behind whatever was patented. But provosts can't lead the effort – they need to be signing on to changes that come from their departments, and the departments need to know that they are acting within the norms of their disciplines, he said.

Even if he believes – as he does – that the monograph is terribly overrated when it comes to evaluating a scholar's research capability, Phelps said he can't "unilaterally" announce that he's looking at other things as long as most English departments focus on the monograph. "If I start granting people tenure on conditions no one else believes in, then in some sense, I'm cheapening the coin of the realm," he said.

If his English department comes forward, however, and says it wants to move away from focusing on the monograph, Phelps said he'll be more than receptive. "I wouldn't blink an eye at approving the idea," which is what the MLA is preparing to endorse.

A special panel of the MLA is finishing a report that will call for numerous, far-reaching changes in the way assistant professors are reviewed for tenure.

Among the ideas that will be part of the plan are:

- The creation of "multiple pathways" to demonstrating research excellence. The monograph is one way, but so would be journal articles, electronic projects, textbooks, jointly written books, and other approaches.
- The drafting of "memorandums of understanding" between new hires and departments so that those new hires would have a clear sense of expectations in terms of how they would be evaluated for tenure.
- A commitment to treating electronic work with the same respect accorded to work published in print.
- The setting of limits on the number of outside reviews sought in tenure cases and on what those reviewers could be asked.

Members of a special MLA panel preparing the report discussed the direction they were taking during a session at the association's annual meeting last week. Many panel members said that they viewed their proposals as potentially historic in dealing with long-term problems that the discipline has been unable to address until now. In interviews in recent days with a variety of experts on tenure, English departments, and higher education generally, it's clear that the MLA panel is not alone in thinking that its work could lead to significant (and praiseworthy) changes at many colleges and universities.

While many offered caveats for their support, they also said that the panel may well be setting out to suc-

(Continued on page 13)

(Continued from page 12)

ceed where the provosts of eight years ago failed. And support for much of the plan seems strong among institutions of various types and is coming from some higher education players who have not always been fans of the MLA. In particular, support is strong for changing the widespread practice of evaluating research capabilities based only on publishing monographs.

"There really has been a taboo until recently about talking about these things," said Lindsay Waters, executive editor in the humanities of the Harvard University Press. Waters has for years now been taking the position that university presses could not afford to keep publishing monographs of limited interest, and that colleges needed to stop expecting monograph publication of junior professors.

"When I first started to say this, I had publishers tell me that they wanted to hit me," Waters said.

By explicitly endorsing a move away from the monograph, he added, the MLA could lead the way to "a renaissance" in scholarly publishing. He said that until now, some publishers and professors have viewed the suggestion that monograph publication be decoupled from tenure reviews as a suggestion that publication didn't matter. The more subtle explanation, he said, is that presses can't afford to publish the monographs, and many monographs aren't that good.

"The message that will come from this is something I learned to say from day one in publishing: Write a more important book," Waters said. Freed from the demands of just writing a monograph for the purpose of writing a monograph, he said, professors could get tenure in one way while working on broader writing projects that could change the way people think.

"Imagine that you are an English professor. The challenge is how you write about Byron for the medievalists to understand, too," he said. That is so much more intellectually challenging and exciting, he said, than the status quo, which is "the assumption that it's OK to write a book for two men in New Haven who will understand it."

"I think we could be seeing a great shift happening – this is a very positive, very important moment," he said.

The move away from what MLA panel members call the "fetishization" of the monograph is also important for there to be any chance of departments embracing another recommendation: that electronic work not be devalued because it isn't in print, said several experts on new media.

Alan Liu, a professor of English at the University of California at Santa Barbara, is the founder of Voice of the Shuttle, a portal for electronic material in the humanities, and is currently leading the Transliteracies Project, which examines cultural, cognitive, and technological issues related to reading online.

Bias against electronic materials is a "significant" problem, Liu said, and it relates directly to the monograph issue. It is very hard for people working in an electronic format to say that their work resembles a monograph, Liu said, so as long as the monograph is the gold standard, rhetoric about valuing electronic media won't mean much. But if departments embrace some of the other ideas being put forward by the MLA panel – that a series of essays may be as valuable as a monograph, or that work done in collaboration may be important – then it becomes realistic for electronic materials to be valued, because they aren't so different from print journal articles or print collaborative projects.

Liu also said that there has been a reinforcing problem of departments being able to say that there are not good tools in place to evaluate work online, and people who work online saying that there won't be good tools until departments take their work seriously. Liu said it was vital for professors to spend more time on evaluating the quality of electronic work – something he said he thought might be possible if the dominance of the monograph is finally challenged.

"The connection between the printed version of the monograph and tenure is problematic in many ways," he said, adding that he thought people who worked in electronic media would applaud the movement coming from the MLA.

Similar praise comes from Rosanna Warren, a Boston University professor who is head of the Association of Literary Scholars and Critics, a group that has in the past said that the MLA isn't sufficiently devoted to the traditional study of literature. Warren said that the questions being raised by the association panel are "pressing and real" and said that she was "delighted" by the direction of the committee's work.

Warren said that she thought there were good reasons that some had doubted the value of online scholarship, but that the time had come to find ways to evaluate it and accept that it can be good. "The suspicion of online work in many quarters has a great deal to do with the wild, miscellaneous, and often ill-judged quality of work available online," she said. "Our generation of scholars has the challenge of devising forms for establishing editorial rigor for online academic publication, so that review committees, administrators, and the institutions they represent can have more confidence in those publications."

Of those interviewed for this article, all but one said that the monograph needed to be seen as but one way for a scholar to demonstrate

(Continued on page 14)

(Continued from page 13)

research excellence and not as the only way. And every single one said that the economics of publishing and the changes in technology made such a change essential. But at the same time, several qualified their support by saying that they thought the monograph needed to still be in the mix – and in some cases to continue as the most common way used. "There is no question that technological and economic developments are changing scholarly practices," said Langdon Hammer, chair of English at Yale University.

Hammer said his view was that "the quality and promise of a scholar's leadership in her or his field" should be the "first criterion" in tenure reviews, and that such leadership would be "defined by the ways in which a field is organized." He said that he expected monographs "to remain the first measure in most fields, for the foreseeable future," but he said he also expected to see "other forms" take hold and to matter more over time, as in some cases "they do now."

Daniel Fogel, president of the University of Vermont and also a literary scholar, said that he found the MLA approach "very sensible." Speaking as the founder and longtime editor of the *Henry James Review*, he said that "the academy never found a global and sustainable way to support the agencies of publication on which it relied for certification of the faculty.... So the move to de-emphasize the monograph and to no longer privilege print over electronic dissemination of scholarship seems to me to make sense."

Fogel did add some caveats. He said that the monograph may be more expendable in some fields than in others, and that in some kinds of scholarship in English (Fogel cited rhetoric, medieval studies and linguistics), careers can already be built on journal articles. But he said that in other fields "monographs provide the scope for development of a really rich and well documented argument," adding: "I would not want to see the monograph so devalued that we would no longer see productions of works with the heft, range and impact of *Mimesis, The Mirror and the Lamp*, or *The Anxiety of Influence."*

He also said that print-on-demand systems may provide economic ways to preserve the monograph where it is needed. "Truth is, there is a great deal to be said for a book in one's hand," he said. "How many of us would have wanted to read the Gilbert and Gubar trilogy beginning with *The Madwoman in the Attic* online?"

While much of the discussion of the MLA panel's work has focused on its recommendations about the monograph, there are other significant changes proposed as well, and they too are drawing attention.

One of the ideas is the creation of a "memorandum of understanding" between new hires and departments. Many younger faculty members and those who advise them said this approach could be very helpful.

"Among the junior faculty I coach, the most upsetting problems arise when the criteria for tenure are unclear or raised capriciously," said Mary McKinney, a psychologist and the founder of Successful Academic Coaching, who helps junior faculty members navigate the tenure process. "It's tough to jump over a bar that you can't see. And even harder to clear a bar that is being lifted as you leap."

Richard P. Chait, director of the Project on Faculty Appointments, at Harvard University, said that he and a colleague published an essay five years ago called "Tenure by Objectives," that suggested an approach similar to the "memorandum of understanding" idea. Chait said that the essay was "pretty obscure," so he was very happy to see a similar idea coming from a new source.

Chait has advised many university administrations on how to reform tenure systems, and has sometimes criticized faculty members for being too timid about considering changes. But he had praise for the ideas currently being discussed. "The very opening of the promotion and tenure canon to conversation strikes me as healthy. Making the process more transparent and consistent is better still," Chait said. "Bravo for MLA."

One person who wasn't impressed with the memorandum plan is Jeffrey Duban, a lawyer in New York City whose practice consists entirely of helping faculty members sue their institutions, in many cases because of tenure denials. He said he agreed with the concept that junior faculty members should have a clear understanding of expectations. But he was skeptical that departments would stick with those expectations. He has recently dealt with three cases, he said, in which faculty members received rave reviews in evaluations up to the point of tenure, and then were denied tenure over issues that weren't raised earlier. Duban said that many departments don't take reviews or agreements seriously until the point of a tenure vote.

Another major change being proposed would limit the number of outside reviewers to six – and urge that departments avoid asking them certain questions, such as whether they would grant tenure to the candidate at the reviewer's institution. Proponents of these changes said that the large number of outside letters were taking too much time to collect and evaluate and adding little to the process, and that outside reviewers bring expertise only on the question of research, and not on many other factors that should go into a tenure decision.

How big a change this would represent varies by institution. Phelps, of Rochester, said that his university typically expects 12 outside reviews, although he has been willing to be

(Continued on page 15)

(Continued from page 14)

flexible. Several administrators interviewed, while applauding the overall direction of the tenure changes, said that they liked outside letters. Hammer, of Yale, said his university considers three rounds of outside letters, the last round of which has six letters. But while the letter limit would be a big deal at many places, it's a non-issue at many others.

Heinz Woehlk, dean of the Division of Language and Literature at Missouri's Truman State University, said that as "primarily a teaching institution," there is not a focus on publication or outside reviews. No outside reviews are required. He said that the MLA plan appears to be a move "to loosen the sometimes inappropriate requirements" in tenure decisions, which is a change he said he would support, and would predict his faculty members would support as well.

One concern expressed by some – including supporters of the tenure proposals – was that they wouldn't change some of the underlying economic conditions facing language and literature departments. Phelps said that one reason for the difficulties faced by English departments is that they need to be large to teach writing to undergraduates, but there is not economic support to keep all of those teachers in professorial positions.

William Pannapacker, assistant professor of English at Hope College, in Michigan, said that he thought the MLA proposal was "a great idea," and that the reforms made sense. But he said he worried that the association was "addressing a symptom rather than the root problems – overproduction of doctorates and elimination of tenure lines."

And the only person to defend a monograph requirement also cited similar economic arguments.

Jerome Christensen, chair of English at the University of California at Irvine, said he would not object to any individual department making the kinds of changes suggested by the MLA panel. And he said that it was possible to show excellence in forms other than the monograph. But he said that just as there are great undergraduate programs and great Ph.D. programs, he thought there were ways to demonstrate greatness in both types of programs and that the monograph was the appropriate review tool for faculty members in Ph.D. programs. He said that there may be too many people seeking tenure-track jobs, but that doesn't mean that the standards should change. Having too many ways to demonstrate research excellence, he said, could result in faculty committees without the ability to judge the work being presented.

"I continue to think that every Ph.D. granting institution should require a scholarly monograph for promotion and tenure," Christensen said. "I also continue to think that the real, objective problem in the profession is that we have too many Ph.D. granting institutions. To alter the standards for promotion and tenure in a fashion that would allow for everyone at Ph.D. granting institutions to be recognized for excellence in one shape or another, each in his or her own way, is to ignore the serious problem of over-production of Ph.D.'s while diluting the quality of the Ph.D. programs that we have."

For now, it appears Christensen's views on preserving the monograph as a requirement are in the minority.

Rosemary G. Feal, executive director of the MLA, said that she is hearing almost uniformly positive reactions to the work of the committee, and particularly the section about monographs. "The phrase 'fetishization of the monograph' is on everyone's lips," she said. "People are really rallying behind this."

One question that many are posing is what the MLA will do with the panel's work, once it is finalized. Feal said she envisioned a two-pronged effort. The MLA as an organization will seek to speak with groups representing provosts and deans and other concerned parties to explain why the association took on the issue, and why it is recommending the changes.

But in terms of colleges changing policies, Feal said that long-term change will need to come from within. So she said that she hoped department chairs would be the "prime advocates" for these reforms, first working with members of the department to discuss which measures to adopt, and then selling those to deans and provosts. Feal said that panel members did talk to administrators during their work, and found them very enthusiastic about the ideas being discussed, if they are proposed from the ground up.

Given that many provosts wanted to push similar ideas eight years ago, supporters of the MLA reforms have reason to believe that at many institutions, these ideas may well go forward.

The following article is reprinted with permission from the 5 June 2006 edition of The Chronicle of Higher Education, copyright 2006.

COLLEGES SHOULD TAKE ACTION TO COMBAT ACADEMIC STRESS, REPORT SAYS

by Xiao-Bo Yuan

Higher-education professionals face rampant stress from their jobs, and colleges and universities could be doing a lot more to prevent and alleviate it, according to a new report by the Universities and Colleges Employers' Association, which represents academic institutions in the United Kingdom.

The report, "Preventing and Tackling Stress at Work: An Approach for Higher Education," recommends that academic workplaces adopt a "proactive" approach to stress management. Among other things, the report suggests that employers check early for the risk of stress and that staff members and managers undergo training to strengthen communication.

A 2003-4 survey by a British government agency revealed that stress in the education sector was higher than in other industries. According to the survey, 0.93 percent of workers in education reported a work-related illness due to stress, compared to an average of only 0.73 percent in all other industries. This higher frequency of stress-related illnesses can harm a college by increasing workplace accidents and absences, undermining an institution's teaching and research, and lowering staff morale.

Although stress among higher-education professionals has been little-studied in the United States, the British report provides examples of practical steps that may improve work environments in academe on this side of the Atlantic as well.

According to the report, "the most important prevention measure is the development of managers at all levels" who are responsible for the well-being of their employees. The report also cites several models of workplace surveys designed to assess stress levels. The surveys allow employees to evaluate whether they fit their job descriptions well and are consistently motivated.

Taken together, those assessment techniques amount to a "policy, procedures, and systems audit" that will allow institutions to "identify troubled employees," the report says. In particular, the report urges institutions to combat undue anxiety by clearly stating work objectives to employees, by consulting with staff members on decisions that may change their work, and by dealing openly with workplace conflicts by ensuring that complaints are directed to managers. The report also includes samples of stress-relief and assertiveness-training workshops for use in academe.

"Avoiding harmful stress at work is part of good management," writes David Melville, chairman of the association's Health and Safety Committee, and vice chancellor of the University of Kent at Canterbury, in the report's foreword. "Getting it wrong can have serious effects on personal performance, as well as the potential for financial and reputational damage to institutions."

The report, which includes a CD-ROM, can be ordered from the Universities and Colleges Employers Association, Woburn House, 20 Tavistock Square, London WC1H 9HU, for £15.00. The order form is available online: http://www.ucea.ac.uk.

THE FAUW WEBSITE HAS A NEW LOOK AND ADDRESS!

Please take a few to minutes to visit us at:

www.fauw.uwaterloo.ca