

---

# FACULTY TIMES

*A Newsletter of UWOFA*

---

Vol.VII, No.2

May 2003

inside ...

Western Democracy, 3  
Becoming and Being, 5  
Why Coaches Matter, 6  
To Ratify Or Not? 7  
Challenges Ahead, 8  
Reflections on UWOFA, 9  
Show Me the Money, 10  
Long Live Negotiations, 11  
Legacies & lessons, 12  
A well-deserved raise, 15  
Centralized power, 17

---

**Faculty Times** is an official publication of the University of Western Ontario Faculty Association.

Published for UWOFA by the Publication & Communication Committee.

Signed articles do not necessarily reflect the views of UWOFA.

---

**Faculty Times** welcomes contributions and letters to the Editor. We look forward to lively responses and debate on issues related to UWOFA and its membership.

Bernd Frohmann, *Editor*

## Shock and Awe, Western Style

*by Paul Handford*

*Editor's note: This is a lightly edited version of the author's last President's Report, presented to the General Meeting of the Faculty Association, 10 April 2003.*

I have decided to use the opportunity provided by this final President's Report to make a few personal reflections on events of the last year. I should like to make these remarks as an Association Member who just happened to occupy the Chair during the last year; so these aren't official statements: they are personal views and reactions.

In the summer of 2001, and into the fall of that year, I cherished the fond hope that the new contract might be pretty much wrapped up before I should take office in May 2002. History has shown me a fool to have entertained such thoughts, but I'm sure that I am not alone in this kind of folly: I imagine that Albert Katz, our VP, very soon to take presidential office himself, will have looked on in disbelief, not to say dismay, as my presidency has ticked steadily by, while our new contract edged only grudgingly closer. It is clear that we won't have our new contract any time soon, and one has to wonder: how can this have taken so long?

In retrospect, I suppose we might wonder if perhaps we began our bargaining preparations too late—but it certainly didn't seem so at the time. Given the same sort of ground rules and good will as were in place last time around, the notion of starting the survey work in the fall of 2001 and getting the

goals and language in place for early in 2002 seemed to offer an entirely reasonable prospect of having the new contract in place at the latest before the new academic year should start, in Sept. 2002.

However, it quickly became clear that the ground rules were not the same; and while one shrinks from suggesting that good will has not been present in the same measure as before, I must convey to you my impression that at least the same level of respect has not been shown to our team—the respect that they are entitled to as the legal representatives of the Membership. This became apparent even on Day One where our team was treated to what was presumably intended as a sort of local “Shock and Awe” display: something to stun the opposition into disarray. Fortunately, our team is made of sterling stuff, and, while momentarily shocked perhaps, they were not awed. They were, however, dismayed: it portended a rather messy future.

And so it has proved to be—as we all know—for this has been a rather sorry tale of foot-dragging and dilatory inventiveness: despite our being ready to begin talks in March, we could not start until July—four months were lost. Now it is true that delay is almost always of some benefit to management—at the very least they save

money by not paying interest on back-pay where a settlement is made after the expiry of the contract, as in the present case. But delay is also a tool of control and a demonstration of power relations. Of course, negotiations *are* all about power—there's no mistake about that—but it seems to me that the present negotiations have been expressive of a particular conception and exercise of power. I have the impression that the Administration has, through its team, sought to build upon a style which has been evolving since the ratification of our last contract, through the Joint Committee for the implementation of the Collective Agreement, and through the machinery of the grievance process: a style based in non-co-operation, obstruction, delay and frustration. The conduct of these negotiations seems to me to be of a piece with this approach to faculty relations.

This approach has made it very difficult for us to do our job. For example, we were obliged to wait sometimes months for the Administration to provide us with the information we need, and which they must provide, in order for us to develop our bargaining positions; in the grievance arena, one gets the clear impression of the Collective Agreement's being used as a tool for keeping the Membership in line rather than as a set of rules to keep dispute resolution orderly. It is far too rare an event that Members' complaints are settled easily and amicably, with a straightforward focus on *the problem*; rather, we too often become diverted into a truly stultifying series of ritual exchanges, focused on procedural minutiae, whose only sure result has been a deepening alienation of the faculty from their Administration (who, by the way, seem to have long forgotten their historical role as the University's civil service). We have witnessed, in short, the development of an adversarial bureaucratic arrogance, married with a paternalistic disdain: the style of these negotiations seems to me to reflect that style very well.

The saddest aspect of this state of affairs is that the senior Administration seems largely unaware of the gravity of the alienation, the anger and the sense of hurt that has developed across broad segments of the campus. Nonetheless, I can tell you that I have taken many opportunities to convey this situation as clearly and forcefully as conditions permit to Western's President and Provost, along with

the kind of incident and behaviour that feeds it. I wish I could report to you that this message has been received loud and clear; unfortunately, I am not confident that it has been heard or attended to.

Following the Administration's absurd first salary offer, the Membership voted decisively to give the Union a strike mandate. Shortly after that, the Administration tendered their "comprehensive package." Since this package was non-negotiable, UWOFA responded by offering to send all outstanding issues to arbitration, which offer was declined, as you all know. It has been conjectured that this refusal simply makes it clear that the Administration knew well that to have accepted our offer would have been to run a grave risk: in other words, their refusal can be interpreted as an acknowledgement, on their part, that their package was inadequate. In any event, UWOFA had already decided that if the offer of arbitration were rejected, then conciliation would be sought, and as you know, on the 16<sup>th</sup> of April there will have been a third encounter of this kind.

So, what are the prospects? We hope, as ever, that reason will ultimately prevail, and that our Administration will see the wisdom of making a deal with the faculty that makes Western a place that can hope to attract and retain good academics—and continue to do so—in a time of severe hiring competition. However, the portents are not immediately encouraging: The Administration continues to insist that our compensation and benefits package is competitive; in a recent meeting of Senate the Provost apparently suggested that the primary reason that we may fail in the hiring and retention stakes has nothing to do with poor compensation, but with the fact that we don't have a good spousal hiring policy. Members will weigh this proposition for themselves.

Recently, it became apparent, by some "leak" or other, that the Administration has contingency plans to deal with the eventuality of a salary settlement that they see as "beyond their means." These plans apparently involve making further cuts to faculty budgets, among other things. Now what is the message here? Of course, this "plan" is consistent with selling a picture of our pay demands as being truly beyond the real means of the University's budget: there really isn't enough money. But

more than that, it suggests that if faculty greedily insist on more than is really feasible, then there is no alternative but to take it out of what we can give to support of the faculties: so we have a view of the selfish faculty growing fatter, but at the expense of our poor students. The Administration is portrayed as having no capacity to respond otherwise.

But all this should be recognised as prevarication: we must *always* remember that all Ontario's universities are operating in pretty much the same environment; in that environment, most other institutions have steadily pulled away from us, and are also hiring aggressively. So we must continue to ask: what's so special about UWOFA? Perhaps the dollars really are there in Stevenson-Lawson but are being spent other than on the faculty (we know our share of the Operating Budget has fallen from 30% to 20% over the last ten years or so)—spent, say, on the Research Park, or other pet projects—in which case the Administration must be prevailed upon to shift its policy. Or, perhaps the dollars truly aren't there, in which case the Administration should perhaps consider resigning, despite their recent handsome raises.

So my overall impression from this year is that the Administration is determined to push ahead with a corporate managerial style that is not well-designed to win hearts and minds; that they are unaware of, or unconcerned about, the alienating consequences of their paternalism, and that they just will not listen until it becomes unavoidable. In the coming year we must make them hear.

Remember: our demands are fair and reasonable. They are to make *all* aspects of this university commensurate with its status as one of the country's premier academies.

Remember: the Administration seeks to wear down the Union and the Membership, to its advantage, through delay, obstruction and distraction—to persuade them to give up and go away.

Remember: the University is nothing without its faculty and students.

I urge the Membership to stay the course: continue to insist on being treated fairly and reasonably; continue to support your Association and its Negotiating Team.

*Paul Handford is Past President of UWOFA and Associate Professor in the Department of Biology.*

# From Senate to UWOFA: Reflections on Western Democracy

by Albert Katz

## Democracy at work in Senate

I served for two terms, four consecutive years, as a member of Western's Senate, elected from Social Sciences. This was in the days just prior to and just after the Membership voted to certify. I have never been as disillusioned with the governance of Western as I was during those years, and the Senate experience was directly responsible for my willingness to let my name stand for election to the UWOFA Board and, later, for Vice-President of UWOFA. During those days, I often heard words that our Association was "an old boys club" and that "there was no difference between the Association and the Administration." Whether those sentiments were ever true, they are, categorically, not true today.

When I went to Senate, it was with the expectation that it was a place where issues of academic importance are debated and considered in an open, collegial manner. But I was disappointed, and my four years often felt like a long exercise in black humour. The Senate is constituted of roughly three constituencies: students, elected faculty members and a large number of people in management positions, such as Deans and Vice-Presidents. The students and management tend to act as single blocks. Faculty, except for a select few, are often invisible and tend to reflect the specific concerns of their academic Units. There is no coherent or strong voice to express concerns held about workload or renewal or compensation, issues of concern to faculty members across the University. Indeed, the mix of constituencies provide the Administration an easy "divide and conquer" tactic, setting student issues against those of importance to faculty members and, when dividing resources, one Faculty against the next.

But faculty members are disadvantaged in other ways. Much of the real work of the Senate is done at the committee level, with the Administration having a strong *ex officio* presence in those committees and power over who gets nominated as additional committee members. The prepackaged administrative agenda comes to the Senate floor from these committees. If you are not a member of a committee, and most Senate faculty members are not, then the only notice of the issues to be voted upon comes in a very large package, two or three days at most before the Senate meeting, hardly time to understand the complexities of the issues to be debated, or to poll Members of your Unit for their opinion, or to find two or three other Senate members to join you should you wish to protest some controversial initiative. And, in the Senate meeting itself, the agenda is controlled and manipulated by the Administration. Questions can be and often are asked. Obtaining clear and concrete answers is somewhat more difficult.

One of my most memorable and, to me, canonical moments of Senatorial black humour was when, during what passes for debate on the annual budget, a faculty member asked whether any of the arguments that had been presented would lead to changes in the presented budget. With admirable candour our Provost and Vice-President (Academic) answered: "Well, no."

In the end, I did not see the Senate as a forum for debate or for the effective expression of concerns to our Membership, but as a rubber stamp for the often myopic vision of administrative policies. One of my most memorable and, to me, canonical moments of Senatorial black humour was

when, during what passes for debate on the annual budget, a faculty member asked whether any of the arguments that had been presented would lead to changes in the presented budget. With admirable candour our Provost and Vice-President (Academic) answered: "Well, no." I left the Senate with a strong conviction that faculty members need an independent voice to champion our concerns.

## Democracy at Work at UWOFA

So how does that experience compare with my experience with the Board of UWOFA and as Vice-President? It's simple. We are a democracy. The Administration is not and can never be. Our strength comes from the will and energy of our Membership. The Administration's leadership is backed by those who control the purse strings and a too compliant set of Deans who, at least in public, rarely disagree with the central Administration even when damage is done to their Units. If UWOFA was ever an "old boys club," and I

have no reason to believe that it ever was, it is no longer. With changes to our Constitution each Faculty is represented on the Board, and Full-Time and Part-Time Members are elected at large across the campus. One of my greatest pleasures this past year was to see the number of new people elected to the UWOFA Board for 2003-2004.

We most certainly do not govern like the Administration does. Unlike Senate, where there is a climate of adherence to the "company line," at Board

meetings your representatives argue concerns arising from your Units. We hear the voice of Ivey as well as that of Arts, FIMS as well as Science, Engineering as well as Music, Law as well as Health Sciences. Decisions made at the Board have to be ratified by the Membership at large. Our General Meetings are not closed

committees but open to any member of the Association. We have a constitution unlike any other faculty association in Canada: we have provisions where a petition by about 10% of the Membership can force a ballot vote by the whole membership as a means of ensuring that decisions truly reflect the will of our Members.

#### Costs of our democratic process

Democracy and a climate of transparency is messy and has its costs. Our negotiating positions, for instance, are posted on our website so that our Members can be fully informed, but this information is available also to the Administration's Negotiating Team. They can see what we intend to present and can draft their positions accordingly. Our Negotiating Team does not see the Administration's proposals until they are presented at the table. This puts us at a very distinct negotiating disadvantage. Association members are free to express their personal opinions to the media, as they should be, whereas the Administration tightly controls what it presents so that one message, and one message alone, is conveyed. This asymmetry can give the impression to the less informed that we are disorganized and divided. There are costs to democracy, but it has the benefit that the will of our Members is represented. When the members of our Association, and the Members of our Bargaining Unit, stand together, we do so on a principled basis.

Our democracy depends upon ongoing communication between the elected members of the Board and the Membership at large. In the year just past, your Board and Negotiating Team have scheduled many General Meetings and published numerous Bulletins. We will continue to keep our Membership up to date with events as they unfold. I would like to see more Unit representatives—non-elected members in each department—who can

inform their colleagues quickly about ongoing circumstances, and can communicate responses from their colleagues on matters to be considered by the Board. I would like to initiate regular contacts with Chairs of Departments so those Members with responsibilities for implementing the Collective Agreement can alert us to problems that they face at the ground level.

The Administration's leadership is backed by those who control the purse strings and a too compliant set of Deans who, at least in public, rarely disagree with the central Administration even when damage is done to their Units.

As I write this, after about nine months without a contract, a tentative agreement has been reached. This achievement was the result of a Herculean effort by your Negotiating Team and by the solidarity given them by the Membership. For the first time in the history of this academy, faculty members voted to give their Board the power to call a strike. As far as I am aware there were more faculty members who turned out to vote on this issue than ever before at Western. Moreover, more people voted "Yes" to job action, if necessary, than had voted to certify our union. The way that Paul Handford, our outgoing President, Mike Dawes, our Chief Negotiator, the Negotiating Team, and the UWOFA Board conducted the process of keeping the membership aware of events as they unfolded was, to me, a model of

an organization that cares about, listens and responds to its members.

#### Restoring collegiality

I began this piece on my disillusionment with how the Administration controls Senate. Over the past year, as Vice-President of UWOFA I have recognized that the management of the elected Senate faculty members is only one instance of how our Administration manages all of Western's faculty members. Both in Senate and beyond we see the spin-doctoring of facts, the denigration of the work done by many in our Membership, the failure to be open and honest, and tactics that set one Unit against the next, designed to divide us and set factions of our diverse membership against one another. From grievances I have seen how mean-spirited our Administration can be in dealing with individual colleagues, often, I think, with the sole purpose of putting us in "our place." The disillusionment felt by too many of our Members is, unfortunately, not new. It has evolved, in my more than twenty-five years at Western, from the time when the word "collegial" was found in almost every article in the *Western News*, to today, when it is seldom if ever employed.

One of my aims as President will be to work towards increasing trust, goodwill and collegiality in the interactions between the Membership and the Administration. For this to work, our Administration will have to listen to our concerns, and understand the malaise that exists on this campus. As President of UWOFA, my job will be to remind the Administration of our real place in the academy, and who we are. We are not the makers of widgets nor are we the widgets. We are the University.

*Albert Katz is President of UWOFA and Professor in the Department of Psychology.*

---

**The Double Cohort is Coming!** Advice to Workload Committees: specify maximum course section enrollments as part of Normal Workload. This will allow you to measure increased Workload. Under the tentative Collective Agreement, Deans are mandated to return the workload of a Unit to Normal Workload within two years when workload exceeds Normal Workload.

---

# On Becoming (and Being) UWOFAs Vice-President

by Allan Gedalof

*Editor's note: This paper was submitted before a tentative collective agreement had been reached.*

## Lessons of 31 years

It's an odd thing to be acclaimed to what one believes to be a position of considerable responsibility. My first thought was of Ambrose Bierce's definition of the word "abdication" in his wonderfully anarchic *Devil's Dictionary*. It seemed to me that it could serve equally well as a definition of acclamation. He defines it as "an act that testifies to the high temperature of the throne." I hasten to add that I hardly think of the position as a throne; a footstool seems more apt for anyone wearing a hollow crown. Nevertheless, having now worked at Western for thirty-one years, I'm quite used to both high temperatures, and to the other condition that might have led others to avoid such a job: hard work had better be its own reward at Western, because my experience suggests that any other rewards will be given both grudgingly and belatedly.

Over those thirty-one years, I've seen the continuously increasing but not progressive bureaucratization of this university, where it seems that there is always money for another vice-president, and for generous salary increments for apparently always deserving senior administrators. Meanwhile, many departments have fewer faculty and staff teaching and serving more students, running more programs, producing more and higher quality research, while being micro-managed and over-scrutinized by that growing body of senior administrators who have to find something to do to attempt to justify their positions and salaries. We seem to now spend so much time reporting to administrators of various stripes what we're doing, with every report or CV requiring a different format, that it's a wonder we have any time to do the work that gets reported.

Yet, despite these conditions, we not only do the work, but do it well, evidenced by the growing number of research and teaching awards and other forms of recognition earned by our Members. And while there is an orgy of self-congratulation among administrators as Western's rankings rise in various ratings of Canadian and international universities, they seem to have lost sight of the fact that their

only role in the earning of those rankings has been to (sometimes) crow over our hard work and achievements when it suits them, but to remind us that we're not all that good when it comes to raises that will put us level with our colleagues at comparable and even at less highly-rated institutions, and in internal appraisals, annual performance evaluations, and the granting of promotion and tenure.

Indeed, I know of several cases where the same transient poster boy or girl, lauded one day for their extraordinary achievements and contributions to their disciplines and the academic community, are the next day told that there's something else they neglected to do enough of, some little point of vulnerability for which they will now be punished by having a promotion, a well-deserved raise, or a sabbatical denied.

One of the many things at this institution that I cannot comprehend is why Western, given the general high quality and the undoubted considerable achievements of its faculty, is so grudging in rewarding its very many hard-working and high-achieving citizens with appropriate raises and promotions. I wonder also why so many Departments have bought into what seems to me a culture characterized by a massive inferiority complex. We promote more slowly than most Canadian Universities, and we have a draconian merit pay system that, in order to reward a few, requires us to tell many of our excellent and hard-working colleagues that their performance is sub-standard when in fact they are doing everything that can be reasonably be expected of them, and in many cases even more.

Not only is this divisive practise deeply demoralizing, but in a period such as the one we continue to suffer through, when for years raises have not kept pace with inflation and the rise in the cost of living, it is particularly unconscionable. There is no doubt that this combination of circumstances, an increased workload, low wages, shrinking staff support, belated and grudging recognition of all sorts of achievements, slow career progress, and a resulting feeling of being undervalued, has led

to the many departures of highly talented faculty members that we are now experiencing and that we will continue to experience unless we are successful in at least coming close to our goals in the current round of contract negotiations.

All of this should indicate to you that I strongly support the goals and efforts of our current Board and Negotiating Team in their attempt to secure for all of us, notably including our part-time and limited-term colleagues who contribute so much to the intellectual and cultural life of this institution under such adverse and anxious conditions, working conditions that will allow us to serve our students, our disciplines, and our society as well as we can.

## Lessons of negotiations

As I write this, that agreement still seems far away as the administration's professional curmudgeons continue to employ tactics that delay, obstruct, obfuscate and misrepresent. Like most of you, I still hope that we can reach an agreement without the need for strike action, but I also have to confess that there is precious little that I have seen or heard in the actions or pronouncements of the administrators that gives me hope of a speedy and amicable conclusion to our egregiously protracted negotiations.

If the current round of conciliation fails, and strike we must, I hope that we will be unanimous and unequivocal in support of that action, signalling as strongly as possible our outright rejection of the insulting offers and conditions the Administration would like us to settle for in our long-overdue agreement, and our commitment to fairness for all members of the bargaining unit, and to the best interests of our students and communities.

Eventually, that agreement will be reached, and if we stick to our course and our well-founded principles and goals, the pill may not be too bitter to swallow. I have no doubt, though, that the way these negotiations have been conducted will leave a great many of us with a bad taste in our mouths, and a lot of

work that remains to be done in the years ahead.

One thing that is clear from the current negotiations is that we cannot wait until near the end of the term of a collective agreement to review our positions and goals, but must work between contracts both on our own and with the Administration to establish points of common cause and to identify and work on areas of dispute. In general, we have to do better at finding and strengthening those areas of common cause with the Administration and the students.

I was somewhat dismayed, although not surprised, when the University Students Council turned down overwhelmingly a motion to support the faculty in their negotiations with the Administration. Rather, they passed a motion supporting themselves, urging both sides to come to an agreement in a way that didn't interfere with their timely passage through the academic year, which I suppose is understandable. Among the many things that this signalled to me was that although we have a great deal of common cause with our students, that common cause is ill-understood, just as it is with the Administration. Faculty and students, as I understand it, are the very heart of the university; the rest is resources whose purpose

is to let the faculty and students get on with their jobs in the best way possible.

We also have to do a better job of representing what we do as university researchers and teachers, not as individuals but as practitioners of a profession that makes all living stranger and more wonderful. UWOFA, like the CAUT itself, has a job to do in representing that profession and its value to the larger community in a way that goes beyond the functions of a union that represents us in negotiations with the Administration.

#### What UWOFA can do

Over the next few years, we will be joined by a sizable, perhaps unprecedented number of new colleagues necessitated by enrolment growth, the backlog of departed and unreplaced colleagues, as well as the spate of current retirements and departures for conspicuously greener pastures. Even though the Administration still refuses to put its own promises for faculty renewal and growth in writing in the new agreement, some significant number will be hired, and there will be a lot we can and should do for them. We can do better than we have historically done at introducing them to institutional life at Western, to what they can expect under the Collective Agreement, to the tenure and promotion

process, to the status and rights of sessional, limited-term and part-time instructors, to what UWOFA does and can do for them, and to ways that they can contribute to and have an impact on life at Western and the community beyond. We need to do what we can to welcome these people to Western, and to involve them in the life of the institution. We can also play a larger role in celebrating the achievements of all of our members.

At the university, we have the important responsibilities, through our research, publication, and teaching, to preserve and better understand the past, to do damage control and generally improve the present, and to do what we can to secure a better and kinder future for our planet and all those who share it, while subscribing to and practising the highest ethical and professional standards. There is no road for us but the high road, which UWOFA must take in its attempts to provide for all of us conditions that enable us to do our best work, to be productive in the interests of our students and the communities beyond our gates that we ultimately serve. I assure you that I will work as hard as I can towards those ends, and to serve the interests of our Membership.

*Allan Gedalof is Vice-President of UWOFA and Professor in the Department of English.*

## Why Coaches Matter

by *Aniko Varpalotai*

A collective agreement is a collection of articles that establish the relationship between the university Administration and both the Faculty Association and Members of the Bargaining Unit. Some articles pertain to all Members, whereas others are specific to smaller groups with unique needs and circumstances. The latter is the case with Faculty Coaches. They are now subsumed under but clearly identified in the Article *Alternative Workload* (interim sign-off). Faculty Coaches are those who hold combined positions as Members within particular academic units in addition to coaching a varsity sport, and have been formally designated as Faculty Coaches. Currently this group numbers fewer than a dozen Members, although there

are many more coaches who may also be Members, or who are hired from the community on a part-time or volunteer basis to coach or assist in coaching an intercollegiate team.

Faculty Coaches had not been explicitly identified in our first Collective Agreement. During the life of that agreement, it became apparent that this group needed stronger protections. As the intercollegiate sports program underwent significant restructuring under the umbrella of the Faculty of Health Sciences, the Coaches were offered split contracts: one negotiated under the Article *Reduced Responsibility* for their academic work, and the other a separate short-term coaching contract. This separate contract removed them

from UWOFA jurisdiction for their coaching responsibilities. Without membership in any other employee group, they were unprotected from problems arising in their coaching work.

Western has a long tradition of sports programs, including a large and diverse offering of intercollegiate (varsity) sports, intramural sports and recreational programs. Over the years, Senate and Faculty-mandated task forces have studied and made recommendations about these programs, twice under the chairmanship of Wes Dunn, former Dean of Dentistry—first in the early 1970s and then in the late 1990s. Recognizing the contributions of Faculty Coaches to the undergraduate experience, both on the playing field and in the classroom, these reviews

recommended maintaining a core of Faculty Coaches as full-time members of the university's professoriate. While UWOFA is not in the business of making academic policy, the Association has responded to invitations to contribute to the deliberations of such reviews because they affected our Members. The Association has also assisted its Member coaches with issues regarding their workloads, performance evaluations, and other issues that are sometimes made more complex because of the unusual combination of duties that coaches bear. For example, does coaching count as Teaching? as Service? and do related publications count as Research? Most recently, just prior to this round of negotiations, the Association was approached by the coaches, both individually and collectively, regarding the lack of protections in their proposed split contracts.

Given the complexities of the issues, the Contract Committee, and subsequently the Negotiating Team, worked closely with the

Coaches to draft contract language to facilitate an improved and clearer status for everyone involved. One might have expected it to be a relatively straightforward exercise. Not so! In fact, many negotiating sessions were spent disentangling the issues, reviewing the historical decisions made in Senate regarding the role of Faculty Coaches within the University, and the current administrative decisions that produced the difficulties coaches were currently experiencing. At the same time, a record number of Faculty Coaches resigned their positions, either to leave for a university coaching position elsewhere, or to return to the classroom full-time.

In the end, a compromise was achieved, as so often happens during negotiations. Designated Faculty Coaches were offered the full protections of the Collective Agreement under the article *Alternative Workload*, with reference to the application of other articles such as *Workload* and *Annual Performance Evaluation*. Strengthened roles for the Directors

of the Schools within the Faculty of Health Sciences should also help to make life easier for Faculty Coaches and administrators alike.

While this particular negotiated understanding seemingly affects only a very small group of Members, it illustrates the diverse needs across the Membership, and the importance of remaining vigilant by bringing to the Association's attention issues such as these, and the ways in which the Collective Agreement can be improved to better incorporate Members' concerns. Other groups who have worked with the Contract Committee and the Negotiating Team to create language to improve conditions for their particular colleagues include Basic Scientists in Clinical Departments, Research Chairs, and Part-Time Members in the Faculty of Music.

*Aniko Varpalotai chaired the Contract Committee and was Deputy Chief Negotiator of UWOFA's Negotiating Team. She is Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education.*

---

## To Ratify or Not?

by Tess Hooks

*Editor's note: This is a lightly edited version of a statement read by the author at the meeting of the UWOFA Board of 29 April 2003.*

I would like to begin by saying that I was honoured to be chosen by my colleagues to serve on the Negotiating Team. And I was even more honoured to serve with such an outstanding team. Their dedication and commitment to the cause was, and is, indefatigable and unwavering. I was chosen to serve on the team because the UWOFA constitution requires that there be at least one Part-Time Member on negotiating teams. So I suppose I was there with a particular expertise and a particular constituency to represent. But I would like to make it clear that I never felt that I stood alone. I am grateful that I always felt the support of my fellow team members. We did work as a team.

But now is the time to decide whether this agreement should be ratified. On the morning of April 24<sup>th</sup>, when the negotiating team took their vote on whether this agreement should be brought to the Board, I abstained. The Board has decided to put it to the Membership. So

now it is up to you to decide whether to accept or reject this offer. That decision should rest on an assessment of the gains and losses achieved. So how does everything shake out?

For Full-Time Members I think there are some important improvements in contract language. And we did bring in some Members who had been overlooked in the first Collective Agreement: Faculty Coaches, Basic Scientists, and the Centre for Women's Studies and Feminist Research. But we did not achieve our goal of salary parity with the Bovey institutions nor did we get any language on faculty renewal.

For Part-Time Members there are salary increases over the life of the agreement. For current Tier 2 Members there is potentially increased job security, language that will protect Part-Time Members' pensions in the event of a break in service, and for a small group of Members there will be offers of Renewable Limited-Term Contracts. We have

also protected current Tier 1 Members by grandparenting them into Renewable Multi-Year Contracts. In fairness, I would say that these represent modest improvements in some respects; in other respects, it is little more than holding the line.

I am, however, leaving this experience with an overwhelming sense of disappointment. On a personal level I wonder if the time I have committed to the project is worth what we are walking away with. On another level, as a Part-Time Member, I would interpret this Collective Agreement, at best, as a holding pattern. It will not solve the problems we brought to the table and it may precipitate a different set of problems. In the end we still have a group of marginal workers at the bottom of the institutional hierarchy who have little room to manoeuvre to improve their conditions of employment. The consequence of this is that without a commitment to faculty renewal, in the next few

years we may see huge numbers of part-time workers hired to deal with increasing enrolments without corresponding full-time hires.

An example might be useful here. The Sociology Department has posted its Limited Duties positions for the 2003-2004 academic year. The Department is attempting to fill the equivalent of sixty-nine half courses. This constitutes over 85% of the undergraduate program. What begins as a temporary solution to a temporary problem—the double cohort—may well end up becoming permanent practice. The number of Limited Duties Appointments in Sociology has increased in each of the last three years.

So the question is: did the Negotiating Team cave in too soon? Should we have held out for more? I don't think so. If we had held out for more on these issues we would have had to have been prepared to strike to get

them. It saddens me and disappoints me but I do not think that our Membership, at this juncture, has the resolve to fight for these issues. And it was the collective opinion of the Negotiating Team that our Members would find the Administration's financial offer of April 23<sup>rd</sup> attractive enough to accept it. What is perhaps more disheartening for me is that I don't think there will be future improvements in the areas of Part-Time Appointments and faculty renewal until our Membership comes to the conclusion that having one group of easily exploitable workers in the Bargaining Unit is damaging not just to those workers, but to Full-Time Members as well. Once having reached this conclusion the entire Membership must be willing to fight for their joint interests at the negotiating table and on a picket line.

It took us a long time to learn that having a certified union to bargain for our interests might result in better agreements. I hope it

does not take us an equally long time to learn that solidarity amongst us will yield the best collective agreements.

Should we ratify this agreement? Yes, if this is all that we are willing to fight for. The union will not achieve salary parity with the Bovey institutions, better conditions of employment for Part-Time Members, or a commitment to faculty renewal until it is willing to stand up to get these things, including walking a picket line if necessary. If I am wrong about our resolve—no, your resolve—then demonstrate that by voting No. If I am right, then vote Yes, not because it is a good agreement, but because it is the best agreement we are going to get at this time.

*Tess Hooks was a member of the UWOFA Negotiating Teams, and is a Part-Time Member in the Department of Sociology and the Centre for Women's Studies and Feminist Research.*

## The Challenges Ahead

by Kim Clark

The last year has been a disappointing one, with the discouraging pace of negotiations and an initial compensation offer from the Administration that many of us felt was mean-spirited and contemptuous of the value of our work. However, it has also been an exciting year, as we learned the importance of standing together in support of carefully reasoned bargaining positions in which we can take pride. I think that in general we are better informed than we have been in the past, as we learned more about what has happened in recent settlements on other campuses, as we discovered the long-term consequences of our last salary settlement, as we teased out the *very* long-term implications for the institution of another poor settlement, and as we learned the real value of our benefits, among other things. I also feel great pride in our Negotiating Team, the members of which have not only shown persistence but also great competence when it comes to things like evaluating the cost of various proposals or understanding the implications of specific contract language. They have served us very well and I thank them.

I think that we should be pleased with many aspects of the tentative agreement reached between the two negotiating teams, particularly the fact that previously excluded work of several groups on campus has been brought under the terms of the tentative Collective Agreement, that the conditions for Limited-Term Members have been improved, that procedures for grievances have been clarified and the appeals process improved, and that for a large number of additional issues conditions have been improved and attacks were successfully resisted. If our comparison point is the offers made to us in December or January, our team—with the strong backing of the Membership in the form of a strike vote—has done very well for us indeed. The contract is not ideal, however, and there are challenges facing us that will have implications for the institution as a whole. I would like to highlight four of them.

1) We still have not achieved parity with the salaries at the other Bovey Six institutions, although we are at least on a slow trajectory that might eventually lead to convergence (unless other universities continue to win substantially better settlements, which may well

happen). This has important implications for our ability to recruit and retain the best faculty. The fact that our student-faculty ratio has increased so dramatically over the last four years (by 40%) is likely not entirely disconnected from the fact that our salaries are so uncompetitive. Not everyone who is hired stays around for very long, and we are also losing mid-career faculty who are more difficult to replace.

2) We were unable to achieve any commitments in terms of faculty renewal. We are told that the Administration does have plans for renewal, but is not willing to commit contractually to them (although their counterparts in some other institutions have done so). We will have to be very vigilant over the life of this agreement in regard to student-faculty ratios (which are measured as a ratio of full-time students to *full-time* faculty) in order to monitor the extent to which a serious effort has been made in the area of renewal.

3) A new structure of job security is established for Part-Time Members, quite a few of whom will be eligible for rights of first refusal in a course, some of whom will be eligible for multi-year part-time contracts, and

a few for Limited-Term Appointments. Again, we will have to be very vigilant in monitoring the real effects of the new procedures, which are clearly very far from what we had initially hoped to achieve for our Part-Time Members.

4) In the Article *Management Responsibilities* we were again unable to obtain a commitment by the Administration to treat us in a "fair" manner (something that Western staff and TAs did achieve in their collective agreements). The absence of this phrase in our first Collective

Agreement was used against us in an arbitration case, and we will have to watch carefully to see how it is used over the life of the new agreement.

In sum, in some ways we should certainly be pleased with this agreement, but it is incumbent upon us to invest time and energy over the next three years in tracking the effects and the importance of some of the things that we were not able to achieve. My hope for the

next few years, then, is that we will continue educating ourselves, with an eye toward further improving our working conditions and the education we can offer our students, as we lay the groundwork for the next set of negotiations.

*Kim Clark is a member of the 2003-2005 UWOFA Board of Directors and Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology.*

---

## Reflections on UWOFA

*by Anne Skoczylas*

The jaded feeling that hits academics at the end of the year is hard to dispel. Reflections on what has been accomplished often turn into regrets at missed opportunities to teach more effectively, to make a more meaningful impact on an individual student, or to complete that paper for publication. This professional doubt has been intensified this year for me as I also consider what, if any, effect I have had on the welfare of the faculty of UWO through my membership on the UWOFA Board.

Over the past twelve months I have attended more meetings than I care to count, and have occasionally added my comments to the discussion. I am confident that the members of the UWOFA Board represent a cross-section of the faculty community, and that they are committed to ensuring that all members are treated with respect and understanding. No faction has swayed decision-making, and each issue has been debated openly and in an unprejudiced manner. Our Negotiating Team has reported to the Board fully and regularly, allowing us to appreciate and share their frustration with the antagonistic nature of the negotiating process in 2002-03. But the question remains, have our efforts to improve the salaries and working conditions of our colleagues been successful?

I represent the Limited Duties (Part-Time) section of the UWO community. Last year I taught two and a half courses for a total salary of about \$24,000. This places me on or

below the poverty line and is a disgrace in a university as rich as UWO. If the current tentative agreement is ratified, by 2006 my base salary per course will have increased by approximately \$1,200, bringing my total for two and a half courses to about \$27,000. I do not, however, complain for myself, but for the 400 or so other Part-Time Members, who do not share in the illusion that the average faculty salary by 2006 will be \$100,000.

On the plus side, I feel enriched by the fact that I was able to return to graduate studies in 1989 after a long hiatus, completing my MA and PhD by 1996, and was hired by UWO to teach history in 1999. I love my subject, am exhilarated by the chance to do research, have published one book, and have given papers at international conferences. Furthermore I find teaching exciting and challenging. Students are eternally interesting, and I feel privileged to be able to interact with the stimulating young minds who will run our country tomorrow.

On the minus side, however, is the fact that Part-Time Members are under-appreciated by the Administration of the University, although not by our colleagues. I am a more than middle-aged, married, woman. I am fortunate in not having to live on my salary, and in being included in the benefits from my husband's employer. Were I young, single and dependent on the goodwill of UWO, my case would be dire. That is the problem which was not addressed by the

Administration in reaching a settlement. Young Part-Time Members with PhDs are the tenured faculty of the future. They need to know that there is hope for them in the academic jungle. It is morally wrong to treat them as cheap labour to be exploited and discarded when the double cohort has finally departed.

Those of us whose lives are secure and whose mortgages are nearly paid off might give thought to the position of a thirty-something PhD who graduates with \$30,000 in student loans to repay and who is teaching for the same sum that I am. Can you even imagine the economic vulnerability of that person? Would you consider starting a family in those circumstances? Is this how we want to treat the best minds of the next generation? What does this tell us about the ethical standards of our Employer?

The two unresolved but related issues of limited duties job security and faculty renewal have not been seen as priorities by the Administration. While the blame for this lack of understanding does not lie with us, nevertheless UWOFA has not succeeded in addressing these problems through the negotiating process, and this must be seen as a failure, which I bitterly regret.

*Anne Skoczylas is a member of the 2003-2004 UWOFA Board of Directors and Secretary of the UWOFA Executive. She is a Part-Time Member in the Department of History.*

---

# I said “Show me the money”... and they did

by Michael P. Carroll

## Why are our salaries so low?

By now, we’ve all seen the UWOFA data showing that other Ontario universities—operating under the same provincial funding formula—are paying better salaries. So: if we’re not spending money on competitive salaries, what *are* we spending it on? In theory, it should be possible to answer that by looking at the Budget presented to Senate every spring (this year, on April 11<sup>th</sup>), or at least, by asking questions about the Budget during that Senate meeting. In fact, though I am on Senate and asked several questions at that meeting, by the end of it I was still puzzled. The fact that debate was closed off after only an hour by calling the question certainly didn’t aid the process.

One bit of information, however, which did emerge probably deserves a wider audience. Thus, in response to one question, Paul Davenport indicated that UWO receives 8.9% of the operating grant that the province provides to universities. On the face of it, then, it would seem that Western is not in any way being short-changed by the government compared to other universities.

Following this year’s Senate Meeting, I requested additional information from the Administration in order to assess a number of hypotheses—which we’ve all heard—concerning Western’s spending habits that might help explain our lower salaries. In particular, I wanted to assess the possibility that our lower salaries were (1) the result of costs associated with a few “star” faculties, like Ivey and Medicine and Dentistry, (2) the result of subsidies given to ancillaries like the Wind Tunnel or the Research Park, and (3) related to the proliferation of highly paid positions of the “assistant to the assistant VP” type, and a top-heavy bureaucracy.

## Looking at the hypotheses

I received the information that I requested and—to give the short answer—that information does *not* really support any of these hypotheses. Ivey, certainly, is not being subsidized. Medicine and Dentistry *is* being subsidized by other Faculties (e.g., the expenditures for this Faculty greatly exceed

revenues derived from tuition and their share of the government grant), *but* this is far less true that it was five years ago. The Administration’s claim to a policy of redistributing funds, in short, seems correct.

Similarly, though the Research Park did get money several years ago to pay down its debt, the information that I received suggests that neither it nor other ancillaries (like the Wind Tunnel) are currently a drain on the operating budget.

In thinking about where the money goes, of course, we also need to look at the Capital Budget. Here one of the big budget items is the \$34 million dollars that Western will be spending on renovations to the Medical Sciences Building. To understand the scale of the Administration’s commitment to this particular project, consider that expenses for this project are listed under Deferred Maintenance and that this particular Medicine and Dentistry project accounts for 48% of *all* monies budgeted for Deferred Maintenance at this University over 2002-04. Then too, this is presumably independent of a one-time allocation of half a million dollars in 2003-04 to Medicine and Dentistry for the Investment in Dental Facilities listed in another section of the budget document.

On balance, then, it seems possible that there is more support for the “support of star faculty” hypothesis, at least as regards Medicine and Dentistry, when both the Capital and Operating Budgets are taken into account—but it’s probably not enough to explain our lower salaries in any significant way.

Finally, there’s the “top-heavy with bureaucrats” hypothesis. At first blush, this seemed promising. For example, the Offices of the President and the Vice-Presidents have a base budget of \$3.2 million. This is a budget line separate from, say, the University Secretariat, the Registrar’s Office, and all the subunits that report to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and to the Vice-President (Administration). The sum of \$3.2 million might not seem like much given the overall budget, but remember it compares favorably with the base budget for some of the

smaller faculties, like Law (\$4.3 million) and Music (\$5 million). Furthermore, it turns out that this \$3.2 million is 80-90% salaries and benefits. Isn’t that fairly obvious evidence of Administrative extravagance? Possibly. Certainly, it’s a testament to the extremely high salaries earned by a few individuals. Nevertheless, the Administration can produce independent assessments of administrative costs at various universities which seem to suggest that overall the administration here is relatively “lean,” mainly because other universities often have an additional administrative layer. At the moment, I have no reason to doubt those assessments (though I invite others to find flaws if they think they can).

So what are we left with? Nothing, save for a few boondoggles and irritating things. There is, for example, PeopleSoft, the mistake that keeps on ticking. The Budget document says that last year’s Budget allocated \$1 million in “one time” funds to support an upgrade, that this year an additional installment of \$1 million in “one time” funds will be allocated to this upgrade, and that one more year of “one-time” funding is coming after this. (Sort of gives new meaning to the term “one-time,” eh?). Add to this the initial cost of converting to PeopleSoft and there seems little question that this has been a major drain on university revenues. Still, as irritating this sort of thing is, it hardly accounts for our low salaries.

## The uses of parking fees

Finally, I cannot pass by “irritating” without comment on parking. Two years ago, when I first came on Senate, the Administration announced in the Budget that parking fees would be going up and, during the discussion, it became clear that much (most?) of this was due to an increase in the transfer to the operating budget. This transfer is money generated by parking fees but *not* spent on parking-related matters (like the construction of new lots, the amortization of loans used to construct older lots, the maintenance of existing lots, etc.). This year, as a member of the President’s Advisory Committee of Parking and Traffic (PACPT), I knew that the

Administration was again proposing to raise parking fees (by 5% on average) and to increase the transfer to the operating budget from \$900,000 to an even \$1 million.

It was pointed out at PACPT that if the money now being transferred, or at least some portion of it, were left *in* the Parking Services Budget, then it would be that much easier to pay off the loans used to construct existing lots. Nevertheless, although the PACPT voted unanimously *against* both proposals, the Administration brought both proposals forward and both were passed as part of the Budget document (suggesting that presidential advisory committees are best listened to when they give advice congruent with the

Administration's plans). For me, it's hard not to see this increase in parking fees which, remember, has little to do with parking-related expenses, as an clawback in anticipation of wage settlements over the coming year.

Once the matter of parking had been raised, one member of Senate complained about the increasing lack of parking spaces near the core. The Vice-President (Administration) responded to this by pointing out that the new Althouse lot is never full. I suspect this is based on second-hand reports, since as far as I have been able to find out both the Vice-President (Administration) and other senior administrators have, or have

access to, lots in the center of campus.

But irritations like PeopleSoft and parking aside, what about the original questions: Why are our salaries low? What are we spending money on instead? At the end of the exercise, I still don't know the answers. Perhaps an assessment of salaries by an agency at arm's length from both UWOFA and the Administration would be useful ... or maybe not. I'll think more about that next winter as I'm walking in from Althouse.

*Michael P. Carroll is a member of the 2003-2004 UWOFA Board of Directors and Professor in the Department of Sociology.*

---

# Negotiations Are Done: Long Live Negotiations!

by David Heap

By the time you read this, a Bargaining Unit vote may have ratified the proposed settlement between UWOFA and Management, and we may have a new Collective Agreement. I have nonetheless opposed this settlement—at the Board and elsewhere—despite it being recommended by our Negotiating Team and our Board as “the best deal we can get at this time.”

## Double cohort “flexibility”

The first and most important flaw in this settlement is, in my opinion, the complete lack of progress in the area of Faculty Renewal. UWOFA's proposal in this area was passed unanimously by one of our (often fractious) Membership meetings, and also received one of the highest levels of support in our surveys of Members of the Bargaining Unit. And yet the new settlement delivers *nothing* on this key issue, while in most other areas, including compensation, there are at least modest gains.

What does this mean for the next three years, the time remaining on our tentative four-year Collective Agreement? Very simply, all decisions about how many faculty members are hired, and in what kinds of positions, remain an absolute Management prerogative. The Employer is now free either to honour or break its public “commitments” (in Senate documents, Strategic Plans, etc.) to hire new faculty members—and there is *nothing* we can do about it under our new Collective Agreement. It should be noted that Management refuses to make any enforceable

commitments to specific hiring goals in our contract *despite* the fact that the provincial government has committed to stable, predictable funding for the next four years. The Administration can now plan with reasonable certainty what their budgets will look like during the life of this agreement, but they still refuse to commit in a meaningful way to new hirings. While some positions will obviously be filled between now and 2006, exactly how many, of what type and in what Departments or Faculties, will be entirely up to Management.

The lack of progress on Renewal, coupled with an erosion of rights for new Part-Time Members hired in coming years, who will have to teach the same half or full course for three years within a four year period in order to gain First Refusal Rights—and only for that particular course (as opposed to our first Collective Agreement, which granted an entitlement, upon application, to a rolling two-year Appointment—Tier 2 status—after teaching any two full courses within a three-year period).

Together, these aspects of the settlement give our Employer exactly what they want to deal with the Double Cohort: management “flexibility” to deal with increased enrollments in a temporary, ad hoc fashion by hiring “disposable” part-time faculty when needed, and then discarding them without consequences when no longer needed. It is hard to see this increase in precarious employment in our ranks as a victory for our

Union: the abuse of part-time positions in this way will negatively impact *all* faculty members at Western, full-time and part-time alike.

## Enhanced Early Retirement

A related area where we failed to make progress was on Enhanced Early Retirement (EER). Faculty members nearing retirement age will continue to be eligible for EER only at the whim of the Provost, despite the fact that the University invariably saves money with these departures (for more background this issue, see the column in *Western News* of April 11, 2002; [communications.uwo.ca/western\\_news/opinion.html?listing\\_id=5010](http://communications.uwo.ca/western_news/opinion.html?listing_id=5010)). This is just one more instance where Management can continue to do pretty much what they like, given the absence of any contract language requiring the Employer to act in a “fair and reasonable manner”. *Management Rights* is an Article where our Collective Agreement still has *weaker* limits (i.e. less protection for our Members' rights) than those of the Staff Association and the GTA union at UWO.

## Getting a stronger mandate

But of course our Negotiating Team (who had and still have my utmost confidence and admiration) knew all this, and yet they recommended this settlement as the best deal we could get with the mandate we had. So, if issues like those mentioned above are really important (as I think much of our Membership

agrees they are), then how do we go about achieving a stronger mandate in negotiations in order to achieve such goals?

The UWOFA membership took an important step towards a stronger negotiating mandate by holding a strike vote earlier this year, and winning 70% support for a strike, if necessary. This vote was no doubt decisive in improving the successive “final offers” we subsequently received. In addition, Members returned more than 395 “blue sheets” in response to our survey of what faculty would do in event of a strike. Of these, 376 said they would participate in a strike, over 250 signed up for one or more picketing shifts, and over 200 were willing to perform other strike-related tasks—all of this *without* an actual strike date set having been set. Clearly, a significant portion of the UWO professorate is ready to withdraw its services in order to achieve a better settlement.

There are, of course, many important gains in the new settlement, which others can represent better than I can here. Whether or not these gains are “enough” to satisfy our expectations in bargaining is a question each of us will answer individually. But the lesson of this round of bargaining is clear: if we really want to make significant gains in key areas such as Management Rights and Faculty Renewal (which the UWO Administration seems to consider sacrosanct management prerogatives), then we must be willing to strike in order to achieve these goals. And preparations for the next round of bargaining should ideally begin immediately following the ratification of the current agreement.

As a dedicated educator who knows that the quality of the education we deliver depends in large part on maintaining and improving student-faculty ratios at this institution, I remain very sceptical (at best) about Management’s “commitments” to faculty

renewal. As a believer in collegial decision-making, I know that “fair and reasonable” is not too high a standard to expect from our Employer. As a member of the new UWOFA Board of Directors, I will join with Board colleagues to work toward building the support of our Membership for a strong strike mandate early in our next round of bargaining, since I am convinced that this is the only way to achieve certain key goals. Nobody relishes the thought of a strike, but if we truly want higher quality education, as well as fair and reasonable treatment by our Employer, we must be prepared to give our future negotiators a strong strike mandate, and to lay the groundwork so that it can be used effectively and in a timely fashion while bargaining our next Collective Agreement.

*David Heap is a member of the 2003-2005 UWOFA Board of Directors and Associate Professor in the Department of French.*

---

## Legacies and Lessons

*Editorial, by Bernd Frohmann*

### Why did we sign?

If you are among the rigorous folk who read newspapers in the order of articles presented, then even if you were unable to attend the May 6 General Meeting you’ll know by now that the tentative Collective Agreement signed by the Negotiating Team is not as good as what we, and the Membership, wanted. Work remains to be done in several areas, chief among them Appointments, Compensation and Benefits, and Faculty Renewal. Why then, did your Negotiating Team sign it?

One can use three measures to assess the merits of the agreement. The first is to contrast what we signed to what we had sought. Clearly, our tentative agreement falls short on this score. Meeting more than fifty times with the Employer’s team, and consulting amongst ourselves even more often, all over the space of a year, your team members naturally become so attached to what we all want that we begin to think, and speak, about articles and clauses that express our wishes as if they state what we already have. And there is good reason for this: at most stages of negotiations, wishes on both sides are traded (“I’ll give up this wish if you give up that one”). There is some merit in judging a collective agreement against our

wishes, as if they were as substantial as what we already have, because to do so reminds us of the reasonable and just proposals we have to continue to negotiate in future contracts. But to judge it only by this measure is to raise the bar of fair assessment too high—which is not to imply that we should give up on our reasonable and just demands.

A second measure is to compare what we’ve gained with what we already had. On this score, the Negotiating Team feels that we have not compromised any of the gains made in our first Collective Agreement. Some disagree: you can find a counter-argument concerning Part-Time Members in David Heap’s contribution, above. Overall, the team believes that there are significant gains. Moreover, highly objectionable and offensive proposals by the Administration have been successfully resisted. The most egregious of these was the Employer’s transparent attempt to split our union by its attack on Part-Time and Limited-Term Members. They did not succeed. Mike Dawes will have noted these issues for you at the May 6 meeting, and summaries will be published. Overall, we’re somewhat better off, but by how much will vary from case to case.

The third measure is more difficult to apply with certitude, but perhaps it’s the most important one, and I thank my colleague and new Board member representing Law, Sam Trosow, for insisting on it at a Board meeting. Did we get all that we could get? The trouble with this measure is that it’s impossible to know for sure, because one of the two comparators is unknown. Although images of Alex Mercer and Alan Weedon giggling horribly into their single-malt scotch threaten to disturb my sleep, I am, to use a phrase thankfully made available to us by the natural philosophers of the seventeenth century, morally certain that we could not have gained more from the Employer’s team. My fellow Negotiating Team members share this view, even those who have the best reasons to be very disappointed with particular articles (see Tess Hooks’s contribution, above).

A collective judgement such as this is complex: it’s made up, like all judgements of the trustworthiness of what other people say, of the knowledge one has of the other’s sincerity, as evidenced by facial expressions and body language, and past record of match between their previous statements and reality. We’ve seen their team for over fifty sessions,

over a period of a year. Can we be mistaken? Of course. There are others, even on the UWOFB Board, who believe themselves to be in a better epistemological position to make this judgement than members of the team, and who therefore disagree with it. They may be right, but so far, we've not heard any evidence in support of such disagreement, and would certainly be happy to receive it.

Toward the end of our sessions, when we worked until 12:30 a.m. on April 17<sup>th</sup> and until 2:30 a.m. on the morning of April 24<sup>th</sup>, it seemed to us that their side was under some real pressure to get an agreement. We were surprised by their movement on Appointments, where they finally seemed to at least grasp our idea and finally seemed willing to negotiate what we had long before laboured to prepare and then present. We were also surprised by their movement on Compensation and Benefits, given their past performance. These movements, and what appeared to us as some genuine nervousness on their part about their need to demonstrate to their masters that they were in fact capable of delivering an agreement, figured in our collective judgement, and in our determination to continue until the last minute to press them on their understanding, not only of our positions, but also of their own financial analyses. In the end, both sides made last-minute concessions. Our judgement was also determined by our collective reading of our Membership's will to strike over the very few divisive issues that remained, and we were mindful of the cost of a strike, and of the legal right of the Employer to unilaterally change employment conditions after a No Board has been issued.

### Negotiating with phantoms

More needs to be said about our conviction that their team would not make more concessions after April 24, because it goes to the heart of one very important lesson learnt from these negotiations, and one that future negotiators must understand—although our former thrice President Eddie Ebanks knew it all along, and said so at more than one General Meeting (and even in the Grad Pub). The lesson is this: the Employer's team had little power to negotiate financial articles, and there is little reason to suppose that this situation will improve in the future.

True to the managerial vaporware befogging Stevenson-Lawson, the important decisions about the direction and character of this institution now issue from an administrative royalty with no intention of slumming with faculty members outside those excitingly excellent venues that celebrate the

exploitation of their research and teaching accomplishments as adornments of managerial majesty. The gulf—or perhaps the moat—separating Western's faculty from Western's managers is most egregiously manifested in what must be intended as one of the legacies of the Davenport-Moran régime: the administrative layers recently installed in order to insert an infinitely inflatable buffer between faculty and senior Administration. This takes the form of a non-academic, industrial relations approach to the machinations of the Office of Faculty Relations, and the creation of a new office of Vice-Provost for Policy, Planning and Faculty Relations, together with their bureaucratic technologies of faculty regulation.

The crowning achievement of the Davenport-Moran régime appears to be the attainment of a *sui generis*, transcendental form of administrative rationality so exalted and so uncontaminated by contact with those who actually perform the University's work that its primary activity consists in basking in the reflected glory of its own internal processes. At negotiations, we only get to meet the managers who inhabit the buffer zone and their selected minions from the zones lying beneath. The administrative royalty, whose dictates emerge from the vortices of bedazzling and phantasmagorical spreadsheet force fields, never shows up. The real power in these and future negotiations is wielded by the phantoms who delegate the messy job of bargaining to their civil service.

Things often get testy in negotiations, especially in the wee hours of the morning. A case in point occurred in the early morning of April 17<sup>th</sup>, when we rejected the Employer's salary offer presented at that time. You read about it in the Provost's dark memo of the same day, presaging stormy weather ahead, upon our "unexpected" behaviour. At the negotiating table they loudly demanded whether, when they had said, "There is no more money," we had thought they were lying. The answer is: "The statement you uttered was false, but you were not lying." How can this be? The solution is simple: their assertion does not mean that there is no more money. It means: "We have no mandate to offer any more money." In rejecting their offer at that time, we were addressing the phantoms, through their team. Their side was not lying, because, even though it is in a position to know there is indeed more money—in fact much more money at this time of governmental largesse—which could be made available to bring our salaries in line with our competitors, those who are really in charge, far

above the scene of negotiations, simply will not make it available. In a Davenport-Moran world, such matters are simply beyond discussion. One is reminded, because Mike Dawes drew it to the Team's attention, of Robert Louis Stevenson's remark in *An Inland Voyage*: "... at a certain stage of prosperity, as in a balloon ascent, the fortunate person passes through a zone of clouds, and sublunary matters are thenceforward hidden from his view. He sees nothing but the heavenly bodies, all in admirable order and positively as good as new. He finds himself surrounded in the most touching manner by the attentions of *Providence*, and compares himself involuntarily with the lilies and the skylarks. He does not precisely sing, of course; but then he looks so unassuming in his open *Landau!* If all the world dined at one table, this philosophy would meet with some rude knocks."

The administrative strategy at Western is now quite clear: managerial rationality dictates that the proportion of the University's budget spent on faculty salaries will continue to decline. The Employer's negotiating teams have no power to negotiate this decision. The buffer between faculty and central administration is designed to ensure that the really important decisions—those that would be negotiated in truly good faith bargaining—will never get to the negotiating table. The creation of a zone of administrative rationality far distant from faculty contamination is the Davenport-Moran régime's corporate response to certification—the managerial strategy of an administration with a public record of its visceral abhorrence of a faculty union at Western.

For a stunning example of this administration's rapaciousness when it comes to controlling your work, take a look at the concentration of power documented on page 17, below. Mike Dawes presented most of this material at the General Meeting of 6 May. It shows that on 20 April 2001, Western's Senate approved—*without discussion*—the transfer of its own power to allocate the resources necessary to create or dissolve Academic Units, a power granted under the UWO Act, to two senior administrators: the Provost and the Vice-President (Research).

The strategy of insulating the authority of the senior administration not only from the messiness of bargaining but also even from Senate oversight is richly rewarded by Western's Board of Governors: they increased the salary of Alex Mercer, their Chief Negotiator and Director of the Office of Faculty Relations, by 9.9% in 2002, Moran's

salary by 24.7% in 1998–2002, and deployed a “parity for Presidents” rationale for Davenport’s 9.58% salary raise in 2002, to \$260,000.

### Organising the shop

During negotiations Mike Dawes reminded us of an old saying in labour relations: “the boss organises the shop”. It certainly applies to Western, where this administration’s attempts to micro-manage faculty labour led to certification. In most corporations, CEOs whose actions focus the energies of workers to the point of their forming a union risk dismissal. Not so at Western: in 2000, Moran enjoyed a pay increase of 17.3%. Certification was a turning-point for Western, because the grim realities of the corporate management of university labour had begun to impress itself upon the consciousness of our Members.

During negotiations, the boss was once again busily organising the shop, this time, in the form of hostility and contempt at the bargaining table, repeated whinings and bleatings about UWOFAs communications with our Members, rollbacks in the working conditions of Part-Time Members to pre-certification conditions, an attack on the pensions and benefits of all Members, and an insulting salary offer featuring a 0.5% scale increase for Tenured and Probationary Members in each year of a proposed four-year contract. As the Employer’s industrial relations ideology brought into clear focus how our work is organised, by whom it is organised, to what end it is organised—and most importantly, who should have the power to organize it—the second chapter in the story of the development of our collective consciousness was quickly written: Western’s Bargaining Unit supported a strike vote by a 70% majority, followed by a sense of outrage communicated to the union representatives of Faculties and Departments across the campus, and commitments in the form of responses to the “blue sheets,” as documented in David Heap’s article, above.

The third chapter is perhaps the most important: a strike at Western. The Davenport-Moran administration may have forfeited its opportunity to take a measure of credit for such an event, as we will likely see new faces in senior administrative offices before our second Collective Agreement expires, should it be ratified on 21 May. In a way, that is unfortunate, since a strike in this régime’s tenure would be a fitting tribute to its talents in organising the shop. But an administration that includes Alex Mercer and Allan Weedon will undoubtedly exhibit strong continuities in the Stevenson-Lawson variation on Western’s theme of leading and thinking. It is unlikely that the industrial relations approach to faculty relations, now enshrined by the Davenport-Moran administration in the bureaucratic inertia of an Office of *Faculty Relations* headed by Alex Mercer and the office of Vice-Provost for Policy, Planning and *Faculty Relations* held by Allan Weedon (emphasis added)—and one richly rewarded by Western’s Board of Governors—will deviate very far from its path of organising the shop.

Western needs a strike because the corporate strategy of concentrating power in administrative offices far distant from any negotiations with Members will not be defeated without it. Western’s administrators are committed to this strategy. If our current academic leader will not be here to see a strike, the next one may. This round of negotiations has clarified the situation: we are confronted by an administrative royalty committed to what it regards as its exclusive right to manage this institution according to the imperatives of administrative control and its staged public relations extravaganzas. This will not change unless Western’s Bargaining Unit becomes sufficiently militant to write the next chapter in the story of the development of our collective consciousness about who gets to control our work.

### Restoring collegiality?

At this point I will take perhaps unfair advantage of my position as Editor (I get to see the contributions before I write the Editorial) to say that I do not believe, as does Albert Katz, our new President, that the next chapter will be a narrative of the restoration of collegial relations between Western’s faculty and its Administration (see “New UWOFAs President wants more collegiality,” *Western News*, 8 May 2003, and page 4, col. 3, above). Putting to one side the question of whether there ever were collegial relations between the sides, my experience of negotiations, UWOFAs Board meetings, and General Membership meetings leads me to believe that the rhetoric of collegiality belongs to an idealisation of university faculty labour that fails to grasp how it is organized in the contemporary corporate university. We are no longer—if we ever were—in a work environment modeled upon ideals of rational conversation among equals. We are in a power struggle with those who want to wrest as much control over our work as possible in order to manage the institution according to policies and strategies free from any oversight or negotiation.

Collegiality has been thoroughly trampled by the Davenport-Moran régime in its stamped to centralise administrative authority in the office of the President and Provost. Smiles, deference, well-turned phrases, and sound logical argument won’t spawn collegiality amongst Western’s faculty and Administration. The only way to resist and break administrative control over your work is to teach Western’s managers the lesson of *whose* work is essential to the functioning of this institution. Our tentative Collective Agreement has sufficient weaknesses to build strike action into our next bargaining strategy, right from the beginning.

*Bernd Frohmann was a member of the UWOFAs Negotiating Team, and Editor of Faculty Times. He is Associate Professor in the Faculty of Information & Media Studies.*

## 9.58%: a well-deserved raise

President Davenport's 9.58% raise for 2002 may seem high, but not when you take into account his responsibility to set annual priorities for Western—no easy task, for sure. The next two pages show that our President grasps priorities so excellent and fundamental as to need little change from year to year. See for yourself, and stop already with your grumbling about 9.58%!

*The following material is reproduced from a found text.*

<b>Davenport's Priorities for 2000-2001</b>	<b>Davenport's Priorities for 2001-2002</b>	<b>Davenport's Priorities for 2002-2003</b>
<p>Each year in year in the spring I submit for approval to the Board my priorities for the coming year, which are considered by the Board in June and then discussed with Senate in the fall.</p> <p>My overall priorities will be set by Western's Strategic Plan, Leadership in Learning, which was approved by the Senate and Board in the fall of 1995, as well as by Senate and Board resolutions which have been approved in the subsequent four years. The Strategic Plan contains a commitment by the President to report twice a year on the implementation of the Plan. There have now been ten such updates: February, June, and November of 1996; May and November of 1997, 1998, and 1999; and May of 2000. To keep this statement of priorities brief, I will not repeat the extensive material contained in those update reports.</p> <p>In setting out priorities for 2000-2001, I use the same broad categories as in previous years: Setting Directions; Keeping Academic Priorities First; Ensuring Open Administration and Effective Communication; and Strengthening Ties with the External Community. Most of the specific priorities were also contained in last year's report: for example, faculty, staff, and student recruitment will undoubtedly be priorities throughout my term as President, although the specific actions taken in support of those priorities will vary from year to year. While I present these as presidential priorities, accomplishing them will require effort by all in our campus community, as well as determined leadership by Vice-Presidents, Deans, Chairs, and Directors.</p> <p>Once again this year, I wish to preface my priorities with a reference to the constraints which arise from a shortage of operating</p>	<p>Each year in year in the spring I submit for approval to the Board my priorities for the coming year, which are considered by the Board in June and then discussed with Senate in the fall.</p> <p>My overall priorities for the coming year will be set by Western's 1995 Strategic Plan, Leadership in Learning, which was approved by the Senate and Board in the fall of 1995, as well as by Senate and Board resolutions which have been approved in the subsequent four years. In late June we will distribute the draft report of the 2001 Strategic Planning Task Force for consideration by Western's community. My priorities will be respond to those initiatives endorsed by the Senate and Board when the Task Force Report receives formal consideration in the fall of 2001.</p> <p>In setting out priorities for 2001-02, I use the same broad categories as in previous years: Setting Directions; Keeping Academic Priorities First; Ensuring Open Administration and Effective Communication; and Strengthening Ties with the External Community. Most of the specific priorities were also contained in last year's report: for example, faculty, staff, and student recruitment will undoubtedly be priorities throughout my term as President, although the specific actions taken in support of those priorities will vary from year to year. While I present these as presidential priorities, accomplishing them will require effort by all in our campus community, as well as determined leadership by Vice-Presidents, Deans, Chairs, and Directors.</p> <p>Once again this year, I wish to preface my priorities with a reference to the constraints which arise from a shortage of operating</p>	<p>Each year in year in the spring I submit for approval to the Board my priorities for the coming year, which are considered by the Board in June and then discussed with Senate in the fall. My overall priorities for the coming year will be set by Western's 2002 Strategic Plan, Making Choices, which was approved by the Senate and Board last fall.</p> <p>In setting out priorities for 2001-02 (sic), I use the same broad categories as in previous years: Setting Directions; Keeping Academic Priorities First; Ensuring Open Administration and Effective Communication; and Strengthening Ties with the External Community. Most of the specific priorities were also contained in last year's report: for example, faculty, staff, and student recruitment will undoubtedly be priorities throughout my term as President, although the specific actions taken in support of those priorities will vary from year to year. While I present these as presidential priorities, accomplishing them will require effort by all in our campus community, as well as determined leadership by Vice-Presidents, Deans, Chairs, and Directors.</p> <p>A key issue in realizing our objectives at Western will be the level of operating funding available for new faculty and staff appointments. We will need to build on the advances made in May, 2001, Provincial Budget and the Throne Speech of May, 2002. In recent years our Province and the federal government have provided significant increases in research and capital funding, for which the University is grateful. We are hopeful that the next Provincial Budget will contain additional operating funding for universities.</p> <p>As in years past, my foremost hope for Western is that we can maintain the sense of common purpose and the commitment to</p>

funds. In recent years our Province and the federal government have provided significant increases in research and capital funding, for which the University is grateful. Nonetheless, the chronic public underfunding of operating funds has been the greatest barrier to realizing our objectives as a leading university. Our full-time employment has fallen by nearly 500 employees over the last seven years, from 3,300 in 1992-93 to 2,820 in 1999-2000, because of repeated reductions in the government grant.

Ontario universities are tenth among the ten provinces in grants per capita; our ratio of students to faculty has risen dramatically during the last decade and is now well above the national average. We are falling further behind the public universities in the United States in the resources we have available for students and faculty. These trends must be reversed and all Ontario universities will be pushing hard through the Council of Ontario Universities to make the coming years ones of significant increases in government operating. As Chair of the COU, I will continue to devote a considerable share of my time to these issues.

As in years past, my foremost hope for Western is that we can maintain the sense of common purpose and the commitment to excellence so evident in our successful student and faculty recruitment efforts of recent years. A broadly held spirit of cooperation among our faculty, staff, and students has kept our academic community whole and healthy despite the onerous external budget cuts we have experienced. Our top priority must be to work together in solidarity to preserve and enhance the achievements and values that define Western.

[[www.uwo.ca/univsec/board/minutes/2000/r0006sro.html](http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/board/minutes/2000/r0006sro.html)]

funds. In recent years our Province and the federal government have provided significant increases in research and capital funding, for which the University is grateful. Nonetheless, the chronic public underfunding of operating funds has been the greatest barrier to realizing our objectives as a leading university. While some progress was made in the May 9, 2001, Provincial Budget, which provided funding for future enrolment increases, even with that announcement we remain significantly below other Canadian Provinces in public funding per student and above the other Provinces in our student-faculty ratio. The gaps in this regard between Ontario and the average of US public universities is even greater.

As in years past, my foremost hope for Western is that we can maintain the sense of common purpose and the commitment to excellence so evident in our successful student and faculty recruitment efforts of recent years. A broadly held spirit of cooperation among our faculty, staff, and students has kept our academic community whole and healthy despite the onerous external budget cuts we have experienced. Our top priority must be to work together in solidarity to preserve and enhance the achievements and values that define Western.

[[www.uwo.ca/univsec/board/minutes/2001/r0106sro.html#Priorities](http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/board/minutes/2001/r0106sro.html#Priorities)]

excellence so evident in our successful student and faculty recruitment efforts of recent years. A broadly held spirit of cooperation among our faculty, staff, and students has kept our academic community whole and healthy in the face of constraints in operating funding. Our top priority must be to work together in solidarity to preserve and enhance the achievements and values that define Western.

[Appendix 6 of [www.uwo.ca/univsec/board/minutes/2002/r0206\\_sr.pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/board/minutes/2002/r0206_sr.pdf)]

## **VOTE on the Collective Agreement**

**Wednesday, May 21, 2003, 10:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m**

**University College Foyer**

# Centralized Power: Who Sets Academic Priorities?

*The following excerpts have been selected from pp 7-8 (of 59) of the 2001-02 UWO Budget dated 2 April 2001, considered by Senate on 20 April 2001. Emphases have been added. The full text of the budget is available at: [www.uwo.ca/western/bud0102.pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/western/bud0102.pdf).*

---

- Under the direction of the Provost and the Vice-President (Research), all Faculties, Departments, and Schools were invited in early February to develop Academic Plans.
- Deans will develop a timetable for the submission of Departmental and School plans allowing them to be considered in the development of the Faculty Academic Plans.
- *The Provost and Vice-President (Research) will use the Academic Plans as a basis for the development of overall priorities for the University.*
- *Academic Plans at all levels will serve as the guiding scaffolding for future selective resource allocations* including those made in the annual planing [sic] process, the allocation of incremental operating funds, and the CRC process.
- Plans should not be restricted to areas that are entirely represented within a single academic unit but must identify, with significant weighting, areas in education and research that involve the collaboration across units or, indeed, across universities.
- Academic plans will play an important role in future selective budgetary decisions. They will be a reference for future internal decisions, *including faculty complement planning (replacement and additional positions).*
- Units that choose not to identify areas of strength and priority will contribute less to the substance of plans at the Faculty- and University-level *and will be disadvantaged in future resource allocation processes.*

*The Senate minutes do not record any discussion of this issue. The budget passed, i.e. Senate recommended that the Board of Governors approve the document.*

---

*Does the UWO Act support this centralization of power? It provides that:*

## **Duties of Senate**

29. The Senate is responsible for the academic policy of the University and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Senate shall,

1. create, modify and dissolve faculty councils or committees and committees generally to exercise any of its powers, and approve their form and method of operation;
  2. determine all courses of study, including standards for admission into the University and qualifications for degrees [...]
-

## UWOFA UNION REPRESENTATIVES

### ARTS

Department of English

Bryce Traister | Ext. 85827 | traister@uwo.ca

Laurie Harnick | Ext. 85781 | words@uwo.ca

Department of French

Jacques Lamarche | Ext. 85724 | lamarche@uwo.ca

Department of Modern Languages & Literatures

Joyce Bruhn de Garavito | Ext. 85864 | joycebg@uwo.ca

Department of Philosophy

Louis Charland | Ext. 85748 | charland@uwo.ca

### EDUCATION

Greg Dickinson | Ext. 88613 | gdickins@uwo.ca

George Gadanidis | Ext. 88682 | ggadanid@uwo.ca

Allan Pitman | Ext. 88692 | pitman@uwo.ca

Aniko Varpalotai | Ext. 88601 | aniko@uwo.ca

### ENGINEERING

Department of Mechanical & Materials Engineering

R.J. Martinuzzi | Ext. 88318 | rmartinu@uwo.ca

### HEALTH SCIENCES

School of Kinesiology

Kevin Wamsley | Ext. 84113 | kbwamsle@uwo.ca

Communication Science & Disorders

Randi Fisher | Ext. 88191 | rfisher@uwo.ca

Occupational Therapy

Lisa Klinger | Ext. 88963 | lklinger@uwo.ca

### INFORMATION AND MEDIA STUDIES

Lynne McKechnie | Ext. 88476 | emckech1@uwo.ca

### LAW

Sam Trosow | Ext. 82282 | strosow@uwo.ca

### MEDICINE & DENTISTRY

Department of Anatomy & Cell Biology

Alan Hrycyshyn | Ext. 86804 | ahrycysh@uwo.ca

Department of Biochemistry

Stanley Dunn | Ext. 83055 | sdunn@uwo.ca

Department of Pathology

Candace J. Gibson | Ext. 83849 | candaceg@uwo.ca

Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

Keith Hayes | 685-4292 Ext. 42937 | kchayes@uwo.ca

Department of Physiology

Jon Hore | 661-3817 | jon.hore@med.uwo.ca

School of Dentistry

Wim Oudshoorn | Ext. 86171 | wimouds@uwo.ca

### MUSIC

Gerry Neufeld | Ext. 85338 | gneufeld@uwo.ca

Richard Semmens | Ext. 85380 | musrts@uwo.ca

### SCIENCE

Department of Computer Science

Robert Mercer | Ext. 86893 | mercer@csd.uwo.ca

Department of Biology

Anthony Percival-Smith | Ext. 84015 | aperciva@uwo.ca

**SOCIAL SCIENCE**

Department of Anthropology

Christine White | Ext. 85091 | white2@uwo.ca

Department of Economics

Jim Davies | Ext. 83529 | jdavies@uwo.ca

Department of Geography

M.J. Troughton | Ext. 85021 | mjtrough@uwo.ca

Department of Political Science

Carol Agocs | Ext. 83266 | cagocs@uwo.ca

Department of Sociology

James Cote | Ext. 85118 | cote@uwo.ca

Department of History

Andrew Johnston | Ext. 84910 | ajohnst4@uwo.ca

**FACULTY ASSOCIATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS****2003-2004**

<b>President</b>	Albert Katz	<i>(Psychology)</i>
<b>Vice-President</b>	Allan Gedalof	<i>(English)</i>
<b>Past President</b>	Paul Handford	<i>(Biology)</i>

**Designated Faculty Seats**  
**(One year term: May 1, 2003 to April 30, 2004)**

Ted Baerg *(Music)*  
George Gadanidis *(Education)*  
Candace Gibson *(Medicine & Dentistry)*  
Abhijit Gopal *(Ivey)*  
Sam Trosow *(Law)*  
Jesse Zhu *(Engineering)*

**Designated Faculty Seats**  
**(Two year term: May 1, 2003 to April 30, 2005)**

Tim Blackmore *(FIMS)*  
Jim Davies *(Economics)*  
Randi Fisher *(Communication Sci. & Disorders)*  
Louise Milligan *(Biology)*  
Aara Suksi *(Classical Studies)*

**At-Large Seats**  
**(One year term: May 1, 2003 to April 30, 2004)**

Mike Carroll *(Sociology)*  
Anne Skoczylas (PT) *(History)*

**At-Large Seats**  
**(Two year term: May 1, 2003 to April 30, 2005)**

Kim Clark *(Anthropology)*  
David Heap *(French)*  
Tom Murphy (PT) *(Sociology)*  
Clive Seligman *(Psychology)*

---

The Faculty Association and **Faculty Times** wish to extend their heartiest best wishes to **Eddie Ebanks**, upon his retirement from Western. When Eddie was Chair of the Association, he saw it had no office of President, so he created one, and occupied it twice.

Thanks, Eddie, for leading us so well, not only once, but thrice!

Many best wishes on your retirement.

Eddie is Professor in the Department of Sociology.

The Faculty Association and **Faculty Times** wish to extend a special thanks to Al Heinicke, for his expert analyses of financial data, his sage advice, and tireless work, especially as UWOFA's Webmaster. Many thanks, Al. We are in your debt.

Al is Professor in the Department of Mathematics.

The Negotiating Team extends a special thanks to Jeremy and Zoë, who extended exceptional hospitality to us at critical junctures in the late stages of our negotiations, when we all needed each other's company, and a drink (or two). The settlement of our tentative Collective Agreement owes something to them, and we're grateful.

Thanks also to Bruce Fyfe and his staff, whose hospitality easily permits us to imagine the Grad Pub as our unofficial Union Hall.

#### **UWOFA OFFICE**

**Lauren Tremblay, Professional Officer**

Phone: 661-2111 (ext. 86960), email: [laurent@uwo.ca](mailto:laurent@uwo.ca)

**Jane Laforge, Administrative Officer**

Phone: 661-3016 (ext. 83016), email: [uwofa@uwo.ca](mailto:uwofa@uwo.ca)