

# CUASA COMMUNIQUÉ

Volume 35 No. 6

Editor: Arnd Bohm

May, 2005

## **CUASA Executive**

### **President**

FRAN CHERRY  
Psychology

### **President-Elect**

EDWARD OSEI-KWADWO-  
PREMPEH  
Political Science

### **Past-President**

THOMAS KUNZ  
Systems Engineering

### **Secretary**

SONYA LIPSETT-RIVERA  
History

### **Treasurer**

SUSAN JACKSON  
Library

### **Grievance Chair**

GERALD DE MONTIGNY  
Social Work

### **Salary Chair**

PASCALE CHAMPAGNE  
Civil/Environmental Eng.

### **Public Relations**

ARND BOHM  
English

### **OCUFA Director**

MARK LANGER  
Film Studies

### **Research Chair**

VACANT

### **Retired Members Rep.**

DON WESTWOOD  
Architecture

### **Members at Large**

MANFRED BIENEFELD  
Public Policy and  
Administration  
FRANCOIS BROUARD  
School of Business  
TIM PYCHYL  
Psychology

### **CUASA OFFICE**

408 Dunton Tower  
(613) 520-5607  
FAX: (613) 520-4426  
email:cuasa@carleton.ca  
www.caut.ca/cuasa/

### **Executive Director**

PATRICIA A. FINN, LL.M.

### **Office Manager**

DEBORAH JACKSON

## **Announcement of Election Results**

**Congratulations to Janice Scammell, who has been elected to the position of President-Elect. She will assume office as President 1 July 2006.**

**Edward Osei-Kwadwo Prempeh is the incoming President, effective 1 July 2005.**

## **President's Report**

The academic term is coming to a close and my year as CUASA President will also end shortly. I thought it would be a quiet year for CUASA without negotiations but that proved a bit wishful. Mandatory retirement and the Rae Review have kept us busy on the provincial front; centralized scheduling and examining our own organization have preoccupied us on the local front.

On the issue of centralized scheduling, we have had one productive meeting with Provost Harrison. We were assured on 26 April at JCAA that something in writing is forthcoming from the administration that will address members' concerns, but have received nothing in writing as yet. Meetings will continue and we will report back in the fall. CUASA will continue to pursue this matter with the administration. In the fall we will be canvassing colleagues from other campuses to report on their experiences with centralized scheduling.

This past year gave us an opportunity to look at some of our own organizational processes to see if they might be improved. One goal was to create an ongoing capacity for collective bargaining at CUASA. Another goal was to review our operating procedures, especially our committee structure, to determine whether these were adequate to meet the challenges and obligations of CUASA. Members of council set up three committees which looked primarily at collective bargaining and the CUASA committee structure. They worked hard from December to March. Their reports were considered at a day-long meeting of CUASA Steering in mid-March and then recommendations for constitutional changes were passed at both Steering and Council meetings in late March. Some recommendations were introduced at this year's AGM in early April. The recommendations have been posted on the CUASA web site <http://www.caut.ca/cuasa/const.html>. Please read them when you have a chance; they will be brought to members for ratification in the fall. An information session will be held prior to the vote required for all constitutional changes.

There are many things that have made my year as CUASA President a good one. CUASA, Steering, and Council are increasingly a mix of veterans and newcomers at Carleton, and there is much that I have learned from both constituencies. It's a good time to get involved with your union, and I encourage all of you to do so. I would like to wish the incoming President, Edward Osei-Kwadwo Prempeh, good luck, and know that he will appreciate your support.

I hope everyone has a productive summer.

Fran Cherry  
President, CUASA

## **An Editorial on Governance and Collegiality**

(courtesy of the UBC Faculty Association and the author)

### **Collegial Governance – Who Cares?**

Rick Coe, President,  
CUFA/BC

*[reprinted with permission]*

Like most of us, I became a professor to teach and research. I cared about students and I cared about advancing my discipline.

I knew, of course, I would have to do some committee work in my department. But mostly I wanted to teach and research, and what I wanted from administrators was to keep the university running smoothly and leave me to teach and research in accordance with my expertise.

I fear, though, that administrators are increasingly less focused on facilitating the work of those who do the actual teaching and research and more inclined to control.

UBC Prof. Bill Bruneau often speaks of the golden age of Canadian universities, which started in the mid-1960s and has been diminishing at least since the mid-1990s.

This golden age was fuelled by radical expansion, including many new universities (in B.C., UVic and SFU), and relatively plentiful resources. Stimulated by the Duff/Berdahl report in 1966, faculty influence on academic decisions, especially through university senates, became the norm at Canadian universities. Subsequently, these structures of collegial governance were written into B.C.'s University Act.

Like other forms of democracy, collegial governance is time-consuming and inefficient. It consumes lots of time I would rather spend teaching and researching.

What does collegial governance do that is worth the bother? Its primary function, I think, is to give faculty members significant influence over academic decisions, particularly over curriculum.

That is why I am distressed by current trends that tend to increase administrative power and diminish collegial governance – and why I think you should be too.

Like other forms of democracy, collegial governance is a sham unless accompanied by freedom of expression and protection of minority opinions. Collegial governance doesn't work where faculty are not free to voice their honest opinions. Academic freedom, tenure, and other such structures, among their various functions, make genuine collegial governance possible.

In a corporation, the Board of Directors has the final say on major decisions, there is a top-down chain of command, and individuals are supposed to be "team players," which often means doing whole-heartedly whatever your coach/supervisor tells you to do.

At B.C. public universities though, academic decisions must be approved by both the Board of Governors and Senate (Royal Roads University is an exception to this). Because at least half the members of Senate must be faculty, faculty members have significant power over academic decisions, particularly the power to block low quality programs.

Moreover, faculty members exercise power through the creation of curriculum and programs of study, and through the various approval processes before a proposal is subject to a formal vote at Senate.

This faculty role is crucial to what the present provincial government likes to call "quality control." (Unfortunately, this government generally wants to use quality control processes that are more appropriate for controlling the quality of widgets than for controlling the quality of higher education.)

We who spend most of our time researching to advance our disciplines and initiating students into those disciplines generally have a strong commitment to the discipline, to academic values, and to excellence. We can be trusted to protect the academic quality of our universities' programs in ways that career administrators might not.

Given the nature of their work, administrators tend to focus strongly on exigencies, on practicalities, on politics, on what sort of flak might arise from decisions. I don't mean to denigrate administrators or to charge them with dishonesty, just to say that the nature of their day-to-day work requires a strong emphasis of exigency, on being politic, and so forth.

This distinction I am making between full-time faculty and career administrators is, of course, a broad generalization with lots of exceptions. It's based on the observation that individuals' genuine values, honest opinions, and beliefs about the right way to do things very often parallel their life situations and often happen to match up with their best interests. Or as the philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach put it metaphorically, "we are what we eat" – the material realities of our lives influence our perspectives and our values.

Given these differences of emphasis and priority between faculty and administrators, I believe that universities are best off when both faculty and administrative perspectives participate in academic decisions, especially about programs, course offerings, requirements, and academic procedures.

Our universities will be worse off if that faculty influence is diminished. Unfortunately, the current trend toward corporate-style management, corporate-style structures, and corporate-style decision making does just that.

Corporate management of universities, based significantly on metaphors, analogies and processes imported from the business world, is steadily displacing collegial governance in our universities. University presidents speak of themselves as CEOs. Administrators act like managers; they rationalise administrative structures, which increasingly look like chains of command; they want "business plans" from academic units; and they replace collegial interaction with mountains of paperwork.

## **Lobby on the Budget!! Make a Difference!**

Mr. Rae has recommended a \$1.3 billion increase in operating base funding to bring Ontario up to the national per student funding average. **The next Provincial budget is due on May 11. OCUFA is asking that members call their local MPP and seek support for the \$1.3 billion increase in base funding and/or send an email to the Premier pressing him to deliver on his promise to raise per student funding to the national average. Click here for more information on the [OCUFA Budget Advocacy Campaign](#) and insert member in the Username box and member in the Password box for access.**