



MAUT – APBM Newsletter

www.mcgill.ca/maut/

McGILL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS
ASSOCIATION DES PROFESSEUR(E)S ET BIBLIOTHÉCAIRES DE MCGILL

Vol 28 No 3 Summer Été 2002

In This Issue

<i>Editor's remarks</i>	1
<i>P-Card Administration</i>	7
<i>Proposal for Changes to the Ranks of Professor Emeritus, Associate Professor Emeritus, Librarian Emeritus & Associate Librarian Emeritus—Update</i>	8
<i>MAUT Membership Committee</i>	9
<i>Tenure Procedural Changes Proposed</i>	9
<i>Tenure & Mentoring Committee</i>	11
<i>President's Report</i>	7
<i>VP (Communications) Report</i>	10
<i>VP (Internal) Report</i>	10
50th Anniversary	
<i>MAUT Anniversary Notes (Carman Miller)</i>	3
<i>Memories of Grief and Collegiality (John Hobbins)</i>	4
<i>Memo from Roy Morrison</i>	6

Editor's Remarks

This is the third and last issue of the *MAUT-APBM Newsletter* for the 2001/2002 academic year; a whole new cycle starting again at the end of the summer. I suspect that most of you like me have answered innumerable times, "So what do you do in the summer?" Well, of late my answer has become "Catch up on what I did not get done in the winter!" In my 25 years at McGill, I have seen a shift in my summer activity from it being a time to look forward to for a decrease in commitments, committee work and general level of stress to one these days of just more of the same. Perhaps this is due to the summer teaching my department has embraced, perhaps it is due to e-mail and the ability to be in touch with everyone all the time, or perhaps it is just the natural progression of one's career. Be that as it may, it is at least a chance to get this final Newsletter out, so "I hope you have a good one" even if this has become somewhat less meaningful.

Spring General Meeting

The MAUT Annual Spring General Meeting took place in the Faculty Club April 16, 2002. MAUT Executive and Council made a conscientious effort when preparing the agenda and designing the presentations to make the meeting more lively and to be a forum for input from those members present by distributing as much information as possible via the MAUT website prior to the meeting. Unlike previous meetings where the last items on the agenda were presented to just the handful of people who remained, the meeting concluded in a timely fashion to an audience that was still awake! For those who did not attend the meeting, most of the reports are presented in this newsletter. During discussion on matters of money, group health insurance and matters of concern discussed by Michael Smith, VP Internal, there was a request from the floor to provide an overview in a future newsletter. As mentioned at the meeting this is not necessary since Michael had already summarized the various issues in past newsletters. MAUT members can access the previous issues of the *MAUT-APBM Newsletter* via the MAUT website (<http://www.mcgill.ca/maut/>).

Membership Efforts Summary

A total of ninety-one new members were signed up in the period from September 1, 2001 to the present. With departures, this meant that the

Corrections to January Newsletter

- G. Tannebaum, not E. Zorychta as mentioned in the January newsletter, reported on the Gender Equity Issue at the Fall General Meeting.
- Also, 1165 academic salaries were analyzed in the review, of which 319 were females. Sixty-two women whose salaries merited further scrutiny were identified.

number of members has remained stable. It is clear that membership remains a central issue for the coming years since without the focused efforts we are making, the roll-over of staff that is occurring rapidly these days will quickly erode our numbers. The key challenges identified by those recruiting are that there is a lack of awareness of the existence of MAUT, the assumption by some that people will just automatically join so there is no need for a recruiting effort and the feeling that the return for the membership fees is very low as compared to what one gets at McGill without becoming a member. My personal feelings on this are simply that higher membership would translate to lower dues and a stronger voice for teaching staff when dealing with the administration. So it is in every member's interest to encourage one's colleagues to join. Active grass roots campaigning is likely to be the most effective. Don't leave it out of your discussions. Ask at Department meetings "Who are members?" Joining these days is as simple as filling in a four-item web-form at <http://www.mcgill.ca/maut>.

Emeritus Professor Proposal

It was reported at the Spring General Meeting that there was no progress at the level of the Senate Ad-hoc Committee on Emeritus Professor on the issues of changing the Guidelines for the Honorary Degrees Committee and the University Regulations regarding the rank of Emeritus Professor. It is ironic since it seems that the issue boils down to one of the name, despite the cliché that "a rose is a rose is a rose". McGill's use of the term emeritus to mean merit-worthy when the origin of the title is emeriti – latin "to serve", makes finding a solution a challenge since the emotional debate around this issue is based on error. But perhaps one way forward has been suggested: the rank of Emeritus Professor should be preserved at McGill in its present embodiment and a new rank called, for example, "Professor Alumnus" be created. This would keep the McGill tradition of misusing words

(alumnus is also not the correct term for what we would do) and make everybody happy since there would be benefits to the individual and the University from automatically appointing everyone to this rank upon their retirement.

CAUT Meeting

James Turk, Executive Director of CAUT and Rhonda Love, Chair of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, CAUT, and President of the University of Toronto Faculty Association, came to Montreal and spoke with MAUT Executive and Council at a Special Meeting, May 22, 2002. Among the main issues discussed was membership under the "Rand Formula", voluntary, modified or creeping, whereby new staff could be given the option of opting out for Conscientious Objections, but otherwise be required to join a faculty association or at least pay a sum equal to the membership fees. Also discussed were the corporatization of universities and the impact on academic freedom. Your comments on these issues sent via the list, mautcncl@lists.mcgill.ca would also be welcome.

Principle-Elect Meeting

MAUT Council met with the Principal-Elect, Dr. Heather Munroe-Blum on June 12, 2002. The items that MAUT discussed were a) salary, b) infrastructure (physical and human) support, c) recruitment and retention, d) collegiality and importance of consultation, e) setting up priorities, f) CRCs: where are we going, are we in danger of losing some, g) non-tenure track academic staff and h) support for basic research (Is commercialization a threat to basic research?)

FYI: a report prepared by Dr. Munroe-Blum while she was V-P Research at the University of Toronto on the Commercialization of Universities can be seen at <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/rir/report/index.html>

U21 Global

It was briefly mentioned in Senate that McGill's US\$500,000 contribution towards U21 Global will be completed in the coming year. The University of Toronto has decided to withdraw from this organization. UBC and University of Virginia remain the other North American member universities. More information on Universitas 21, the parent body of U21 Global can be seen at <http://www.universitas.edu.au>.

Publication Costs

An active messaging campaign took place late in the term as staff discussed the merits and their activities regarding the costs of journals and their reviewing efforts. It was interesting to learn that some staff at McGill refuse to review for high priced journals unless remunerated, whilst others favour the speed and exposure of the "self-publishing" of various electronic journals and spurn the mainline—read "expensive"—journals. I realize that I am a neophyte in these matters, suggesting to me that the debate is idiosyncratic to discipline. However, it makes me wonder at what point, if ever, will the globalization of things be resisted.

Sabbatic Leaves

The MAUT informal survey of Sabbatic Leaves in the current round of applications and administration decisions through the MAUT Forum received responses from thirty-one staff. Many reported that they had no problems, whereas others were confronted by unexplained delays, requests for clarification and responses that were tending to negative. People who seemed to require advice were directed to Joseph Varga, MAUT's legal officer and hearsay has it that most staff are now satisfied with the situation.

RALUT / CAERA

Peter Russell, President of the Retired Academics and Librarians of the University of Toronto, visited McGill on February 1, 2002 and spoke of the situation at the University of Toronto. He also invited McGill partici-

pation at the CAERA (Canadian Association of Emeriti and Retired Academics) Conference held May 31. See <http://www.ralut.ca/> and <http://caera.caut.ca/>. A lively e-mail forum has taken place in the interim, as these organizations look to the best possible ways to support their members. A summary of the discussion to date from Peter Russell can be seen at <http://www.ralut.ca/caera1.htm#Preliminary>. It is interesting to note that the number of retired members in UTFA (University of Toronto Faculty Association) is far greater than in MAUT, perhaps due to Ontario legislation requiring retirement at age 65. This brings additional challenges to their association as the interests of the membership span a wider range perhaps than we typically see in MAUT.

Senate Coverage

A question was put to the *McGill Reporter* about Senate coverage. It seems publication deadlines create some difficulty but we were assured that they will be doing their best. Senators who are MAUT members are reminded that the MAUT Forum is available to quickly distribute information on matters of interest to MAUT. ■

50th Anniversary

MAUT Anniversary Notes

CARMAN MILLER

Old MAUT hands and former presidents usually warn innocent incoming presidents to be prepared for the unexpected. For me it began with my recruitment.

About a month before the annual call for nominations closed, George Just sidled up to me in the Faculty Club Ballroom and asked if I would consider being nominated President-elect. Before he had quite completed his case, I explained to him that there were two serious impediments to my candidacy: I was not a member of the MAUT [I had resigned a few years ago because I disapproved some policy position or other], and I disagreed strongly with their support for increased student tuition. George was not one easily dissuaded. Nevertheless the conversation ended there, at least temporarily. Then about 48 hours before nominations closed, George called to ask if I had made a decision, leaving me with a tinge of guilt—maybe he had been awaiting a response. I reiterated my objections. In his view the first was easily remedied; and should the tuition issue arise, someone else could handle the matter. With some hesitation I agreed. My candidacy however preceded my membership, and consequently it was probably invalid.

But I had scarcely consented when another “impediment” arose: I agreed to return to the Chair of the History Department, a conflict of interest that only McGill would tolerate. Another condition was required to accommodate this circumstance: I would recuse myself from any issue of faculty grievance.

The real challenge was not the conflict of interest but the immense amount of work entailed in managing these two demanding responsibilities. The personal reward was a greater understanding of the University, and the opportunity to establish some lasting

friendships with some of the University’s great citizens.

During my presidency the two burning issues were the University’s decision to close the Faculty of Dentistry, and the great equity debate. Both required an immense amount of time, energy and diplomacy. The more brutal was the equity debate, perhaps because it was divisive, internal and highly emotional. The senior administration looked on with bemused enjoyment as our internal debates distracted us and threatened to create innervating and permanent divisions. Senior actors on both sides of the debate threatened to leave the MAUT and found an alternative organization. Three or four extraordinary general meetings and a postal ballot were required to bring us back to the status quo!

The first extraordinary meeting underscored my abysmal knowledge of parliamentary procedures, which I endeavoured to rem-

MAUT-APBM Newsletter

The *MAUT* – APBM *Newsletter* is published monthly during the academic year, by the McGill Association of University Teachers/Association des Professeur(e)s et Bibliothécaires de McGill, to keep all members informed of concerns and activities.

Editor Ralph Harris
(Mining, Metals & Materials Engineering)
Administrative Officer Honore Kerwin–Borrelli
Design and Layout Marilyn Fransiszyn (Libraries)

Postal Address
McGill Association of University Teachers
3495 Peel Street, Room 202
McGill University
Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 1W7
Tel (514) 398–3942
Fax (514) 398–6937
E-Mail mautadm@po-box.mcgill.ca

edy with a crash course. I also took the precaution of asking Bob Vogel to Chair the subsequent meetings, which he did with his usual great parliamentary skill. During the parliamentary wrangling, as both sides sought mastery of the floor, my most difficult challenges came from my colleagues in the Faculty of Arts - that I expected - and my greatest support from members of the Faculty of Science!

In contrast, the fight to save Dentistry was long but relatively painless. The MAUT took its stand on the pre-emptory manner in which the Central administration had announced its decision, in the Summer, and without the normal consultation required. While the MAUT co-ordinated its forces for the subsequent Senate discussion, the real battle was fought and won in the larger Montreal and alumni Community, outraged by its anticipated loss and willing to match its outrage with the resources required for its continuance. ■



50th Anniversary

Memories of Grief and Collegiality

JOHN HOBBS

When Irwin Gopnik changed hats in 1983 from Chair of the MAUT Grievance Committee to President-Elect, he proposed the Grievance Committee be dissolved. It was to be replaced by a panel of advisors – basically a group of academics who had experience in advising and could be called to help with a case, but who did not meet formally as a committee. Requests for help were channeled through the Chief Grievance Advisor, who could select one of the panel to advise in any particular case. Irwin persuaded me to become MAUT's first Chief Advisor. I had spent the previous two years in the rather depressing job of Treasurer. This was depressing because I inherited a massive six-figure debt. My predecessor, faced with legal bills from the ongoing court case to dissolve the MAUT and monthly bills from FAPUQ, had decided not to pay the latter for a year. He was an economist – need I say more? I was obliged to go to general meetings and make gloomy reports, begging for a dues increase at a time when staff members were not getting raises. By the time the debts were paid off by special levy I was ready for a change.

Chief Grief

Chief Grievance Advisor—or Chief Grief as our President Roy Morrison always put it in a way he found vastly amusing although I never quite saw the humour myself—was not my only role. The VP (Internal) has been president elect up to this time, but the new position of VP (President-elect) was created. I became the first VP (Internal) not to move on to the presidency. In this position I was often part of a group that held discussions with the University. Three of us met with three Vice-Principals to solve the problems of the day. One Vice-Principal, as I recall, observed the proceedings in relatively silent and seemingly abstracted benevolence, his

mind apparently far from the room we were in. A second seemed to us highly confrontational, giving the appearance of yapping at the heels of our contingent like a deranged Rottweiler. It seemed to me that the only person on their side with whom a rational conversation could be held was the Vice-Principal (Academic), Sam Freedman. Sam had a reputation for toughness and rigorous enforcement of academic standards, but that I think went with the territory. He could also be compassionate and he, at least, understood the nature of being an academic in the University.

Nothing in my previous training and upbringing had prepared me for being Chief Grievance Advisor. I was considerably out of my depth but also extremely fortunate in the people I could count on. Older hands, who had carried the flag before me, like Irwin Gopnik and Archie Malloch, were always willing to offer me critically important advice. A number of the cases each year dealt with appeal at the renewal or tenure level, a situation that could mean loss of job for the unfortunate individual. In my view one could only advise on a single major appeal case per session since it can be a time-consuming, stressful and arduous process. The advantage of being Chief Advisor was that I could choose which case to advise on personally and find other advisors for the remaining cases that were not so much to my taste. As a result I built up quite an enviable record over the next two or three years, winning every case except the last. This distressed me a great deal and I still blame myself for failing to win a case I thought should have been won. I then decided to pass the torch to abler hands and get out of association politics.

Credit Sam Freedman

The large majority of cases referred to me did not, however, involve appeals. There were a bewildering variety of things that went wrong for people of sorts that I could never have envisioned. The remarkable thing to me was the number of cases that could be settled without resort to formal proceedings. At this time collegiality was not simply a concept but was actually practiced. Our bosses were essentially colleagues who, for a little while, took on administrative duties before rejoining us again. Vice-Principals were not only accessible, but could often be found having lunch in the Faculty Club. All kinds of general issues could be resolved over lunch and appointments could be made with ease for specific cases. I was free, with my clients' permission, to discuss many matters "off the record" with Sam Freedman. It seemed to me that he often came up with ingenious solutions that satisfied everyone but, since we did not advertise his role, it tended to make me look undeservedly rather competent. Perhaps it is time to give Sam the credit he is due with a few examples.

One day in mid-March a young assistant professor came to see me. He had wanted to be considered for early tenure and had been told the previous September that the department would recommend him. Early tenure was important because his salary was below the minimum for Associate Professor. He had heard nothing in the intervening six months and wondered how he could find out what was happening. A quick call to the ever-reliable Sheila Sheldon revealed the information that the Secretariat had never received this tenure application and the deadline for such receipt was five months previously. It transpired that nothing had been done about his application because his department was in a level of disarray, seldom achieved even at McGill. Some time before these events, the departmental chair had developed an interesting procedure that could potentially make millions of dollars. However, there was national publicity surrounding this venture followed by allegations of procedural wrongs and other turpitudes. The

chair resigned to pursue commercialization and an acting chair (poor chap) was installed in December. Thus, in the tide of greater events, the tenure application for this person had been completely forgotten. I was unsure how we could build a tenure dossier, get letters of reference and get the University Tenure Committee to hear the case all in three weeks. However, I went to have a chat with Sam and he figured out a way. We agreed that my client had been let down by the system and Sam, who knew the field well, told me the individual deserved tenure. He undertook to get whatever the tenure committee needed to make a decision and so I left it in his hands. My client got his tenure and I think that we must have set a record in fast-tracking the process that would be hard to beat. I didn't enquire too closely into the nature of the corners Sam must have cut

"The remarkable thing to me was the number of cases that could be settled without resort to formal proceedings."

but, although he had no obligation to do so and it would have been easy to blame others, he did the right thing for the individual. Naturally the client thought I was a splendidly effective advocate.

Non-tenure Track Dismissal

Another case was even stranger. It seems a Research Director, who had employed a researcher on soft funds for some dozen years or more, suddenly called the unfortunate fellow in and summarily fired him. This was all very difficult because we had, at that time, no policies covering dismissal of non-tenure-track academics. There was no sever-

ance, no appeal, nothing. When the researcher came to see me he was hoping for at least a few months' salary in lieu of notice. He also told me a tale that was full of intrigue. The Research Director had been on the political left in the 1950s and was still denied access to the US. The researcher had been giving papers in his supervisor's name for years because of the travel ban. The RCMP interviewed him now and then about his boss, meeting him unexpectedly on campus or outside his house. Throughout all this he had remained loyal to the Research Director, said little and ignored the politics. Then out of the blue he was peremptorily fired, because he might have gone over to the "other side". I felt I did not have a lot of high cards in my hand regarding any internal remedies on this one, and felt that a nasty, but interesting court case might be looming. But I spoke to Sam anyway and, inevitably, he was familiar with the case. The Research Director was becoming ill and irrational. Since Sam was a doctor and I was known for my intimate scientific knowledge of the various physical and psychological ills that beset humankind, Sam was able to explain the problem to me in terms of clinical precision. The Research Director, Sam told me, was going off his rocker. This fact was apparently well-known in the field and that the individual would be taking retirement shortly. It wouldn't do any good to reinstate the employee since the granting agency would not be renewing the funding. There was nothing that could be done according to policy, since the Research Director had absolute control over who was hired on the funds. We knew, however, that the employee had been unfairly treated. The first thing we did was to sit down and articulate a severance policy for non-tenure track academics – basically a month's salary for each year worked up to a maximum of 24. Sam then offered a severance package on the basis of this policy, which had not received formal approval from either MAUT or the Board. He also noted that McGill would not be pursuing this area of research after the Research Director retired, and, at that point in time, it was only

being undertaken at two Canadian institutions. He also stipulated that, before the severance package need be accepted, he would get both institutions to offer a job to my client. And, within weeks, these offers came to pass. Basically Sam made a policy on the fly and used his extensive contacts to do the right thing by an individual who had no formal rights. All I had to do was sell the package to my client, which was not hard. Indeed, he was delighted and thought I was a brilliant negotiator. Who was I to disabuse him?

The Case of the University Lecturer

The third case involved the policy on deferred retirement that had just been developed after the Province determined mandatory retirement was discriminatory. This policy involved people who stayed on post-65 being reduced in salary to the minimum of the rank they had held. I think all of us knew, in our hearts, that this policy would not survive a court challenge and, in the event, we were right. However, it remained the policy for a few years. One day a neighbour of mine came to me to find out how he could take some of his pension to scrape by, while he continued to work full-time. When I questioned him on why this would be necessary, he explained the minimum of the rank he was in was not enough for him and his wife to live on. It transpired he had been a University Lecturer for over 40 years and the salary minimum was about \$20,000 p.a. This was, of course, a problem we had never thought of when discussing the policy since there were only about three such people in the University. I suggested that before we look at pension options he give me permission to see if something could be negotiated regarding the salary minimum. Naturally I went to see Sam, who had not thought of the issue either. He immediately saw the unfairness of the situation and came up with an instant solution. Since the academic policy had not considered ranks below assistant professor, it was clear that we would have to apply the only other McGill policy then in existence – the MUNASA policy. I inquired

what this would mean for my client to which the reply was that he could work as long as he wanted at full salary. When I relayed this to my neighbour he stared at me in wild surmise, like one of Stout Cortez's men, silent on a peak in Darien. When he regained the power of speech his joy was boundless, nor did he raise any objection to the apparent loss of academic status.

In conclusion, it seems to me that in the old collegial world we could talk things over and make deals that were in the best interests of the individual and the institution. I never felt there was a conflict of interest in discussing matters with Sam and always kept the client fully informed about what was

going on. I am not sure that things can be done the way we did them any more, or even that they should be. Certainly the approach requires a confidence in collegiality that I no longer have. Sam Freedman had the reputation of being tough and exacting on the enforcement of academic standards, and I think this was a fair comment. People should also know, however, that he did not enjoy that role especially and that he did a lot behind the scenes for people in a humane and decent fashion. Many times he made me look good as Chief Advisor, although the solutions were mostly his. But I still can't forgive myself for losing that last case . . . ■

50th Anniversary

From: Roy Morrison, QUEEN'S STAFF
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2001 11:53 AM
Subject: MAUT Fiftieth Anniversary
To: Dr Bruce Shore
President, MAUT

Dear Bruce:

I'm afraid I received your letter too late and, as a result, missed the deadline for contributions to the special edition of the Newsletter, so this will just be a personal note to thank you for advising me of the fiftieth anniversary –and to wish you and all members well in your celebrations.

Actually, not too much of lasting import happened during my term, although we were certainly kept busy enough with one thing and another. Our greatest concern was the effect of accumulated budgetary constrictions not only on staff salaries, important as that was, but on University performance generally. Of course that issue was not either new or unique. As I recall, also, we did have to spend an inordinate amount of time and effort on the provincial association, with its focus on union-related matters and its endless meetings, "congresses" and rogatory commissions. Nevertheless, with Irwin Gopnik as my mentor and Abbott Conway as my sidekick and successor I was well buttressed, so all went fairly well.

One thing that I do recall, because it was important to me, is that when I was approached to stand for the position of president-elect I made it a condition of acceptance that the next person to stand for the presidency (after Abbott, who was already in line) would be a woman. That was arranged, in the person of Myrna Gopnik, who filled the post excellently.

Myrna was not the first woman to be president—Frances Bairstow (and perhaps others as well) had been our fearless leader several years previously—but to my mind too many years had passed since then, and the MAUT was sorely in need of balance. No doubt issues of that sort are, happily, no longer a matter of concern

Bruce, I was very glad indeed to learn by your letter that you are now serving as president of the MAUT. The association will certainly benefit from your leadership. I wish you well in your celebrations of the fiftieth anniversary, and I hope you will convey my warmest regards to all the members.

Yours aye
Roy ■

P-Card Administration

N. WHITE

Over the past year or so, without consultation of any kind with its faculty members, the University has implemented new policies for using research funds to make purchases. These include the use of a credit card ("p-card") and a method of reconciling its use on a website ("Banner"). This change has had three major consequences:

- 1) It has downloaded a considerable amount of work keeping and reconciling records of expenditures; and
- 2) it has transferred responsibility for oversight of expenditures from the accounting office to individual professors, who are now personally responsible for any expenditure that cannot be appropriately accounted for.
- 3) Records must be kept available for audit at any time for 7 years (!).

The University has reminded faculty members several times, in rather threatening terms, of the possibility of an audit and of their personal financial responsibility if an audit reveals anomalies.

The MAUT Council has discussed the possibility of making representations to the Administration concerning this imposition of extra work and financial responsibility on its members. You are invited to contribute any experiences you have had with the new system (especially if you have been audited), and to suggest ways in which the system could be made to respond more closely to the needs of the faculty. ■

President's Report

R. PRICHARD

The past year has seen a number of initiatives such as the establishment of the Tenure Mentoring Committee, re-establishment of a Membership Committee, new proposals on the grant of the rank of Emeritus Professor, as well as revisions to the Tenure Regulations, and to the Teaching Portfolio Guidelines, which will be reported on separately by members of MAUT Council. I wish to inform members of MAUT of other developments in which MAUT has been active.

Academic Salary Policy

Academic salary policy is discussed in a committee involving representatives of the administration and MAUT. This is a priority activity of MAUT and involves six MAUT representatives, which I have chaired. Following a survey of academic salaries in 1998, the administration and MAUT agreed the following year that McGill academic salaries were low and should, over 5 years, be raised to the mean of the G10 (the 10 most research intensive Canadian universities). The MAUT Academic Salary Policy committee has maintained pressure on the administration to address the underfunding of academic salaries and continues to argue for higher increases in salaries than those being awarded in other Canadian universities in order to reach this target.

How have we been doing? Below are shown the mean increases for the G10 universities and McGill salaries over the past 3 years, together with the excess of the McGill increases compared with the G10 means, i.e., the amount of catch-up achieved in each year.

*Mean increases for G10 Universities and McGill Salaries
1999-2001*

YEAR	Mean of G10 %	McGill Mean %	Catch-up %
1999	3.3	5.1	1.8
2000	3.8	5.0	1.2
2001	4.5	6.0	1.5

We are making progress, but we still have some distance to go. Furthermore, the goal of reaching the mean of the G10 is a moving target as the other Canadian universities continue to enjoy increases each year.

A number of factors distort the simple comparison of academic salaries by rank between McGill and other Canadian universities. For example, the proportion of the professoriate who are Full Professors at the University of Toronto is more than one third higher than at McGill; the difference is even greater between McGill and some of the other G10 universities. This has a large distorting effect on McGill salaries because some McGill Associate Professors are likely to be Full Professors at other Canadian universities and would enjoy higher salaries than at McGill. Amongst other factors, the lack of a salary increase, with promotion from Associate to Full Professor or Librarian, may result in some academic staff not going to the trouble to apply for promotion as soon as they are likely to be successful. MAUT believes that McGill should recognize that the attainment of the rank of Full Professor or Librarian is a major accomplishment and should be reflected in the salary of academic members.

The recent increase in the rate of academic staff hires at relatively high salaries may create, in future years, a two-tiered salary system, with academic staff who have been at McGill for

many years and who commenced their appointments at a time when starting salaries were low, being disadvantaged relative to more recent hires. However, this may be masked when mean salaries are compared between McGill and other G10 universities. In fact, starting salary is a major factor in salary relativity. Salaries of some female academic staff have been found to be lower than their male colleagues, possibly as a result of lower starting salaries. These and other factors led to MAUT proposing to the administration that the size of the salary anomaly pool should be increased in recent years and the survey of salary differentials between males and females led to the establishment, in 2001, of a special anomaly pool to address the relatively low salaries of some female academic staff.

MAUT will continue to address the need for a fair salary policy for academic staff, which is competitive with other research-intensive Canadian universities.

Non-Tenure Track Academic Staff

Non-tenure track academic staff make valuable contributions to teaching at McGill, but have not been eligible for membership in MAUT and are sometimes overlooked when policies on salaries and benefits are determined. MAUT has urged the University to establish what the facts are with respect to numbers and terms and conditions of employment of non-tenure academic staff. We are pleased that a Task Force has been established to investigate the facts concerning these staff. At the suggestion of MAUT, Malcolm Baines is a member of the Task Force. MAUT has also reviewed its Constitution with a view to possibly extending membership to non-tenure track academic staff. When the Task Force delineates the categories and number of non-tenure academic staff, MAUT Council will consider bringing to the members a constitutional amendment to include some categories of non-tenure academic staff in its membership.

Revisions to Sabbatic Leave Regulations

The University administration has proposed revisions to the Sabbatic Leave Regulations and MAUT has carefully looked at and commented on them. MAUT is in agreement with many of the proposed revisions as they tend to clarify the objectives of, and process for applying for sabbatic leave. However, MAUT has requested that some wording of the existing regulations be retained and expressed concern over the proposed requirement that academic staff, who fail to return for a full year after a sabbatic leave, must refund salary, benefits and research grant paid during the sabbatic leave. MAUT is concerned that the granting of sabbatic leave continue to be administered in a manner consistent with past practice.

MAUT Membership on McGill Committees

MAUT plays an important role in nominating members of the McGill community for membership for key University policy and selection committees, or for jointly selecting the composition of these committees with the Principal. One such committee, on which MAUT selects two members, has been the Statutory Selection Committee to Recommend a Principal. Bruce Shore, who was succeeded by Maria Zannis-Hadjopoulos following Bruce's appointment as Dean of Students, and I have served on this committee over the past 15 months. This has been an interesting but demanding task, with the Committee having met 44 times. It is important that MAUT be strongly represented on this committee.

The coming year will see many of these issues continue to be priorities of MAUT. The appointment of a new Principal will inevitably lead to changes in the University and it will be important that MAUT continue to represent academic staff effectively.

The MAUT Executive, Council, advisors, committee members and Officers have worked well together over the past year and I wish to thank each of them for their great

contributions to MAUT and to the University. I am delighted with the quality and dedication of the incoming Executive and Council and wish them success and look forward to continuing to contribute to these bodies and to the University. ■

Proposal for Changes to the Ranks of Professor Emeritus, Associate Professor Emeritus, Librarian Emeritus & Associate Librarian Emeritus

Update

R. HARRIS

A meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Emeritus Professors—membership given below—was convened by Principal Shapiro after his receiving the MAUT Proposal from MAUT President, R. Prichard. The meeting was to consider Senate Document D99-79 “Report of the Honorary Degrees and Convocations Committee” that proposed changes to the “Criteria and Guidelines for Appointment to Emeritus Professor” (CGAEP) and the MAUT proposal regarding “Ranks of Professor Emeritus, Associate Professor Emeritus, Librarian Emeritus and Associate Librarian Emeritus”. The following comments summarize the issues and the meeting, held on March 22, 2002.

Senate document D99-79 proposes amendments in four areas covered by the current CGAEP:

- 1) To incorporate gender-inclusive language.
- 2) To codify current practice.
- 3) To expedite the process.
- 4) To synchronize the CGAEP with plans to change the way the honor is bestowed.

Of these, the second is the one of most concern to MAUT members, since the current McGill regulations permit the nomination of any full-time professor who retires from the University to be considered for the rank of Emeritus Professor and the proposed amendment would limit nominations to retired Full Professors. Thus it would seem

that the phrase “to codify current practice” inadvertently makes restriction to the current University Regulations and is therefore unacceptable to MAUT.

The course that the MAUT representatives followed in the meeting was to refuse to consider any of the proposed amendments to the CGAEP until the University considered MAUT’s proposal to modify the University Regulations such that the regulations were more explicit with respect to eligibility and entitlements.

When the MAUT proposal was brought for consideration, the position of the University members of the ad-hoc committee was that there is a restrictive tradition at McGill with respect to the awarding of the rank of “Emeritus Professor” and that they would not contemplate accepting the MAUT proposal.

It is evident that the matter is deadlocked at the level of the ad-hoc committee. After discussion at MAUT Executive and Council, it was decided to take no further action at this time. ■

Members, Ad Hoc Committee on Emeritus Professors:

Deans D. Buszard and J. Gruzleski, and Professors E. Meighen and R. Harris

MAUT Membership Committee

K. GOWRISANKARAN

The MAUT Membership Committee has been very active in recruiting academic staff to become members of MAUT. Lunchtime meetings were held twice in the fall for this purpose. Each time a number of key members from various areas of the University were invited for a brainstorming session. We have recruited 91 new members this year. A lot of work remains to be done in this respect. Help from one and all will be highly appreciated in this respect. Please do talk to your colleagues who are not members of MAUT and try to convince them to join the organization. It is in their interests to do so. ■

Tenure

Procedural Changes Proposed

K. GOWRISANKARAN

The University intends to modify the procedure for granting of tenure to Academic staff. MAUT Council has had the opportunity to examine thoroughly one of the latest versions of the proposed Tenure Regulations document. The Council has given its input to the Provost through the MAUT President.

Please take note that the criteria for tenure remain the same, that is, superior performance in two and at least acceptable in the third of the three areas of research, teaching and other contributions. What is envisaged are the procedural changes. Most of the changes suggested are in the best interests of the candidates. However, there are some drawbacks and one of them at least is the time factor. Here are the salient points in bullet form.

- External evaluators are named in September, and to be sent in final form to the Secretariat before October 1.
- External package (Tenure dossier excluding the material on teaching) has to be sent to the Secretariat before October 15.
- The Secretariat will solicit letters from external evaluators and are to obtain them before December 10.
- The entire tenure dossier (THIS INCLUDES THE LETTERS FROM EXTERNAL EVALUATORS CONTRARY TO THE PRESENT PRACTICE) to be given to the Departmental Tenure Committee (DTC) before January 5.
- The report of the DTC on tenure is due by March 1.
- The University is trying to come up with a uniform policy for the formation of DTC’s. The document also addresses the cases of joint appointments more explicitly.
- University Tenure Committee (UTC) remains as at present.
- All further procedures including appeal etc. remain substantially the same.

There are still some points to be ironed out and clarified, particularly the formation of DTC. We anticipate scrutinizing the revised (final?) version at one of the forthcoming meetings of the Council. ■

Report of the Vice-President (Communications)

R. HARRIS

Newsletter

Articles are invited for the upcoming newsletter. Changes and corrections related to past issues will be duly reported.

MAUT Website

Marilyn Fransiszyn now updates the MAUT website on a regular basis. Additions and links are being made as they become apparent. Changes and additions you would like to see should be sent to Marilyn marilyn.fransiszyn@mcgill.ca with a copy to me ralph.harris@mcgill.ca for approval. Thanks again to Marilyn who is doing a super job keeping the MAUT website looking one of the best of the staff associations' sites in Canada.

Listserv

There are reports that people are not getting their MAUT Forum listserv mailings. Some may consider this a blessing. It likely means that

- these people's addresses are wrong in the list, which is quite possible due to the recent change of mail servers and the rather confusing rollout of same at McGill or
- people are using addresses to which their McGill accounts, the addresses that the list has, have not been forwarded.

If you suspect that you are not getting mail from MAUT—there have been about 5 messages so far this year—let me know by e-mail ralph.harris@mcgill.ca and I will edit the list to send to whichever address you wish. ■

Report of the Vice-President (Internal)

M. SMITH

In terms of benefits, this has been a distinctly quiet term. Only the following are really worth reporting.

1. It is fairly clear that the demutualization process was more favourable to faculty and other employees at Concordia than it would have been under the McGill Administration's proposal (a 50/50 split). In light of this, the Staff Benefits Advisory Committee referred the matter back to the administration. They have taken a very long time to respond. However, another meeting of the SBAC is in the process of being convened. All will no doubt be revealed to us at that meeting.
2. We have made excellent progress in eliminating the health and dental insurance deficits.
3. No increase in the long-term disability premium was necessary this year.
4. It remains the case that the government problems with its RAMQ program may in turn cause problems for our health insurance program. This is something that needs to be watched. ■

Tenure & Mentoring Committee

ALENOUSH SAROYAN

The Tenure and Mentoring Committee was created in the fall of 2001 to advance MAUT's mission of providing its members, particularly new academic faculty and librarians, support and guidance as they prepare for the tenure process.

The five members of this committee—K. GowriSankranan, J. Kurien, D. Mather, N. White, and Alenoush Saroyan (Chair)—articulated the following 5 objectives for this committee:

1. To disseminate information about successful mentoring models at McGill
2. To provide annual workshops for chairs and new faculty
3. To solicit departmental help in establishing formal and informal mentoring
4. To alert MAUT members about responsibilities re preparing tenure dossier
5. To identify/introduce advisors to MAUT members who can assist in preparation of tenure dossier

As a first step, the Mentoring Committee conducted a survey of all McGill departments to identify existing practices and has already identified several departments which have well developed mentoring programs in place.

The next step of the Mentoring Committee is to organize a workshop in early November 2002 to generate a discussion around various mentoring models and ways that faculty and librarians can best be supported as they prepare for the tenure process. The workshop, though open to the community at large, will target and invite particular groups (e.g., chairs, individuals who have just gone through the tenure process, particularly those who have had difficulties and are thus in the best position to provide feedback). The expected outcome of this workshop is a document, to be prepared by the MAUT Mentoring Committee, that will outline various approaches to mentoring and steps which need to be taken by chairs, departmental mentoring committees, and individual faculty members and librarians at the outset of academic careers at McGill.

The MAUT Mentoring Committee will also organize a second meeting in the spring of 2003, this time for untenured faculty and librarians, to provide general guidelines concerning the preparation of tenure dossiers. ■

COUNCIL MEMBERS 2002-2003

Nick Acheson	Microbiology & Immunology	3921	7052	nhacheson@microimm.mcgill.ca
Erika Gisel	Physical/Occupational Therapy	4510	6360	erika.gisel@mcgill.ca
Estelle Hopmeyer	Social Work	7067	4760	hopmeyer@leacock.lan.mcgill.ca
Richard Janda	Law	5097	8197	janda@falaw.lan.mcgill.ca
John Kurien	Economics	4826	4938	jkurie@po-box.mcgill.ca
Guy Mehuys	Natural Resource Sciences	7944	7990	mehuys@nrs.mcgill.ca
Darlene Canning	Library Computer Services	4765	3903	darlene.canning@mcgill.ca
Anthony Paré	Education / Integrated Studies	4525	4529	anthony.pare@mcgill.ca
Alenoush Saroyan	Education /Centre for U T & L	6648	6968	alenoush.saroyan@mcgill.ca
Maria Zannis-Hadjopoulos	McGill Cancer Centre	3536	6769	mzannis@med.mcgill.ca

McGill Association of University Teachers
Association des Professeur(e)s et Bibliothécaires de McGill

MAUT Executive 2002/2003

	Phone	Fax
President Kohur N. GowriSankaran MATH/STATISTICS gowri@math.mcgill.ca	7373	6671
President-Elect Bernard Robaire PHARMACOLOGY/THERAPEUTICS brobaire@pharma.mcgill.ca	3630	7120
Past President Roger Prichard PARASITOLOGY rprich@po-box.mcgill.ca	7729	7594
V.P. Internal Norman White PSYCHOLOGY norm@hebb.psych.mcgill.ca	6082	4896
V.P. External Daniel Guitton NEUROLOGY/NEUROSURGERY dguitt@mni.mcgill.ca	1954	8106
V.P. Communications Ralph Harris MINING, METALS & MATERIALS ENGINEERING ralph.harris@mcgill.ca	2608	4492
Secretary-Treasurer Celeste Johnston NURSING celeste.johnston@mcgill.ca	4157	8455



MAUT – APBM Newsletter

www.mcgill.ca/maut/

MAUT APBM Newsletter
3495 Peel Street, Room 202
McGill University
Montréal, Québec, Canada H3A 1W7