

Faculty Times

Volume XII, No. 3

A UWOFA Newsletter

March 2009

President's Report

The budget situation and the Board of Governors' ability to lead

By Mike Carroll

I've attended several presentations on the budget over the past few months, and increasingly two things have become clear:

- The budget crisis is less of a crisis here at UWO than you would guess from these presentations.
- The problems which do exist are the result of ill-advised policies set by the Board of Governors that are still not being discussed critically and which may well be continuing.

Remember: student enrollments are not going down and indeed grad enrollment is going up; tuition fees

are not declining; there's been no decline in government grants; Western will be getting something like \$50 million in infrastructure funding; and finally, the nature of the pension plan here means that university faculty and staff assume all the risk with respect to investments and the university has no pension obligation to people who retire. So where's the crisis? It seems to consist mainly, if not entirely, in a loss of investment income (about \$48 M) that was going to go into the operating budget this year and in the next two years.

But this brings us to the second point, which is about accountability, or really a lack of accountability, on the part of the Board of Governors. After all, the Board sets financial policy and the President and Provost are obliged to operate within the constraints set by that policy.

What has happened over the past 10 to 20 years is that the Board has, as a matter of policy, invested a large portion of the University's non-endowed revenue, which includes much of the money coming in for salaries, research grants, etc. – into relatively risky investments *and then* built a dependence on the result-

ing investment income into the operating budget. As long as the markets were good, of course, that paid off.

“Does the Board of Governors possess the leadership abilities and the skills that are needed in this difficult time...?”

The problem is that when the market declined dramatically, we got a sudden and sharp drop-off in expected income.

It is of course always easy to see what should have been done after the fact. Fair enough. But in this case, it's not as if the University community had the opportunity for critical reflection and discussion before the fact. I've sat through lots of budget presentations over the years, at Senate and elsewhere. And at no point was it ever made clear that the Board was depending so heavily on such a risky investment strategy.

And this brings us to the general question that in my mind needs to be answered before we can evaluate any of the statements about the budget coming from

Inside this issue:

Moving up to the land of milk and honey 3

Mike Carroll

Age discrimination in academia 4

Equity Committee

We're Number 14! 6

Vince Gray & Kristin Hoffmann

The corporate assault on academic integrity 7

Paul Handford

Faculty Times is an official publication of the University of Western Ontario Faculty Association. Signed articles do not necessarily reflect the views of UWOFA.

Mary Doyle, *Editor*
mdoyle@uwo.ca

Micki Izzard
Production Editor

the Administration - and it's this: does the Board of Governors possess the leadership abilities and the skills that are needed in this difficult time to set the financial policies that would allow us to weather the economic downturn without eroding the core functions of the university?

One way to assess this would be to meet with members of the Board in a true Town Hall meeting to see if they can discuss, in an intelligent and informed way, their own policies. UWOFA made a request to do just that; that request has been declined. Given that, all we can do is assess Board effectiveness by looking at the indicators available to us. Those indicators, unfortunately, are not encouraging.

As a start, there has been no accountability. Faculty, staff and students, remember, are evaluated every year using an arm's length process. There is no such accountability for the Board members, who are evaluated only by themselves. And certainly no one on the Board has stepped up to the plate and taken responsibility for the Board's disastrous investment policy.

Another indicator that we might use to assess the Board's ability to lead is to look at whether or not the Board has been creative in responding to changed circumstances - but here again the evidence is not encouraging. There

is no evidence, for example, that the disastrous investment policy that has gotten us where we are has been changed. Nor has the Board shown any creativity in proposing new policies.

“And remember there are obvious alternatives to what the Board has done.”

For example: it seems evident that getting more people to retire would quickly result in savings. Yet the Board has only offered faculty a slightly revised version of the existing phased retirement option that is next to worthless. And the early retirement incentives offered to staff are equally ineffective and pathetic. If anything, it seems as if the Board is just going through the motions offering early retirement incentives as a prelude to cutbacks in funding for contract faculty and staff layoff.

And remember there are obvious alternatives to what the Board has done. Short term borrowing to finance meaningful retirement incentives is clearly a possibility that would pay for itself in short order. There's also \$2.5 million in the budget as an “operating reserve” (which means it's not allocated to specific projects). That

may not be a lot of money against the budget as a whole, but it's a sum that could be immensely useful if used to create retirement incentives - but it would require a change in Board policy to use it for this purpose.

Generally, the failure to think creatively in regard to retirement incentives, I think, is yet more evidence that this Board is trapped in modes of thinking that may once have been functional but which now are dysfunctional. I'd like to be convinced otherwise, but the more I learn, the more I fear that I'm right.

And remember too that the Board of Governors is not some distant faraway body whose policies have little impact on the lives of people on this campus. On the contrary, the decisions made by this Board are shortly going to cause real pain to real people. Very shortly, in particular, a wave of staff layoffs will be announced. And soon as well, we will learn just how severe the cutbacks to funding for contract faculty will be.

In times like this, we need confidence in the ability of leaders to set policies that are fair and grounded in a sensible assessment of what's possible and what's not. That sort of confidence is precisely what I do not have at the moment.

[This article is based on the speaking notes that Mike Carroll used at the Town Hall meeting held on March 4.]

Moving up to the land of milk and honey

Some thoughts on administrator salaries and perks

By Mike Carroll, UWOFA President

The annual Sunshine List published by the province makes it clear that senior administrators at Western get enormous salaries. But do they get other perks as well?

OCUFA recently requested access, under the Freedom of Information Act, to “the current employment contracts” for selected senior administrators here at Western. In return OCUFA received a number of letters with some passages blacked out in the interest of privacy. Still, enough information remains to establish that in addition to high salaries, many senior administrators do receive perks not reflected (I assume) in the Sunshine List.

The most obvious such perk is an annual research stipend for administrators who are academics. The table below, for instance, lists the 2007 salary information given on the 2008 Sunshine List and the annual research stipend for several administrators. Remember that these research stipends are given automatically, i.e., administrators don’t have to apply for them in the way the faculty generally have to apply for research funding.

The big winner in the “research stipends” sweepstakes would seem to be Alan Weedon. He gets \$60K/yr to support his scholarly activities and this may be used to appoint a Research Associate in his laboratory. He also gets up to an

additional \$20K/yr to support the research activities of that Associate.

There are other perks scattered here and there. The University pays “annual C.A. Professional fees and Rotary Club dues” for Gitta Kulczycki (I requested the amounts here for the latest year available and they are “nil” for Rotary dues and \$981.75 for the C.A. Professional fees). A 2007 letter to Ted Garrard acknowledged that he will be moving to Toronto (“where you will be nearer to our very large alumni and donor base in the GTA, and closer to Pearson Airport”), and gets travel expenses to and from London as well as \$1,000/month “for overnight stays in London.” He was also offered a one-time payment of \$18,000 to be used for moving expenses and legal expenses associated with buying a new home, “with any balance treated as a retention bonus.”

Dramatic salary increases must also be regarded as a perk. John

Doerksen and Linda Miller, for instance, were appointed in 2008, and Alan Weedon was reappointed in 2008– and some interesting patterns emerge if we compare their salaries at appointment with their 2007 salaries from the Sunshine List. Thus, John Doerksen’s salary in 2007 was \$103,648. In the letter of appointment from the Provost, he was offered a base salary of \$138,000/yr and an administrative stipend of \$20,000/yr starting September 2008 – for a total increase of almost \$55,000 over his 2007 salary. Linda Miller’s 2007 salary was \$121,068. In her letter of appointment from the Provost she was offered a base salary of \$145,000/yr starting July 2008 along with an administrative stipend of \$20,000/yr – for a total increase of almost \$44,000 over her 2007 salary. Of course it’s no surprise to learn that moving up the administrative ladder means a big bump in salary. I only point out the bump in salary often equals the

Name	Position	2007 Salary	Research stipend/yr
Fred Longstaffe	Provost/VP	\$265,775	\$60,000
Ted Hewitt	VP (Research)	\$212,625	\$30,000
Gitta Kulczycki	VP (Admin)	\$228,150	
Ted Garrard	VP (External)	\$267,999	
John Doerksen	Vice Provost		\$20,000
Linda Miller	Vice Provost		\$15,000
Alan Weedon	Vice Provost	\$164,958	\$60,000

entire salary of staff who have been here for years.

Alan Weedon's compensation in 2007 was \$164,958. In the letter of appointment from the Provost sent in March 2008, he was offered a base salary of \$165,000 (starting July 2008) and an administrative stipend of \$20,000. In other words, starting July 2008 Alan Weedon received \$185,000/yr, which is an increase of more than 12% over his 2007 compensation level.

There are usually two justifications offered for the high compensation levels given to senior administrators: first, these compensation levels here are at or below comparable compensation levels elsewhere, and second, compensation levels need to be high to attract qualified people. The first justification, even if true (and I haven't checked this), seems to me completely dependent upon the second. After all, if the second justification is wrong, then the fact that other universities are lavishing money on

administrators is hardly a reason for us to do it. So: do we truly need these extraordinarily high salaries to attract qualified people? Again, as I said in discussing the President's salary, this is never tested, and no one has ever brought forward evidence that it's true. Quite the contrary, I imagine that there are a great many qualified people in this university who would and could do what is required, just as effectively as the current incumbents, for a lot less money.

In the September Faculty Times I reported on the post-retirement arrangements made for Paul Davenport, and Maclean's has also done a story on this "platinum handshake." See: <http://oncampus.macleans.ca/education/2008/07/02/uwo-president-to-get-platinum-handshake-upon-retirement-in-2009/>. Remember just how lucrative those arrangements are. According to the Maclean's story, in *addition* to his regular pension, he will receive a "Special Executive

Pension" that "will pay him \$123,030/year if he begins drawing from it after his 65th birthday" as well as a retiring allowance that Maclean's estimates will be "somewhat more than \$700,000." [Question for the week: how many faculty and staff jobs could be saved over the next few years if Paul Davenport were to receive only his regular UWO Pension?]

There is no mention in the letters obtained by OCUFA of any post-retirement arrangements comparable to those available to Paul Davenport, but – just to be sure - I asked on UWOFAs behalf if such arrangements exist. The answer was that they do not exist. But remember that UWOFAs has also requested a copy of the contract for the new president, Amit Chakma, when it becomes available. So far we've not received anything. In this economic climate, will the Board of Governors promise him a platinum handshake similar to Paul Davenport's? Stay tuned.

Equity Committee workshop

Age discrimination in academia

Age discrimination is an invisible opponent. It is not, therefore, viewed as a serious form of discrimination, despite the fact that mature workers can suffer the same economic, social and psychological problems as those who experience other forms of discrimination. On the UWO campus this issue surfaced last fall, when the claim was made that the aging professoriate

was restricting the options of younger scholars seeking to obtain full-time employment in the academy. In the current economic climate there is even more pressure to show the door to our expensive elders, who cost twice as much as junior faculty.

But this issue affects faculty and students in even more complex

ways. Not only the greying professoriate is seen as an obstacle to a healthy academic environment. PhD students are considered 'mature' at 35, and are passed over in favour of younger peers. Contract/limited term employees age as they wait for full-time positions, which are awarded to younger individuals with the same or fewer credentials. Beneath this lies our

obsession with youth. In the classroom, it would seem, only youthful professors will have relevant things to say, will be attractive and will be able to work the technology. Women are doubly jeopardized, for they 'age' much sooner than men. Also doubly vulnerable is the mature person who is disabled or a member of another minority group.

The Equity Committee of UWOFA hosted a workshop on January 21st, with the intention of making this invisible opponent visible. Five speakers gave brief presentations, then the session was open for comments and personal stories from the floor, where a diverse audience of approximately 70 persons shared their experiences of discrimination based upon their age.

Gaile McGregor (Sociology) pointed out the legal invisibility of age discrimination, highlighting the fact that – unlike the better known forms of intolerance like sexism and racism – only a few cases of ageism ever make it to human rights tribunals, and an even fewer number actually win. Julie McMullin (Associate Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences) described the difficulties people face when seeking accommodation in the workplace for problems that might draw attention to their age. They seek to deny the aging process, for they are constantly faced with the (unfounded) claim that younger workers learn faster and are better able to learn new technology. Michael Lynk (Faculty of Law)

pointed out that being able to work as long as one is able and wishes is a fundamental human right. Where age intersects with disability, gender, religion, ethnic background, religion, etc., this right is even more likely to recede. The current situation in which mature workers cannot afford to retire is leaving individuals open to even more intense age discrimination. Donna Moore (Mature Students Advisor) spoke about the issues arising from this population (that spans 23-62 years of age). Older students, despite the fact that their performance is enhanced by their having greater dedication, a better work ethic and more mature relationships with instructors, routinely feel isolated from their younger peers, and suffer from the need to accommodate family responsibilities and financial difficulties (being ineligible for many scholarships). Younger students frequently regard them with skepticism, as they are *too old to pursue a degree*.

Myeegun Henry (Chippewa-of-the-Thames First Nation) provided an alternative model, one that struck a responsive chord in everyone present. He told a Creation story, one that laid down as natural a human life-cycle that passes through seven stages. At each stage the value of elders is acknowledged, as they guide the younger members of their community. The wisdom they have gained from their life experiences qualifies them to help others to live balanced lives and to reach their full potential.

How could we begin to develop strategies on campus that even remotely resemble this approach to our 'elders'? Audience members had some suggestions:

1. Consider ways of sensitizing younger colleagues to the value of their elders.
2. Find a place where mentoring of younger by older colleagues could take place.
3. Consider a more holistic approach to the workplace, focusing on a 'workplace' policy rather than a 'retirement' policy.
4. Compile a university volunteer bureau, where the skills of senior faculty could be considered as a resource for the broader community.
5. When assessing the value of a PhD consider the quality not the age of an applicant.

The general feeling was that this was only a beginning, a naming of an issue that needs serious attention. The presentations by the speakers were audio-taped, and this can be made available upon request.

UWOFA Equity Committee

Bonnie MacLachlan (Chair)
 Vickie Croley
 Luiz Capretz
 Randa Farah
 Karl Hele
 Denise Horoky
 Elizabeth Mantz
 Gaile McGregor
 Wendy Pearson
 Susan Rodger

We're Number 14!

By Vince Gray & Kristin Hoffmann

Librarians and archivists at Western have the dubious distinction of earning the lowest average salary among our peers. Fourteen Canadian institutions belong to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), and Western ranks at number fourteen. Our average salary in Fiscal Year 2008 was \$66,739, while the average for all Canadian ARL institutions was \$12,300 higher.

Western's average salary for librarians and archivists has been consistently at the bottom of the ARL standings, with one exception. The reporting data for 2007 placed us at unlucky number thirteen -- \$125 ahead of Laval. With negotiations fast approaching, we are knocking on wood, tossing salt over our shoulders (and trusting in the hard work of our Salary Subcommittee) in the hope that this next Collective Agreement will move us permanently out of last spot.

Will 2009 be our lucky year? To see how far we still need to go, let's take a closer look at the salary gains from our first Collective Agreement.

New salary model

The Librarians and Archivists' Collective Agreement was ratified in September 2006. The most significant change to our salary model was the introduction of

merit increases based on the annual performance review. The contract also provided annual 3% increases. In an effort to address the egregiously low salaries of mid- and long-career Members, there were nominal increases to salary based on years of service and years at the salary cap. Finally, there was an increase in salary for recently-hired Members of 0.5% or 1.0%, corresponding to a UWOFA-LA proposed (and rejected) increase in Western pension contributions. The benefit package was not changed from the previous PMA package.

Another change with a potential effect on salaries was the introduction of ranks and salary floors for each rank. While the previous PMA agreement had salary caps, these caps were removed with the new Collective Agreement.

What happened

There was no salary increase in the first year (2006/07) of the Collective Agreement, since an increase had already been accepted by our Members under the provisions of the preceding PMA agreement. Over the first year of the contract, the Transition Committee evaluated all Members and established the rank into which each Member would be placed in 2007/08.

On July 1, 2007, Members were placed into their new ranks, and received salary increases. After all increases listed above were applied, the Member received the maximum of their newly-calculated salary or the floor salary for their rank. On July 1, 2008, Members received the scale increase of 3% and merit pay calculated based on performance.

Effect of increases

Between 2005/06 and 2006/07, the total salary commitment for the 48 Members for whom data were available increased by 3.86%. The following year, salaries of all 55 Members increased by 8.26%. If we assume that without the contract, the salaries would have increased in 2007/08 in the same fashion as 2006/07, we can calculate that the approximate salary cost of the contract to the Administration was \$162,000 (\$2,940 per member). To put this amount into the context of the University's budget, Western's Senate recently chose to add an indexed \$90,000 annual top-up to our outgoing President's pension.

Further comparisons

As we saw above, our Members' average salary in Fiscal Year 2008 was \$12,300 below the Canadian ARL average. In Fiscal Year 2007, before the Collective Agreement's salary increases were

applied, our average salary was \$12,964 less than the Canadian ARL average – hardly a significant increase.

Comparison with US salaries is completely dependent on the vagaries of exchange rates but even with a favourable exchange rate in Fiscal Year 2008, Western salaries were, on average, \$3,955 US less than the US comparators (Arizona, Iowa, Michigan State, North Carolina, Ohio State) used by Western administration. In 2005, when the exchange rate was less favourable, Western salaries were \$13,204 US less than the US comparators.

What about comparisons closer to home? Looking at figures disclosed because of Ontario's Sunshine Law, we see that only two librarians at Western earned more than \$100,000 in 2007, and they both held administrative roles, outside the Bargaining Unit. In contrast, there were 39 librarians at the University of Toronto earning over \$100,000, 23 at Carleton, nine at Windsor, and six at Trent.

It's never fun to be in last place, but the consequences of low salaries extend beyond how we feel about being at the bottom. Our

low salaries result in reduced buying power in every year of our careers, and, since Western pensions are based directly on the contributions made while employed, stunted career earnings lead to a stunted future pension. It's not too late to remedy the situation, but we have a lot of catching up to do.

Vince Gray is Chair of the Librarians and Archivists Salary Subcommittee.

Kristin Hoffmann is the UWOFA Board Representative for Librarians & Archivists.

Book Notes

The corporate assault on academic integrity

By Paul Handford, Associate Professor in the Department of Biology

"Within the unique university context, the most crucial of all human rights are the rights of freedom of speech, academic freedom, and freedom of research. And we affirm that these rights are meaningless unless they entail the right to raise deeply disturbing questions and provocative challenges to the cherished beliefs of society at large and of the university itself.¹"

Many would accept this statement as a fair expression of a central attribute of the University, indispensable—along with institutional autonomy—to its role in

protecting and furthering the public good. Many might further expect that such rights are well and widely understood and observed. But the most recent title in the CAUT book series² shows this is far from the general case on today's campus. This

"The assault on integrity has evidently been broad, powerful and sustained, with major systemic and individual impacts."

volume, focusing on how academic integrity can become compromised under private sector influences, includes contributions from 18 academics, of diverse discipline, most of whom gave papers at the 2nd Harry Crowe Foundation conference, *Protecting the Integrity of Academic Work*, held in Ottawa in November, 2007, upon which this volume is based.

The massively expanded corporate influence in universities is, of course, old news to most of us; yet the stories and perspectives presented here provide a sobering impression of profound and widespread decadence of the academy.

The assault on integrity has evidently been broad, powerful and sustained, with major systemic and individual impacts.

A watershed event is identified as the passage by the U.S. Congress of the Bayh-Dole Act in 1980, affording intellectual property rights to universities, thus allowing them to profit by commercial exploitation of findings from (government-funded) research programs. Universities began to engage in ‘academic capitalism’ through direct investment in diverse enterprises. In this way, public institutions and resources came to subsidize private initiatives, while those profits accrued to the private rather than to the public domain.

Many will have read of the appalling and scandalous treatment of Nancy Olivieri and David Healey at the hands of pharmaceutical companies associated with their research, and of their miserable betrayal by the University of Toronto. Several of this book’s chapters show that these are far from isolated or unusual cases; moreover, Brenda Gallie reminds us that many of the victims in the original Olivieri case, despite their legal triumphs, are still being persecuted by their corporate

“partners” more than 10 years after the main events, for their presumption in putting society’s welfare before the profits and image of their corporate sponsors or employer. Gallie makes an eloquent case that whistle-blowers pay a real and substantial price; much of the ordeal visited upon them can only be described as massively vindictive, concerned not simply to discipline, but to destroy, perhaps to provide an example to others. Altogether, this book makes clear the harsh realities of private pressures on academics and on the institutions wherein they work.

Arthur Schafer argues, by analogy with the judicial system, that the integrity of academic research can be securely safeguarded only by what he calls “sequestration”. He insists that if society values the integrity and trustworthiness of public science in the public interest, it will have to be paid for by the public purse. Schafer acknowledges that many will see such rollback as impossible. He points out, however, that the present state of affairs attaches to a substantial *de facto* price tag, both monetary and ethical.

There seems little doubt that many academics in both univer-

sities and government face serious challenges in dealing with contemporary realities in academic research with a commercial dimension, especially in the sciences—challenges that can have an impact on their entire professional lives. The institutions in which they work face other challenges if public trust in the reliability and impartiality of research findings is not to become terminally impugned.

Western’s administration has often insisted that “this could never happen here”. Yet the U of T’s fine statements utterly failed Healey, Olivieri and colleagues. We need regular careful review of the terms of all corporate-sponsored research, to reassure all that there is no prospect of such practices as ghost authorship, sequestering of research results and the like, and for plainly stated guarantees that the institution will always protect and support researchers’ academic freedoms.

¹ *Statement of Institutional Purpose*. University of Toronto Governing Council. October 15, 1992.

² *Universities at Risk: How politics, special interests and corporatization threaten academic integrity*. Ed. James L. Turk. CAUT Series #9, Lorimer & Co., Toronto. 2008. 416pp., \$24.95.