
FACULTY TIMES

A Newsletter of UWOFA

Vol. V, No.1

November, 2000

**UWOFA General Meeting
Thursday, November 30, 2000
4:00 - 6:00 p.m., Room 3014
Social Science Centre**

President's Report

by G. Edward Ebanks

The Collective Agreement

My one-year term as President of UWOFA began May 1, 2000, when we were in the final stages of negotiating our first Collective Agreement. So far it has been an exciting year. We have had negotiation, conciliation, ratification and now we have implementation.

in this issue...

President's Report.....	1-3
On The Bureaucratic Imagination and the Faculty as Scapegoat	3-5
Report from the Joint Committee.....	6-7
Complaints & Grievances	7-9
Notice of Motions	9
News Item	10
Possible CUPE Strike	10
Professional Expense Reimbursement	10
2000-2001 Association Officers and Committees.....	11
Invitation to join committees.....	12
Call for nominations.....	12

The Collective Agreement, ratified by almost 90 % of the Members who voted, as well as by the Board of Governors, became effective July 1, 2000, covering the four-year period July 1, 1998 - June 30, 2002. The first two academic years are included, but only for the sake of the compensation and benefits settlement. The implementation of some Articles has been unavoidably delayed (see Transition Provisions); candidates for tenure and promotion this year, for example, may go forward under the old provisions of *Conditions of Appointment*. The Tier I and Tier II status of some Part-Time

Members is still being determined. Performance-Linked Career Progress (PLCP) will be determined next spring. So, in one sense, we are now well into the third year of the Collective Agreement, and by the fall of 2001 we will have to set up a new negotiating team.

Between July and September, the main question for our Members was: "When will we get our back pay?" Since the beginning of October, Full-Time Members have been less vocal; however, Part-Time Members have been increasingly frustrated. There are many issues of concern, most of which have come to the Joint Committee. Letters of appointment for Part-Time Members have clauses allowing for all kinds of unpaid service; we regard this as contrary to the CA. We have discussed problems in buying benefits, problems with delays in payment and problems related to the determination of Tier status. These have taken up most of the time of the Joint Committee. It is our hope that we will not have individual and policy grievances on these issues. But we cannot back off dealing with these problems.

On compensation and benefits: we believe that, since we were not willing to have a strike vote, we got a reasonable settlement under the circumstances. Our Full-Time salaries, however, are still at the bottom of the Bovey group of universities. We had hoped that we could have done more for Limited Term Members; but we are pleased that, on average, the salaries of Part-Time Members went from \$7200 for a full course to \$9000, \$9500 and \$10,000.

Floors for salaries have increased, which has affected some salaries. Although the salary for a first sabbatical leave has been raised to 87.5%, we did not succeed in moving the administration on other sabbatical leave salaries; they are still 82.5%. Starting this year, the annual professional expense reimbursement has risen from \$300 to \$750 for Full-Time Members, and for Part-Time Members to a possible \$350 (see p.10). For the first time, it is now possible to use this money to buy a computer. Although this is a substantial increase, it is still too small. On the other hand, starting in 1999, newly-hired probationary Members will have up to \$6000 for research.

Overall, I see this as a respectable Collective Agreement. But the test will be in the implementation. We are already discovering areas that will have to be revisited in the second contract. We hope, however, that the provisions for appointments, promotion and tenure, workload, official file, performance evaluation and grievance and arbitration will be implemented effectively.

The CAUT Defence Fund

As a union, we voted to join the CAUT Defence Fund. Our Trustees are Marjorie Ratcliffe, Ernie Redekop and I; Ernie and I attended this year's Trustees' meeting in Halifax. At the moment, because we include Part-Time Members in our bargaining unit, we are the largest university in the Fund, followed by York. The UBC Faculty Association has recently been certified by the BC Labour Board; if its members decided to join the Fund, they would become the largest. Currently the Defence Fund stands at approximately \$11.6 million. Trustees rejected a proposal to cap the Fund and instead accepted a suggestion from Ernie Redekop that strike pay be increased from \$40/day/member to \$50/day/member. In the event of a strike, the Defence Fund will give the striking union \$50/day x the number of members, beginning one week after the beginning of the strike; the distribution of this tax-free pay is left entirely up to individual unions.

The union which has benefitted most recently from the Defence Fund has been Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association, which went on strike October 31, 2000. The Defence Fund immediately gave MUNFA a \$1 million loan, interest-free for the first six months.

CAUT and OCUFA

These federal and provincial organizations have been very useful to us during our negotiations and continue to help us during implementation. We continue to play a role not only at council meetings but also in both organizations: I was elected to the CAUT Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, and Ernie Redekop was acclaimed chair of the OCUFA Board. To help us deal with complaints and grievances procedures, we will be sending four people to the CAUT Grievance and Arbitration workshop.

Some Other Things

1) There is a notice of motion before Members on appointing a Union Representative in each unit to help Members with complaints and possible grievances (see p.9).

2) Our budget is finally in the black, but because of dues from retroactive pay we have been able to add about \$70,000 to our as yet very small reserve. To give us some perspective on what a good reserve might look like: a maritime faculty association one-sixth the size of ours has a reserve of \$1 million; the University of Manitoba FA has a reserve of about \$1.5 million; Laval FA has a reserve of some \$3.5 million. At the moment, our reserve is about \$100,000, some of which has to be set aside for possible arbitration.

3) The Faculty Dependents Scholarship for this year is \$2500.

4) The thirty-five Faculty Association Scholarships this year will be \$800 each.

EDITORIAL

ON THE BUREAUCRATIC IMAGINATION AND THE FACULTY AS SCAPEGOAT

by Regna Darnell

Whatever happened to the old idea that people in positions of public responsibility took responsibility for their own actions and failures to act? We seem to live in a time when this is dismissed as old-fashioned, and the "rhetoric of excellence" rolls on, although the good times seem long over. In my naive and old-fashioned way, I continue to believe that the academy differs from the worlds of business, finance and industry in that we do not aim to make a profit (except insofar as a thoughtful and educated citizenry profits society) and that we should control the conditions of our own work to a degree unusual for employees in a large institutional framework. From this view, the academic freedom of the ivory tower protects us from a too immediate application of the logic of the larger world. Another of my basic assumptions that is too often challenged is that faculty, regardless of full- or part-time status, share with the administration a commitment to the intellectual work which is at the core of our public mandate. And yet, faculty too often seem to be the

scapegoats of an administration's response to profoundly anti-intellectual currents from the wider political and social sphere. It isn't our fault. We're doing the best we can under increasingly onerous bureaucratic restriction.

I think we did a pretty good job on the new contract. There are still some glitches, but a lot of careful thought, drawing on our negotiators' experience of broad segments of the UWO community, went into its restructurings of the priorities of faculty-administration relations. We chose to emphasize forms of governance over salary in the short term. Nonetheless, issues of salary are not trivial: all of us have been devastated by recent and escalating losses of key faculty to high salaries and more appreciative collegial climates elsewhere. Despite our contract, Western continues to fall increasingly behind comparable Ontario universities in its salary scale. And yet the recent but all-too-familiar announcement of budget cuts from our administration is still phrased in terms of faculty unwillingness to settle for less than the faculty is worth, so that other financial commitments can be met. Whatever our personal and individual penchants for sacrifice to the common good, I am convinced it is not in the interests of this University to decrease dramatically our power to attract and retain outstanding faculty.

Western still has a great number of faculty who feel strong loyalty to this institution. I count myself among them. But across North America, the relationship between faculty and their employers is becoming more instrumental and tenuous. One of the good things about the rotten job market over most of my career has been that people settle in and try to make something of the places in which they find themselves. Many of our brightest and most dedicated faculty have held a single job over their entire careers. Telling such people that they aren't good community citizens if they want to be paid well and improve their conditions of work is a slap in the face to those who have stuck it out and continued to care about this place (even while seriously wondering whether it cares about them). We face an impasse in the negotiations between the administration and the PMA, as well as a potential strike of caretakers and skilled trade workers. Some of the issues are certainly financial. Others, however, are about faculty and other employees' feeling that they have been made the scapegoats for these financial shortfalls.

Yes, we all understand that berating the government is a bad way to establish the good will that sometimes produces monetary and program windfalls. Externally, university administrators must certainly take an upbeat stance about what is achieved. I would be the last to deny the welcomeness of infrastructure funding or various science-industry partnership initiatives. They just don't do much for morale in my part of the world (social sciences and humanities). Internally, however, I would like to hear more sympathy for how we as members of the faculty manage with too limited resources. It's actually no longer a compelling argument to say that we need more resources in order to offer our programs responsibly; apparently everybody thinks they need more resources. But what if there isn't enough for us, individually or collectively, to go around? Should we just double our teaching commitments and forget about research? Then why bother to be at a real university? We need a way to explain to a broader public how difficult it is becoming to offer the kind of education valued by the faculty and, I hope, by our administration.

I spent a good bit of my summer on a committee discussing space allocations in the Social Science building -- in anticipation of the double cohort and overall enrollment increases. We took this request very seriously and thought about space revisions that would meet our collegial requirements as well as package docile bodies into sardine-can facilities. The response was draconian: academic units were given precise percentages of classes that had to be taught at hours when students as well as faculty are loath to appear. It isn't our fault as members of faculty that the provincial government hasn't funded adequately the expected double cohort influx. Sure, we should try to use buildings and classrooms as fully as possible, but central orders to fit faculty and students into these Procrustean beds are so much less productive than requests to explore the possibilities.

Many of you have heard me compare getting faculty to take a single coherent position to herding cats -- difficult at best. There are a lot of prima donnas among us. But maybe that's not an evil thing. Maybe we know the conditions under which we work most productively. I would be a disaster in an 8 a. m. class, but I am often working in the wee hours of the morning when all those morning people are snoring happily. The joint administration-faculty association Workload Study a few years back demonstrated clearly how hard most of us work, all year round, and how complex the range of activities that are part of our work. The conventional workload components of teaching, research and service broke down into 43 categories of things people do -- at all hours of day and night. Hours in the classroom are the tip of an iceberg, even within the teaching component. We don't need policing from the administration to give fair work in our employment. The few exceptions are unlikely to be moved much by a watching Big Brother. The proliferation of bureaucratic intervention penalizes us all.

There was an abortive initiative a few years ago to schedule classes centrally, without any input from academic units about their particular needs and circumstances. Most of us prefer to teach in or near the building where our department/faculty is based. This is not selfishness; it facilitates academic work if students and professors can easily move between classroom and office or laboratory -- never mind hauling large stacks of books around the campus. Of course, we all know that we can't always teach when and where we want to. But it isn't unreasonable for us to have these preferences or for the institution to accommodate them where possible. Common sense and collegiality overlap here.

Local autonomy of academic units seems to be the key here. A centralized bureaucracy is not fair and just, precisely because it doesn't get at local realities. As long as things go smoothly in a unit, members of faculty, students and staff should be able to assume they are doing their work well and that it is valued centrally. The purpose of a university bureaucracy is to serve, to organize the work we do together in an academic community. It is not its function to pass the buck and blame the faculty for structural problems not under their control.

Regna Darnell (Anthropology) is Co-Editor of Faculty Times and a former President of the Association

The Joint Committee

by Dan Jorgensen

What it is? how does it work? what has it been doing?

One provision of our Collective Agreement (CA) is that its implementation is to be overseen by the Joint Committee, which has members from the Administration and from the Association (Mike Dawes, as our chief negotiator for the CA; Ernie Redekop, as past president and member of the negotiating team; Lauren Tremblay, as our professional officer; and I, as vice-president). The mandate of the JC is to resolve problems that inevitably arise when a new contract comes into force, a situation that is particularly relevant at UWO because this is our first CA following certification. Here it is important to add that the JC has no authority to alter the terms of the CA, though it may recommend modifications to the two parties.

As it turns out, there have been a number of problems whose sources range from blank spots or grey zones in the CA to outright disagreements about the interpretation and implementation of the CA's provisions. One result of this is that the JC has been meeting three to four times a month, rather than once a month as originally planned, in order to deal with issues as they arise. Some things have amounted to a filling in of details as required by the CA, such as agreeing on a list of arbitrators. Other issues have turned on the extension of deadlines for implementing particular aspects of the CA. Minor difficulties can sometimes be settled in the course of a single meeting, particularly if all that is needed is to confirm a common reading of a contract provision or for one side to provide information which the other side needs. Examples of such matters include confirmation that certain benefits will be available as of a particular date, requests for information sessions or lists of Members affected by a particular provision. More often, one side brings a particular matter to the attention of their counterparts, who must then look into it from their side and report back before a resolution is achieved. These matters fall under the general category of growing pains; they include such things as letters of appointment for Part-Time Members and the question of compensation for the service of Part-Time Members.

In some cases, there has been extensive negotiation over the interpretation of the CA. Whenever the outcome of such negotiation suggests a substantive modification or clarification of the CA, the result is a Letter of Understanding which must be approved by the Association Executive and by the Administration. These Letters of Understanding then become appended to the CA and have the same force as the main text of the CA itself. To date, we have reached agreement on Letters of Understanding concerning sabbatical leave applications from probationary Members in their last year of probation, the appointment of candidates without doctorates who have completed all requirements except for the dissertation, and transition provisions for Part-Time Members. Outstanding issues awaiting resolution include the interpretation of the carry-forward and carry-back provisions of the professional expense reimbursement and the persistent disagreement, mentioned above, concerning Part-Time Members' job descriptions and the terms under which they participate on committees or otherwise contribute through service.

The Editing Committee and the printed version of the CA:

A source of frustration for many of our Members and University administrators alike is the lack of a printed version of the CA. One of the CA's provisions requires the Administration to print enough copies of the CA so that each Member will have one. This has taken far longer to accomplish than anyone anticipated, and it is reasonable to ask why this is so. The short answer is that the editing of the CA for printed publication is a complex task. Quite apart from technical matters of standardizing usage, setting typographical conventions and so on, this process involves an enormous amount of checking and cross-checking to ensure that the cross-references in the text (e.g., a reference to Article X in the text of Article A) are accurate. In addition, the fact that we are dealing with a document in excess of 170 pages makes the compilation of an index essential to its usability for Members. Happily, this latter task has already been accomplished, and only minor renumbering issues remain. Because the Association has the responsibility for distributing the CA (once it is printed), the Executive of the Association and the Association members of the Joint Committee have insisted that the printing of the CA be completed no later than mid-November. If the printing of the CA can indeed be accomplished by this time, the CA should be in your hands in a couple of weeks.

Dan Jorgensen (Anthropology) is Vice-President of the Association, a member of the Joint Committee, and with John McDougall, one of the two Association editors of the printed version of the Collective Agreement.

Complaints and Grievances

Ernie Redekop

Procedures for grievance and arbitration

Before the negotiations that led to our Collective Agreement, the Association paid particular attention to grievance and arbitration procedures, and our Negotiating Team stressed their significance during our bargaining sessions. Since such procedures provide the direct means for the parties to enforce the contract and to resolve disputes, they are crucial to any collective agreement. We believe that the procedures in the *Grievance and Arbitration* Article will serve us well, should they become necessary.

However, most of the complaints that come to my attention and to the attention of Lauren Tremblay, our Professional Officer, do not lead to grievance. So far, most of the complaints with which we have dealt have resulted from a Member's perception of unfair or unjust treatment by one branch of the Administration or another; they have not arisen out of a violation of any specific clause in an Article of the Collective Agreement. Lauren and I have tried to deal with these complaints through friendly persuasion and, in the majority of these cases we have succeeded.

Complaints from Part-Time Members

There has, however, been a disproportionately large number of complaints from Part-Time Members regarding their letters of appointment, the tardy payment of salaries, the adjudication of Tier status and the whole question of compensation for service. Some of these complaints have arisen because of problems in the implementation of the Articles dealing with Part-Time, but nevertheless all the complaints are, in our opinion, justified. In these cases, the Association members of the Joint Committee have been dealing with the problems; these issues have been discussed at every single meeting of the Joint Committee and will continue to be on the table for the foreseeable future. The Joint Committee does not--nor should it--have the power to resolve the problems; it does have the responsibility for recommending possible solutions to the problems to the respective parties, the Employer and the Association (through the Executive).

Teaching and service of Part-Time Members

Unfortunately, on the critical matters of the content of the letters of appointment for Part-Time Members and on the question of compensation for service, the two sides of the Joint Committee have not yet reached agreement. The Association's understanding is that the Collective Agreement clearly stipulates that Part-Time Members are paid *only for teaching* the particular course or courses mentioned in their contracts; during negotiations, the Administration reiterated its principled position that Part-Time Members could not be regarded as "fractions" of Full-Time Members and that, in consequence, they could be paid only on a *per course* basis and only for teaching. The Administration, by agreeing to a schedule of stipulated services carried out by Part-Time Members in the Faculty of Music, *accepted in principle and in practice* that service not specifically related to a course should be paid separately and in addition to the compensation for teaching a particular course.

Principles in dispute

The current dispute arises out of the conflict between the Association's assertion that service on elected committees mentioned in the Collective Agreement should count as service and the Administration's unwillingness to date to accept that argument. The principle at stake here is that *work should be paid for*. Since the Collective Agreement has no provisions to reward Part-Time Members through a merit system, the only remaining form of reward is financial. Principles of fairness and justice demand that Part-Time Members who do service outside the particular course or course they may be teaching should be paid for this service and not be asked to volunteer their work. Full-Time Members, of course, are required to participate in committees and perform other services as part of their academic responsibilities, so this problem does not arise for them.

Possible policy grievance

The Association members of the Joint Committee have taken this matter very seriously, presenting a motion to the Executive that the President of the Association be authorized to initiate a policy grievance on behalf of the Association if the two matters of the letters of appointment for Part-Time Members and the compensation for service are not resolved by the end of November. The Executive has passed this motion and so the President is now able to begin a process which might end in arbitration, should there be need for it.

How do complaints and grievances work?

Because grievance procedures are new to most Members, a word of explanation is in order. The Association can mount three kinds of grievances: a grievance on behalf of an individual Member, a group grievance concerning an identical issue in dispute, initiated by the Association on behalf of two or more members against the Employer, and a policy grievance that addresses wider issues and fundamental principles. In each case, the Association carries the grievance; there is no such thing as a Member's mounting a grievance by himself or herself. Any complaint, including complaints that might conceivably lead to a grievance, come in the first instance to our Professional Officer or--if the Membership approves the motion on the selection of union representatives--to a union representative in the department, school or faculty. If, in her opinion and mine, there is a possibility that the complaint might indicate the violation of any part of the Collective Agreement, I take it to the Rights & Grievances Committee, which then has to decide whether or not the complaint is a grievance. If it decides that the matter before it is indeed a grievance, the Association is bound by the legal requirements of the *duty of fair representation* in its assessment of complaints to decide whether or not to carry an individual grievance or to mount a policy grievance on behalf of a group of Members if there is evidence that any part of the Collective Agreement has been violated.

It is in the interest of a Member, as it is in the interests of the Association and, indeed, of the Administration, that a complaint be resolved quickly and informally if it at all possible. These interests are reflected in the provisions of the Article, which, in general, requires us to attempt an informal resolution and try to achieve a just solution to a problem without resorting to arbitration.

Ernie Redekop (English) is the Past President of the Association, the chair of the Rights & Grievances Committee and a member of the Joint Committee.

Union Representatives: Yes or No?

Notice of Motion from the Executive presented at the General Meeting of 18 October 2000:

THAT the Association establish a system of Union Representatives in each Department or School or Faculty without Departments who will inform Members of their rights and assist with informal settlement and bring to the Rights & Grievance Committee any complaint that is likely to become a formal grievance.

Notice of Motion from Executive supplementary to the above:

THAT in each Department or School or Faculty without Departments, Members of the Bargaining Unit in that Department or School or Faculty without Departments select a Union Representative.

These motions will be presented to members of the Association at the next General Meeting (see p.1).

News Item

The Executive of the Association has authorized a payment of \$2000 in support of our striking colleagues at Memorial University of Newfoundland and a payment of \$1500 in support of CUPE Local 3903 at York University, which includes all the Part-Time teachers at the university.

So far, over a dozen associations have expressed their support in this manner. The largest support has come from Queen's University FA, which donated \$5000 to Memorial and \$4000 to York, but the most significant support has come from very small associations like that at the University College of Cape Breton, which has donated \$1000 to Memorial.

Possible strike at UWO: a message from the President

Eddie Ebanks

In the event of a strike by CUPE at Western, we will need to be reminded of the Article *Working Conditions*, clause 9.1:

"A Member shall not be assigned new duties that, as of July 1, 1999, were exclusively performed by members of other employee groups, unless the Member agrees to such duties."

We should not do the duties which are the responsibility of CUPE members. The President of the Local, Rick Graham, asks us not to do the jobs of the CUPE members.

It may take longer to get to work, since CUPE members will stop all cars and ask questions. They will not try to prevent us from doing our jobs. We may have to cross picket lines, and I ask all of you to be patient.

Professional Expense Reimbursement

Full-Time Members may claim up to \$750/year; Part-Time Members may claim up to \$150 for the first full-course equivalent and \$50 for each additional half-course to a maximum of \$350/year. Supplies, such as books, paper, print cartridges, computer software, etc. are eligible; as are membership dues, Internet fees and equipment such as computers. Members are allowed to carry the PER forward for up to three years in order, for example, to save up for a conference. At the moment, the arrangement is that equipment may be bought now on the assumption that the Member will be reimbursed at a one-year, two-year or three-year rate, i.e., for up to \$750, up to \$1500 or up to \$2250. Such equipment remains the property of the University. The PER must purchase the equipment outright; there can be no contribution from the Member. Upgrades to privately-owned computers are not eligible, but upgrades to University-owned computers are eligible. The PER reserve must be sufficient to cover the full cost of the equipment (including tax).

President: Eddie Ebanks (*ex officio* on all committees)

Vice-President: Dan Jorgensen (*ex officio* on all committees)

Executive Committee

Eddie Ebanks, President (Chair)
 Dan Jorgensen, Vice-President
 Ernie Redekop, Past President
 Terry Sicular, Treasurer
 Michael Cormier, Secretary
 Mike Carroll
 Bernd Frohmann
 Paul Handford
 Tess Hooks
 Mike Marlborough
 John McDougall
 Alan Webster
 Tom Wonnacott
 Mike Dawes, (Observer)

Policy/Governance

John McDougall (Chair)
 Paul Handford
 Mike Carroll
 Tess Hooks
 Alan Webster
 Michael Cormier

Rights & Grievances

Ernie Redekop (Chair)
 Mike Carroll
 Bernd Frohmann
 Michael Cormier
 Claudia Vicencio
 Kevin Wamsley
 Candace Gibson
 Barbara Murison
 Lauren Tremblay (*ex officio*, non-voting)

Publication & Communications

Ernie Redekop (Chair)
 Paul Handford
 Mike Carroll
 Bernd Frohmann
 Regna Darnell

Salary

Mike Dawes (Chair)
 Mike Marlborough
 John McDougall
 Alan Webster
 Jim Davies
 Doug Baer
 Eric Buckolz

Pensions & Benefits

Terry Sicular (Chair)
 Alan Webster
 Gerry McKeon
 David Radcliffe
 John Starkey
 A. A. de Kergommeaux

Faculty Dependents' Scholarship Plan

Alan Webster (Chair)
 Tom Wonnacott
 Mike Marlborough

Part-Time

Tess Hooks (Chair)
 Kathleen Fraser
 Claudia Vicencio

President's Standing Committee on Employment Equity

Aniko Varpalotai
 Tom Wonnacott

Status of Women

Bonnie MacLachlan (Chair)
 Tom Wonnacott
 Paul Handford
 Tess Hooks
 Margaret Kellow
 Sheila Cavanagh
 Alison Lee
 Aniko Varpalotai

Personnel

Eddie Ebanks (Chair)
 Ernie Redekop
 Michael Cormier
 Lauren Tremblay (*ex officio*, non-voting)

Membership

Dan Jorgensen (Chair)
 Paul Handford
 Mike Carroll
 John McDougall
 Tess Hooks

Occupational Health & Safety

Paul Handford and Sara B. Galsworthy

Parking Appeals: Tom Wonnacott

Parking Advisory: John Trevithick

Joint Committee

Ernie Redekop
 Mike Dawes
 Dan Jorgensen

University, Safety of Women on Campus: Julie McMillin
Employee Assistance Programme (EAP): David Radcliffe

Nominating Committee

Ernie Redekop (Chair)
 3 Past Presidents
 Tess Hooks
 Mike Marlborough

OCUFA Representative: Ernie Redekop (2000-2002)

OCUFA: Chair of the Board: Ernie Redekop (2000-2001)

CAUT, Academic Freedom & Tenure Committee

Eddie Ebanks

CAUT Defence Fund Trustees

Eddie Ebanks
 Ernie Redekop
 Majorie Ratcliffe

Nominations for Speaker (one-year term)

Nominations for the UWOFA Executive Committee

The Nominating Committee invites members of the Association to suggest names of members for consideration by the Committee.

The elective positions, beginning May 1, 2000, are the following:

Vice-President (who succeeds to the Presidency);
Five members of the Executive (two-year terms).

All full-time and part-time members of the Association are eligible.

Please send your suggestion to:

Ernie Redekop, Chair, Nominating Committee
UWO Faculty Association
Room 206, 1393 Western Road (Campus Mail)
Phone: 661-3016 (ext. 83016), e-mail: uwofa@julian.uwo.ca
Fax: 661-3946 (ext. 83946)

UWOFA OFFICE

Lauren Tremblay, Professional Officer

Phone: 661-2111 (ext. 86960), e-mail: laurent@julian.uwo.ca

Jane Laforge, Administrative Officer

Phone: 661-3016 (ext. 83016), e-mail: uwofa@julian.uwo.ca

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

Regna Darnell and Ernie Redekop, editors

Published for UWOFA by the Publication & Communications Committee:

Ernie Redekop (Chair),
Michael Carroll
Regna Darnell
Bernd Frohmann
Paul Handford

Faculty Times welcomes contributions and letters to the Editor. We look forward to lively responses and debate on issues.