



NEWSLETTER

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

www.maut.mcgill.ca

Vol. 32, No. 1. Summer / Été 2006

New President's Message

Ralph Harris, P.Eng., Professor, McGill
Senator for Engineering, and President
McGill Association of University Teachers
ralph.harris@mcgill.ca

McGill is a pretty self-congratulatory place, especially if you are talking to McGill people about their own domains of influence. On the other hand, McGill people tend to be a little less flattering about the domains of others. This seems to fit today's society's competitive mores, but begs an interesting question: is McGill really a normal society and should common competitive values apply?

For starters, is it a societal norm to have McGill professors' levels of qualifications? Even with these qualifications, is it normal to undertake a remarkably comprehensive and extremely thorough investigation, and to convene a world-class statutory committee, just to decide whether or not to remove an adjective from an Associate Professor's title? I think not. Happily, through salary discussions between MAUT and the Administration, there has been a recent move towards normalcy by the (re)introduction of a monetary reward for promotion to Full Professor.

In what other ways is McGill normal/abnormal? From hearing sentiments expressed by other university staff associations at CAUT's workshop for new presidents, and from interpreting the undercurrents at the recent CAUT Council meeting, I have come to understand that McGill is not just unusual, it is unique! Its collegial academic communication paradigm sets us apart from most, if not all other universities in North America.

We who understand McGill's unique way of dealing with things are proud of our own curious brand of collegiality. However, I have learned that we are not always completely happy about it. In these recent times of renewal, some people,

In this Issue

<i>New President's Message</i>	1
<i>VP Reports</i>	3
<i>Librarians' Section</i>	4
<i>Retired Members</i>	6
<i>Committee on Academic Salary Policy</i>	7
<i>Tenure and Mentoring Workshop</i>	8
<i>Planning Forum</i>	8
<i>Professors with a Disability at McGill</i>	11
<i>Spring Annual Meeting</i>	11
<i>CAUT News</i>	15
<i>Bernard Robaire Honoured at CAUT Council</i>	16
<i>Notes from Away</i>	18
<i>Executive and Council</i>	19

particularly those new to McGill (staff and administrators alike), unfamiliar with McGill collegiality, understandably see our ebbs and flows and delays in decision-making as backward, even perhaps archaic. So the question becomes: In this day and age of corporate-style, action-oriented, high-paced management, is McGill's collegiality sensible?

Well, having been around McGill for 29 years, five weeks and two days when I sent this to press, I have concluded that McGill's collegial approach is one of the better workplace communication paradigms. The reason is that I see McGill's collegiality resting on three pillars: a sense of ownership in the minds of all staff, students and administration; a sense of trust; and a sense of fairness. I can hear the protest from those who disagree with my characterization, but pause to reflect on my perspective: McGill's traditional approach requires well-thought-out, collegially developed policies, regulations and procedures. These are applied in as transparent, professional and ethical a way as

possible, given the skills and limitations of everyone involved. At the core of McGill's governance and administration is trust that we are all doing our very best.

What do we do at McGill that justifies such high levels of trust? For starters, we have a responsible, vocal and respected Senate, a model of governance envied in other Canadian universities. We also have a communicative Principal who speaks openly with Senate, staff and students via constructive town-hall meetings, and with MAUT via regular monthly meetings. However, at the same time, we have a situation with the libraries that has remained unresolved for a number of years. Such delays and the associated speculation about motives corrode trust.

Last Tuesday morning, I attended the English Montreal School Board's ceremony to change the name of the Wagar High School building to the 'Giovanni Palatucci Facility'. Giovanni Palatucci was a bureaucrat who, at great risk and the eventual sacrifice of his own life, saved the lives of thousands of others by exploiting his small amount of power in order to provide documentation that allowed people to escape persecution and death. The keynote speaker at this ceremony, Major General Lewis Mackenzie — who knows quite a lot about leadership and the establishment of trust — called the audience to action in the face of oppression wherever it is encountered. His message was poignant because in today's society, trust is a commodity that is in rather short supply. At the national level, we have seen behaviour that society deems unacceptable, and internationally, we experience outright misinformation being used (misused?).

What does this heady stuff have to do with MAUT, you and me? The message is that it is necessary to take some personal risk to do what you think is right. I think it is right to ratchet down the rhetoric around suspicion of others' motives and act in a way that establishes trust. My message as the new president of MAUT is thus rather simple: McGill can be as trustworthy a place as we make it.

For the cynics out there who do not see the central role of trust in the governance and administration of McGill, recently I heard on the CBC

that the corporate world has calculated that a 10% gain in workplace trust is the equivalent in workers' minds to a 31% increase in remuneration. Note that I am adamantly NOT advocating any reduction in salary. Rather, I hope the administration is also listening because such a relationship just as easily goes the other way — a 10% increase in trust obtains a 31% increase in workers' performance for the same remuneration... Clearly, adopting good, trustworthy work practices on either side of the table is good for the organization.

So I return to my original question: are we a normal society with common competitive values? As universities go, I think we are not so normal. Do we have common competitive base values? In some things no: we are collegial rather than competitive; and in some things yes: we get bogged down in suspicion and rhetoric.

What can we do for the betterment of McGill? Take the lead from Palatucci: practice responsible values in the face of the pressure for personal success, and work on behalf of our colleagues (staff and administration alike) and our students. These colleagues are the people whose efforts, along with our own, ultimately give McGill its worthy reputation.

As MAUT President this year, I will be working to ensure that all members of McGill — but especially members of MAUT — get the recognition, respect and rewards that they earn and are entitled to. I hope you will help me build on the unique style of collegiality we have at McGill as a result of the historical co-mingling of governance and administration. Of course we need to do this in a sensible and professional way and we need to do it in a way that maintains and builds trust. And it may also require some separation of governance from administration as it presently exists.

Whether or not you agree with my values, please step up and get involved. None of us, including yours truly, can single-handedly manage an organization such as MAUT. Collegiality is crucial; we have had it in spades at McGill, but in this day and age we still need to determinedly foster it.

Over the coming months, I will share with you much more concrete and detailed information about tangible things MAUT is doing for and

with you. For the time being however, I hope you appreciate knowing who your President is.

VP Reports

VP EXTERNAL

Jacques Derome

jacques.derome@mcgill.ca

CAUT: Ralph Harris, Edith Zorychta, Lonnie Weatherby and Joseph Varga attended (some or all) of the CAUT Council Meeting in Ottawa, April 27–30. It was a special meeting, in that it was on that occasion that Bernard Robaire was officially given the CAUT's Distinguished Academic Award, the first time this annual award by the Association was made. Bernard made a presentation to Council on Thursday afternoon. The presentation was warmly received — in fact, with a long standing ovation. That evening at a dinner in honor of Bernard, Edith took the podium to relate her long acquaintance with Bernard, and to bring out a few more facets of his talents and qualities. [... *more on pages 16 and 17*]

The Council meeting otherwise brought out some level of discontent on the part of some associations with the way the CAUT is handling its business, in particular with its lack, or at least apparent lack, of transparency. A motion from the floor was made to strip the CAUT Executive and the Chairs of Committees of their votes at Council meetings. The motion was defeated, but its discussion allowed the discontent to be aired.

A motion, brought to Council by the CAUT Executive, was presented as an attempt to clarify the by-law dealing with the type of institutions that are eligible for membership in CAUT. In the opinion of some (including myself), the motion, in fact, would have substantially modified the by-law, not simply interpreted it. In my view, it would have made an individual community college eligible for membership, whereas now my interpretation is that only federations of community colleges are eligible. In view of the potential confusion, the motion was withdrawn. Another one from the floor was adopted, which called for the creation of a work-group to look into the eli-

gibility criteria for membership in CAUT. The members of the work-group, with several representatives from association presidents, were named before the end of the Council meeting.

The CAUT is playing a central role in several disputes across Canada regarding academic freedom. Remarkably, the majority of them involve Faculties of Medicine.

FQPPU: Marc Richard and I took part in the FQPPU Council meeting, May 4–5 in Montreal. We had a presentation on a recent study by a consultant on the working conditions of new faculty members in Québec universities. The consultant had met with some (6 or so) new faculty members in a number of universities in November–December 2005, and the report discussed the comments made during these meetings. Interestingly, the academic union at Laval University, no longer a member of FQPPU, participated in the study and paid for the extra expenses related to their participation (e.g. travel of consultant). The report itself was launched at the meeting.

The proposal was made to hold a meeting in the fall dealing with the same topic — the problems encountered by new faculty members. It was decided instead to conduct a survey aimed at a broader representation of new faculty members to ensure a more representative sample, and to hold the meeting only after that survey is done.

The working group dealing with university funding made its first report to the FQPPU Council — essentially reviewing the current funding formula used by the Provincial Government, and the one being proposed for the future.

The position of Secretary on the FQPPU Executive is still vacant. Also, no one around the table was willing to be a member of a Nominating Committee that would be responsible for finding candidates for the next Executive, whose term starts one year from now. Three absentees will be

approached to see if they will undertake that job. At the last MAUT Executive meeting, two suggestions were made of potential candidates for next year's FQPPU Executive. Ralph Harris will contact one to see if interested.

VP COMMUNICATIONS

Deanna Cowan

deanna.cowan@mcgill.ca

The V.P. Communications is responsible for the Newsletter, the MAUTForum listserv, and the MAUT Webpages (www.maut.mcgill.ca). These require quite different skills and degrees of attention, and on behalf of current and former MAUT Executive members, I would like to thank Marilyn Fransiszyn and Alexander (Sacha) Jerabek, both from the Libraries, who contributed so much behind-the-scenes time and assistance to designing and producing websites and Newsletters over the past several years.

Librarians' Section: year in review

Sharon Rankin

sharon.rankin@mcgill.ca

The MAUT Executive and MAUT advisors have continued to provide advice to librarians who have appealed or grieved their 2004-2005 merit awards. This unwavering support throughout the year has been invaluable to the librarians involved. MAUT advising has also been very important to one of our colleagues who was denied tenure and lost his appeal of the University Tenure's decision.

If you are interested in reading about the Library's merit process and how it has been changed over the past year, please consult the Librarians' Professional Issues (PIC) Committee report, for a comparison of the old and the new merit review processes. This report is available on the MAUT-LS website: http://www.library.mcgill.ca/mautlib/PIC/reports/PIC_Merit_Report_April_2006.doc This summer, PIC will be preparing a report on academic freedom and McGill librarians.

The single most important issue for librarians continues to be the redrafting of academic regu-

Following an unsuccessful tenure appeal, Sacha has now left McGill and accepted an exciting and challenging position with the Daniel Langlois Foundation; we wish him success and happiness in his new situation.

I am pleased to report that Genevieve Gore (again, Library!) has now agreed to assist with website design and maintenance if required, and I look forward to collaborating with her.

Long-overdue listserv maintenance has been undertaken, with hundreds of e-mail addresses updated and reformatted. If you are not receiving the MAUTForum postings, or if you would prefer to receive them at a different e-mail address, please let me know. Hospital e-mail addresses are beginning to become problematic as hospitals tighten their communications security.

There are two separate pieces to this issue: first, an entire new *Chapter 2* (outstanding since 2002); and second, an interim set of revised tenure regulations, to parallel the new tenure regulations for faculty.

Concerning the first item, there is no visible progress on redrafting the new *Chapter 2*. This is still the most important aspect of the work remaining. There have been no tenure track librarian appointments (with the exception of the Director of Libraries) since 2002. Library professionals (librarians with contracts of varying lengths) now form approximately 1/3 of the 60 librarians at McGill.

Concerning the second item, interim revisions to the tenure regulations for librarians (*Chapter 2*, Section 5), the Librarians' Regulations Committee (Hudson Meadwell as chair) discussed the results of the committee's work at two librarian meetings this spring. MAUT Council received the document for comments and returned it to the Provost with revisions. To address the

administration's concern that the MAUT revisions did not reflect librarians' preferences, a survey ballot was distributed. The Librarians' Regulations Committee (chaired by Jacques Hurbise) met this month to finalize the text. It is expected that the Provost will return to Senate with revised librarian tenure regulations at the last meeting of Senate (May 24th) for this academic year. *[update: the tenure regulations were presented and passed by Senate on May 24]*

On April 11th, 2006, the MAUT Librarians' Section held their spring general meeting. Lonnie Weatherby is now the chair, the chair-elect is Karen Jensen and the secretary/treasurer is Lorie Kloda.

Minutes of all MAUT-LS meetings are available on the section website, <http://www.library.mcgill.ca/mautlib/>

For your information: At the University Senate meeting on Feb 15th, 2006, Provost Masi addressed the house concerning librarian regulations and reconfirmed his intention to continue the work on the first item (entire new *Chapter 2*), once the revised librarian tenure regulations pass through Senate. The text of his remarks is reprinted below.

Statement to Senate on the issue of "Tenure Regulations for Librarians"

15 February 2006

Professor Anthony C. Masi, Provost

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the working group committee on librarian regulations (Janine Schmidt, Pat Riva, Sharon Rankin, Robert Clarke, Anna Stoute, Marc Richard, from the Libraries; chaired by Professor Hudson Meadwell, Department of Political Science; with Carole Renahan, Area Personnel Officer of the McGill Libraries, and Vilma Di Rienzo Campbell, of Legal Services, as resource persons), for their efforts at producing modifications to Chapter 2, Section 5. I believe these regulations will satisfy the need for an interim arrangement for tenure procedures while at the same time paving the way for further progress on designing a more permanent set of regulations for our academic librarians.

At or immediately after last Wednesday's Senate Steering Committee meeting, the executives of the MAUT were given a copy of this proposal, representing an adaptation of the text of "Section 5 for faculty" that the working group tailored specifically for librarians. The proposal represents significantly more than the house-keeping envisioned by the original notice of motion, brought to Senate last May and referred to me by Senate in September.

In addition to achieving broad consensus among the members of the regulations working group, the concepts and text of this rewritten section of the regulations were brought to two meetings of librarians (the first with nearly 40 participants, the second with about 20), and once again, broad consensus was reached. The working group committee forwarded the revised version to me. I made no changes to the document, believing as I do that they were acceptable as "interim tenure regulations".

I propose to bring the amended Chapter 2, Section 5 regulations to the earliest possible meeting of Senate after MAUT has had time to examine them. I trust that this collegial consultation will result in being able to bring the regulations forward to Senate shortly and that they will be passed.

Progress has been made and continues to be made, but admittedly more slowly than I had hoped.

...continued on next page

Almost exactly three years ago, at an assembly of librarians, in a presentation, I proposed a framework for a new set of regulations that would govern their employment at McGill.

There were five "planks" in the platform I proposed:

1. *librarians would remain an academic, but not a tenure-track, category;*
2. *special secured employment status would be guaranteed and be based on procedures appropriate to the librarian role;*
3. *instead of sabbatical leaves, librarians would benefit from regularly spaced professional development leaves;*
4. *all librarians occupying permanent positions would be on a single, unified, career path, but we would still need and have "project librarians" to satisfy short-term needs;*
5. *procedures would be found to migrate current library professionals to the new single, unified career path, given recognition to their years of service on time-limited contracts.*

Once agreement on Chapter 2 Section 5 is reached and passed by Senate, the working group has agreed to continue to meet to discuss ways of turning that framework into a coherent set of regulations to govern the employment of academic librarians at McGill. This will take time, but if we get it right these efforts and their resulting regulations for the employment of academic librarians will serve the librarians, the McGill Libraries, and the entire McGill community well in the decades ahead

Let me be clear about the last point. The library professional category is the backbone of the current academic renewal in the McGill Libraries. In order to solidify the gains we have been making, we need to get these librarians onto a long-term career trajectory as soon as possible. Based on a recommendation by the Director of Libraries, I have already adjusted their salary levels so that they are competitive with their G-10 counterparts and I have agreed that when we renew their contracts they will be for an "indefinite term", after of course an appropriate review and in anticipation of the changes to the regulations.

MAUT Retired Members

John Dealy

john.dealy@mcgill.ca

Retired members continue to bring us questions about their continuing McGill benefits after retirement, and we are happy to respond to these. The answers to most of these can be found at McGill's website in the section maintained by the Human Resources department, see <http://www.mcgill.ca/benefits/glance/> and <http://www.mcgill.ca/benefits/events/retirement/>

One question that did not fall in this category came from a member who now lives in a province other than Quebec and dealt with drug insurance. If you live in Quebec and subscribe to the provincial drug plan, the government pays a significant fraction of the cost of many prescription drugs, and the McGill health insurance covers some of the excess. If you live outside Quebec, the portion of your drug costs that is not covered by your provincial plan should be sub-

mitted to the McGill health plan insurer for evaluation.

The second MAUT lunch for retired academic staff was held on May 19 at the Faculty Club, and about fifty members and guests attended. We will continue these events next academic year.

The annual fee charged to retired members is currently under review and will probably be revised downward before the next billing period. The new fee will reflect the fact that MAUT retired members are no longer automatically enrolled in CAUT.

Retired members who wish to join CAUT on their own are welcome to do so; see information at <http://www.caut.ca/en/membership/RetiredAssociate.pdf>

Committee on Academic Salary Policy

Michael Smith, MAUT Past President

michael.smith@mcgill.ca

The Board of Governors has the final responsibility for the University's budget, including the academic salary component. What the Board decides to approve or not approve originates in discussions within a parity committee comprised of six members of the Administration and six MAUT representatives - the Committee on Academic Salary Policy (CASP).¹ At its last meeting in early May CASP agreed on a salary policy for 2006/2007. The content of that agreement cannot be provided until the Provost has received Board approval of it.² But there is a background to the agreement, and to future agreements, that warrants discussion.

Some years ago the Administration agreed (in writing) that the academic salary policy should lead to the following outcomes: the McGill mean salary should reach and not fall behind the mean of the Group of 10 research intensive Canadian universities and then should move up to be 'positioned' somewhere near the mean salaries of the three G10 universities with the "best record of academic achievement". This commitment is qualified by the University's obligation "to maintain the quality of its academic programs".

The source of CASP information on where McGill's salaries are located with respect to the rest of the G10 is the Administration which, in turn, gets the information as part of a data-sharing arrangement with other G10 universities. The detailed data (mean salaries by rank and in aggregate for each G10 university) are presented to CASP in confidence and so cannot be published in this newsletter. Moreover, figuring out where McGill's salaries are located with respect to the other G10 universities is not straightforward since the mean is a moving target, that changes as consecutive salary settlements are made at other universities.

However, the data presented (a bit belatedly) as background to this year's discussion are worrying. They revealed that McGill academic salaries are more than \$2000 less than the G10 mean. Previous data suggested that, a couple of years ago, McGill had reached the G10 mean. Clearly, the fact that we have again fallen below the mean is, at the least, unfortunate. My own view is that the University becomes a much less effective organization when salaries fall significantly below a level that corresponds to the quality of its faculty.

The Administration is currently committed to multi-year budgeting. This seems to mean, in practice, a commitment to spending in various areas, over several years, accepting that there might be divergencies between forecast and actual revenue growth. There are lots of valuable things on which the Administration might spend money: continued academic renewal, further library investments, better plant and equipment for research, and so on. But moving salaries to the levels to which the Administration committed itself, and maintaining them there, must count among the list of valuable expenditures. It is to be hoped that the slide below the G10 mean is only an unfortunate blip and that the Administration will approach the process of restoring salaries to suitable levels with a zeal that matches that of the MAUT representatives with whom salary discussions take place.

¹The MAUT representatives this year were Michael Smith, Ralph Harris, Frank Mucciardi, Edith Zorychta, Mary MacKinnon, Joan Hobbins, and Patrick Hayden. The Administration representatives were the Provost, the Vice-Principal (Administration and Finance), the Deputy Provost, the Executive Director (Human Resources), the Director of Libraries, and the Dean of Science.

² As soon as it is released, MAUT will distribute this information via the MAUTForum listserv and the website, <http://www.maut.mcgill.ca>

McMaster's Remuneration Agreement is at <http://www.mcmaster.ca/mufa/jcagreement2006-march3.html>

Waterloo's Salary Settlement 2006–2008 is at <http://www.uwfacass.uwaterloo.ca>

UBC's 2006–2010 Collective Agreement is highlighted in their May newsletter: <http://www.facultyassociation.ubc.ca/newsletters/May2006.pdf>

Notes from the Tenuring and Mentoring Workshop

Alenoush Saroyan

alenoush.saroyan@mcgill.ca

In early March, the MAUT held its 5th Tenure and Mentoring Workshop for non-tenured academic staff. Seventy-eight participants representing thirty-five departments attended.

We organized this year's workshop earlier than usual to accommodate the changes stipulated by the new tenure regulation which are now in effect for the 2006–2007 cohort.

We also introduced something new this year: we asked participants to submit questions that concerned them in advance. This helped our panelists to be more focused in their presentations.

In three hours, we were able to follow the sequence of events that an individual goes through in preparing for tenure. In the first set of presentations, the focus was on preparing for the tenure process: understanding what it involves and the rights and responsibilities of individuals, how to prepare and what to use as evidence of academic performance, who to consult, and resources available within departments and the University including formal mentoring

committees and the Teaching and Learning Services. In the second set of presentations, we concentrated on general evaluation criteria that are applied to evaluate tenure dossiers. A panel representing different Faculties provided a comprehensive view from the perspective of DTCs and UTCs. Following that, we heard from two newly tenured faculty members who spoke about their personal experiences going through the tenure process. The session ended with a presentation pertaining to the new tenure regulations which are in effect as of this year.

We were pleased to read the positive feedback provided by our participants. In addition to affirming their appreciation of the workshop and its content, they have also provided some great ideas that we will try to incorporate in our next year's workshop. A very special thanks to Bill Foster, Sam Noumoff, Gloria Tannenbaum, Steve Yue, Malcolm Baines, Marilyn Scott, Elisabeth Gidengil, Gowri, Anthony Paré, Fred Fabry, Marilyn Fitzpatrick and Bernard Robaire for making this year's MAUT workshop on Tenure a resounding success.

Notes from the Planning Forum

Deanna Cowan

deanna.cowan@mcgill.ca

Anthony Paré opened the session, emphasizing that the purpose of the forum was to provide input to three draft documents: *Strengths and Aspirations (the academic plan)*; *The Task Force on Student Life and Learning*; and the *University Master Plan* for campus development. He noted two trends that have developed over the past several years: class size is now determined on the basis of economic rather than pedagogical need, and teaching technologies have brought benefits to students and teachers alike.

William Watson then took the podium, and voiced his opinions about the academic plan, *Strengths and Aspirations*. Although he agreed with Provost Masi's paragraphs on values, he

found the rest of the plan lacking in focus and without evidence to support its conclusions. He particularly challenged the cost / benefit assumptions of many of the plan's proposals.

Joan Wolforth, speaking about the Task Force on Student Life and Learning, acknowledged that she was at a disadvantage, since she had no document to work from. In addition, the task force membership is by invitation, members do not represent any constituencies, and discussions are confidential, so it is difficult to find out what is being discussed.

The basic tenet of the Task Force is that more resources are needed for students. Surveys have indicated that students tend to feel marginalized,

alienated and subordinated; for example, our faculty-based model for student advising doesn't work very well. On the other hand, students welcome the "my McGill portal" innovation, as it brings resources together for them.

Administrators and the faculty maintain that they are the University, but students are also the University, and must therefore be taken into account. It is worth remembering that students' experiences "come back to bite us later" when we want to ask them to donate money!

Ralph Harris then introduced the *University Master Plan* and focused his remarks on the need to deal with the forthcoming space crunch on the downtown campus. Proposals put forward in the *Explorations* documents also include suggestions for "greening" the campus by banning general parking, creating pathways and new traffic flows, and making optimal use of available space, vertically as well as horizontally.

Michael Smith, considering the ensemble of plans, then challenged the audience to think about what to do with them: implement, use as starting points, use them to raise funds, or all of the above. Implementation of any of the plans, either in present or evolved form, will undoubtedly require lots of space and money. However, none of the plans appear to have been properly costed, and revenue forecasts are usually uncertain.

McGill has been able to attract relatively high quality undergraduates, but has been less successful with graduate students. Will adding more students and better funding increase the quality of the grad students we can attract?

The audience was then invited to ask questions, to be answered by a panel of administrators and resource people: Principal Munroe-Blum, Provost Masi, VP Mendelson, VP Gruzleski, and Mr. J. Diamond, architect.

How can "student-centred" and "research-intensive" be reconciled?

- VP Mendelson confirmed that McGill was (and wanted to remain) research-intensive, and needed to also become more student-centred. Perhaps it would be possible to

engage students more by including more teaching based on research.

- Provost Masi agreed that among upper-level undergraduates, surveys show that their professors' research had a positive impact on their learning experiences.
- VP Gruzleski added that social spaces for students was an issue being addressed by the University Master Plan. He also commented that McGill's large number of legacy buildings, constructed for functions and times past, raised questions about their suitability as research venues.

Who will take over chairing the Task Force on Physical Planning when VP Gruzleski leaves?

- The Provost and the Principal both assured the audience that responsibility would be embedded in the administrative structure so that recommendations would be implemented. The administration is committed to seeing that the Master Plan is carried forward.

Libraries are not particularly mentioned in any of the plans. Expanded collections, space, and provision for storage of older materials are needed, and library staff also need to be recognized and given the support they deserve.

- The Provost protested that the libraries' budget, space and staff have all been increased over the past 5 years, and he promised that there would not be budget cuts.

Macdonald campus seems to have been left out of the current documents.

- VP Gruzleski replied that at the moment, Macdonald Campus has the advantage of fewer constraints on growth and space than the downtown campus.
- Mr. Diamond noted that the development plan for the Macdonald Campus was one of the best reports received by the architects. He commented that it would be better for the Macdonald Campus to develop its own character rather than becoming a clone of the downtown campus.

In all of the proposals to date, the Strathcona Building ceases to be used for research.

- Mr. Diamond responded that the Strathcona building's fabric is slowly being destroyed through inappropriate use. Using the building for another purpose will allow it to retain its desirable features, while research activity can be better accommodated elsewhere.

How and when can the goals be costed, using real projections, not a "holiday wish list", and implemented?

- The Provost reported that goals had been conceived keeping cost projections in mind. Faculty and departmental-level analyses provided the data for constructing the projections.
- Principal Munroe-Blum added that the recently-adopted multi-year budget will allow for broader vision as we move forward. It will not be possible to meet all aspirations in any given year, and we need to grow the revenue base so that any shortfalls can be compensated for.

How will Mount Royal be protected, and not encroached upon?

- Provost Masi commented that McGill already owns much of the land in question, and will need to encroach on more but will do so respectfully.
- Mr. Diamond added that the Master Plan actually proposes integrating and improving connections between McGill's green spaces and those of the mountain.

Are written briefs still being accepted?

- Provost Masi indicated that comments were still welcome, and that he was aware that the professional schools had been underemphasized in the current document.

How will it be possible to commit to increased resources and services for students at the same time as increasing student numbers?

- Provost Masi replied that the university would work area by area: for example, investments have been made in Engineering that can now be capitalized upon by increasing undergraduate enrollment, but Arts is not yet in a position to increase.

Principal Munroe-Blum closed by thanking MAUT for organizing the forum, and reiterated that input from faculty was welcome; despite an enormous call for input, to date little opinion has been expressed. She urged faculty to make their voices heard when these opportunities exist.

She acknowledged that McGill has many strong areas of performance by both students and faculty, but not across all fields; the planning process will help to focus and to achieve excellence in all areas. People at McGill work hard, but we also need to work smart.

The challenge is now to bring the plans together, and implement the best points from all of them. The executive of the University takes responsibility for advancing our academic mission, and to make students more important without diminishing our research-intensive nature.

The University of Calgary's Academic Plan 2002–2006, reports and updates are at <http://academic-plan.ucalgary.ca/>

UBC's "People Plan" is at <http://www.hr.ubc.ca/peopleplan/guidelines/index.html>

Professors with a Disability at McGill

Greg Reid, Chair : Sub-Committee on Persons with a Disability

Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education

gregory.reid@mcgill.ca

Many of us have come into contact with students who have a disability in our classes. They are eligible for accommodation and services if registered at the Office for Students with a Disability, headed by Dr. Joan Wolforth and housed in the Brown Student Services Building. But did you know that services are available for professors and librarians with a disability?

The Sub-Committee on Persons with a Disability is one of five sub-committees of the Joint Senate-Board Committee on Equity. The Sub-Committee deals with professors, librarians, and staff, as well as students. MAUT and the Sub-committee hosted a luncheon on April 18 to begin a dialogue about the experiences of professors and librarians with a disability. We were interested in knowing whether new hires were reluctant to disclose their disability during the hiring process, and what challenges were encountered if a disability was acquired from an unfortunate event or with age. Our initiative was designed to listen to those closest to the issues.

The University administration is committed to improving access and equity for all. For example, a budget is allocated each year to the Office for

Students with a Disability for physical changes on campus — from ramps to different coloured and textured strips on stairs for those with visual impairments. Also, the newly designed McGill website, PORTAL, accommodates those with disabilities very effectively.

Did you know that the Office for Students with a Disability has a technology lab? An Access Technology Guide on CD is available if professors or librarians would like to explore what technology exists in the lab and whether it would be beneficial for them. And the red mini-bus is available to professors and librarians with mobility problems.

Despite many initiatives and much progress, there remains much to accomplish. Participants at our April 18th meeting suggested some short-term goals such as preparing a list of services that presently exist. On a more medium-term basis, the Sub-Committee on Persons with a Disability would appreciate hearing from you about needs and challenges so that we might, as appropriate, suggest changes in policy to the university that would further develop capacity. Please direct comments to me. Many thanks.

Highlights of the Spring Annual Meeting, April 12, 2006

WELCOME

Michael Smith

President Michael Smith welcomed guests L. Czernis from CAUT, C. Sabourin from FQPPU, and J. Pelletier, McGill's Secretary-General.

ELECTION RESULTS

Frank Mucciardi

The 2006–2007 Executive have all been acclaimed

- President-Elect: Andrew Kirk, (Electrical and Computer Engineering)

- V.P. External: Jacques Derome (Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences)
- V.P. Internal: Edith Zorychta (Pathology)
- V.P. Communications: Deanna Cowan (Library)
- Secretary/Treasurer: Estelle Hopmeyer (Social Work)

New Council members include 7 elected members

- Antonia Arnaert (Nursing)
- Ian Butler (Chemistry)
- Terry Spithill (Parasitology)

- Ian Strachan (Natural Resource Science)
- Beverlea Tallant (Physical & Occupational Therapy)
- Gloria Tannenbaum (Pediatrics / Neurology & Neurosurgery)
- Maria Zannis-Hadjopoulos (McGill Cancer Centre)

and Librarians' Section chair, Lonnie Weatherby.

SALARY POLICY

Michael Smith

M. Smith began by reminding members that in 2004, then-Provost Vinet produced a salary proposal which would guide future academic policies, working toward positioning McGill salaries among the three Universities with the best record of academic achievement. This has been the basis of CASP discussions.

The initial objective of bringing McGill salaries to the mean of the G10 has probably been achieved. Positioning within the top 3 is still a target. The University Administration has been hinting recently that money is tight — there have been lower-than-expected transfers from the provincial government, and that McGill will need to run a deficit. A sample of recent G10 settlements suggests something like a 5.2–5.3% increase would be a reasonable expectation for next year.

Components of salary include

- across-the-board amount (less than inflation)
- merit (most people fall into the top 2 categories)
- anomaly and retention pool

When percentage increases are small, it is important to choose the weighting of these categories. If merit awards are small, they're probably not worth it.

The anomaly pool deserves special attention

- release of data about salary distribution brings anomalies to light
- anomaly pool is being increasingly used for retention purposes

- need to look at the overall size of the anomaly pool.

E. Gisel requested that women's salaries be re-examined, focusing on merit and anomaly awards. It is important to remember that anomaly settlements affect pensions as well.

A. Paré asked about retention awards — they can cause anomalies within a department. Should they come from the same pool?

M. Smith commented that MAUT was concerned with the procedures for merit awards: are the criteria explicit, and is feedback available to explain the award received?

GENDER EQUITY

Michael Smith

M. Smith presented a chronology of gender equity studies from the 1990s to date. There have been many questionable methodological and administrative decisions made throughout the years, including the outsourcing of the most recent study to a consulting firm that appears to have inappropriate experience with this kind of analysis. He expressed great interest in seeing the final report.

J. Cumming asked if the Administration will release the data? M. Smith replied that they cannot be expected to release anything confidential, but he does expect them to listen to expert comments and suggestions about how the data should be analyzed.

A. Paré asked what people should do if they feel they have a valid gender-based claim. M. Smith encouraged them to contact MAUT, which could release some non-confidential data to help them evaluate and/or build their case.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Estelle Hopmeyer

The MAUT Financial Committee has taken charge of investments, and is systematically making adjustments to the portfolio. The next "slice" of investment will be in an ethical fund (it is interesting to note that the Pension Depart-

ment has recently announced an ethical investment option as well.)

We are also examining MAUT's insurance coverage, both malpractice and property insurance.

Overall, MAUT is in good financial health.

BENEFITS

Edith Zorychta

A survey was recently done by an external firm, comparing McGill benefits with those of other G10 universities. The analysis included specific benefits as well as an examination of the university / employee share of the cost of individual benefits.

Overall, most of McGill's benefits were deemed acceptable, but long-term disability and dental benefits should be improved. However, McGill ranked considerably below average in the examination of the university / employee share of the cost of benefits, particularly health and dental. It would require about \$3 million to redress this to the average, and about \$5 million to bring it to the top level. There is a need to bring the Administration's attention to the balance of salary and benefits.

There is a Staff Benefits Advisory Committee, with representation from all groups. Benefits are assessed annually. E. Zorychta reminded members that many questions about benefits are answered on an excellent Human Resources website, <http://www.mcgill.ca/benefits/glance/>

POLICY ON HARASSMENT AND DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED BY LAW

Edith Zorychta

The new policy is not yet approved, so the interim, flawed, policy is still in effect. The new policy is expected to be activated soon.

[update: see <http://www.mcgill.ca/files/secretariat/harassment-sexualharassment-discrimination.pdf>]

E. Zorychta drew members' attention to the existence of the Social Equity and Diversity Education Office, [see <http://www.mcgill.ca/>

[equity diversity/](#)] and noted that an education campaign was planned for the week of October 23–27. To coincide with this, MAUT is tentatively planning a forum entitled Harassment in the University Context: analysis and solutions.

There has been enormous work put into making the conflict resolution process fair to both parties, transparent and open.

LIBRARIANS' ISSUES

Sharon Rankin

S. Rankin began by announcing that Lonnie Weatherby had assumed the chair of the Librarians' Section as of their meeting April 11.

MAUT and M. Smith were continuing to provide advice and support to librarians still involved in appeals and grievances against their merit awards. S. Rankin noted that a comparison of the librarians' old and new merit procedures had been posted on the Section website [see <http://www.library.mcgill.ca/mautlib/> > click on 'Merit and Status'.]

Regulations: Since spring 2002, librarians have been attempting to rewrite Chapter 2 (*Regulations Relating to the Employment of Librarian Staff*) of the *Handbook of Regulations and Policies for Academic and Librarian Staff* in order to bring librarian regulations into parallel with faculty regulations. The most recent aspect of this work has focused on Section 5, Tenure Regulations. Text prepared by a committee and discussed at librarians' meetings, was sent to the Provost in February, then to MAUT for minor revisions. The revised text is being sent to librarians for their approval. MAUT has committed to continuing to work on the rest of Chapter 2 once Section 5 is settled.

DAYCARE ISSUES

Ralph Harris

R. Harris began by commenting that McGill is undergoing change and renewal. For example, nine out of 13 deans have been at McGill less than three years, and there is a rising proportion of professors new to McGill. One of the concerns of these recent hires is the availability of child

care, and MAUT conducted a preliminary survey to gather some data on the issue.

Many of the survey respondents indicated that they would like their child care to be “McGill-affiliated”, but there was no consensus about the desired location of child care centres or whether they were public or private. People indicated that it would be more useful for McGill to help them find child care than to actually provide it. The main source of frustration was a lack of information about the availability of child care as part of the hiring process.

Principal Munroe-Blum agrees that providing support to staff seeking child care is important, but she does not want McGill to get into the child care business. The Academic Personnel Office is becoming more involved in providing support, and MAUT is investigating new ways in which support could be made available, such as some sort of brokerage.

There were many comments from the floor, including:

- Providing information is good, but a bit of a cop-out, and could backfire — if more people find out that the McGill Daycare has a long waiting list, more will rush to get onto the waiting list and make the situation even worse.
- It would be useful to find out what comparison universities are doing about child care.
- It is necessary to provide information about child care generally, not only McGill Daycare. It is also important to include evaluative information about child care services — people arriving from outside Montreal / Quebec don't know the context.
- Attention should be paid to existing staff too, not just to new hires, even though the Administration seems to see this as a recruitment issue.

CAUT AND FQPPU UPDATES

Jacques Derome

FQPPU has prepared a guide on Psychological Harassment. MAUT has ordered several copies,

which should be available in a few weeks. FQPPU has also begun to publish an online newsletter in French and English. [see http://www.fqppu.org/lev2/Bulletinweb/vol.1no.1_en.html and http://www.fqppu.org/lev2/Bulletinweb/vol.1no.2_en.html]

A workgroup has been created to examine funding and funding formulas in Quebec universities. Information is being gathered about the amount of money assigned to universities for undergraduate and graduate students in various disciplines, etc. New formulas are being developed, but implementing them would require an injection of additional monies. CREPUQ is working collaboratively with FQPPU to lobby for increased funding.

On the Canadian scene, CAUT membership is now huge, and includes institutions from research universities down to community colleges. A new building is now needed to house the 33 permanent staff members, at a cost of \$4.6 million. The sale of the present building is expected to realize \$2.6 million, leaving a mortgage of \$2 million. Some of this can be raised by renting out surplus space for the first couple of years.

RETIRED MEMBERS' REPORT

John Dealy, reported by Michael Smith

Many retired members have submitted questions about benefits, and J. Dealy expressed his thanks to E. Zorychta, who has been very helpful in finding answers.

The lunches for retired members are proving to be very popular, with the next one scheduled for May 19.

Formerly, a portion of retired members' MAUT dues was submitted to CAUT, so that MAUT membership automatically included CAUT membership. On a motion from the representative of retired members, MAUT Council voted to discontinue this practice, and 100% of a retired member's MAUT dues are now kept in-house and used for local purposes. If a retired MAUT member wishes to remain a member of CAUT and receive the *CAUT Bulletin*, it is now necessary to join CAUT separately, and CAUT has

recently sent out membership bills for \$30 to retired members. Joining CAUT is voluntary, and retired members should not feel pressured to pay these bills.

WORD OF APPRECIATION

Michael Smith

Concluding his term as President of MAUT, M. Smith extended special thanks to Bernard Robaire and Gowri Gowri Sankaran for their advice, and expressed thanks also to the executive and council, particularly to Frank Mucciardi. Honore Kerwin-Borrelli and Joseph Varga were termed "indispensable", and M. Smith also voiced his gratitude to Ralph Harris for his enormous energy.

CAUT News

CAUT TRAVEL ADVISORY

CAUT has issued a travel advisory to Canadian citizens travelling to the U.S. to attend conferences. It is wise, and in some cases mandatory, to carry photo-ID and proof of Canadian citizenship — a passport is not a bad idea. If one is receiving expenses or honoraria, a visa may also be required. See further details at http://www.caut.ca/en/publications/traveladvisory/traveladvisory_conferences.pdf

RATEMYPROFESSOR.CA

MAUT Officers recently received a memorandum from CAUT, with the following cover information: Hardly a week goes by without CAUT receiving a call from a member outraged by the [ratemyprofessor.ca](http://www.ratemyprofessor.ca) web site. Either they have a question "What can we do?", or they make an assertion that "There must be something we can do!"

CAUT arranged for one of Canada's top defamation lawyers to provide us advice on this matter.

INCOMING PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Ralph Harris

R. Harris paid tribute to M. Smith, and described his priorities for the coming year:

- Input to the University's Planning Process
- MAUT Recruitment
- Child Care

Strategies for achieving progress include:

- Encouraging turnover and renewal in the MAUT executive, council and committees (with due respect to the long-serving members currently in these offices)
- Increasing responsible collegiality and community
- Working toward equitable and transparent merit processes.

That advice is in the *CAUT Legal Advisory: Ratemyprofessor.ca: What can be done?* [see the CAUT website, http://www.caut.ca/en/publications/legaladvisory/200604_ratemyprofessor.pdf]

Although the advisory indicates that contesting an unfavourable posting is probably not worth the time, expense and stress, the CAUT memorandum concludes with the statement "We would be pleased to provide referrals to qualified defamation lawyers should any of your members choose to pursue that option."

ON-THE-JOB THREATS TO CANADIAN UNIVERSITY FACULTY

Drs Sunny Marche and Jack Duffy of the Faculty of Management at Dalhousie University are starting a study on the above topic. The first phase will be survey-based and the second phase will be face-to-face semi-structured interviews with volunteer faculty members who have had these kinds of experiences. The survey may be completed online at <http://english.isurvey.ca> or <http://francais.isurvey.ca> during May and June 2006. If you would like to participate in the face-

to-face interview phase of the study, please contact Sunny Marche (sunny.marche@dal.ca), or Jack Duffy (jack.duffy@dal.ca).

Please note for legal and ethical reasons, the interview phase of this study specifically

excludes individuals currently dealing with a threatening situation.

You are invited to contribute to this study.

Bernard Robaire Honoured at CAUT Council

CAUT honoured McGill University professor Bernard Robaire with the 2006 Distinguished Academic Award during a special ceremony at the CAUT Council meeting last month.

Robaire won the award for his exceptional record of excellence in teaching, research and service to the university and the community.

“We congratulate professor Robaire for receiving this prestigious award,” said Loretta Czernis, outgoing CAUT president. “He admirably personifies the type of academic the award was designed to recognize.”



Joseph Varga, Jacques Derome, Edith Zorychta, Bernard Robaire and Barbara Hales.

The following photo and text are reproduced with permission from the CAUT Bulletin Online, May 2006



First CAUT Distinguished Academic Award winner Bernard Robaire addresses CAUT Council

CAUT honoured McGill University professor Bernard Robaire with the 2006 Distinguished Academic Award during a special ceremony at the CAUT Council meeting last month.

Robaire won the award for his exceptional record of excellence in teaching, research and service to the university and the community.

"We congratulate professor Robaire for receiving this prestigious award," said Loretta Czernis, outgoing CAUT president. "He admirably personifies the type of academic the award was designed to recognize."

Robaire is cross-appointed in the department of pharmacology and therapeutics and in the department of obstetrics and gynecology. He has developed an international reputation in the area of reproductive biology and published more than 100 articles and edited or co-edited nine books.

"His work has earned him many honours, including the James McGill Professorship in 2002, the Award of Excellence in Reproductive Medicine and three Wyeth-sponsored awards from the Canadian Fertility and Andrology Society, the Distinguished Service Award from the American Society of Andrology and a Distinguished Service Certificate from the International Society of Andrology," Czernis said.

Robaire is a member of the Johns Hopkins Society of Scholars and the Delta Omega Society at Johns Hopkins University. In 2002, he was selected to deliver the Ernst Schering Foundation Lecture. He is a sought-after speaker and has lectured to audiences around the world. He has created and led several research networks within Quebec and beyond.

As a teacher, he has demonstrated excellence as recognized in the consistently high evaluations of his pedagogy as well as from the large number of graduate students he has supervised. In recommending Robaire for the award, one of his referees remarked, "I have yet to encounter anyone as talented and accomplished in so many areas as Bernard ... He teaches at all levels, undergraduate, graduate, professional and post doctoral. He puts as much effort, imagination, and enthusiasm into an entry-level lecture for undergraduates as in an advanced topic presented to graduate students. His love of learning and fascination with science are infectious." Robaire is renowned for the collegial and mentorship role he has played in support of academics at McGill and in other institutions. He has demonstrated his innovative approach to teaching through the creation of a precursor to the current Life Cycle Course in McGill's faculty of medicine as well as in other courses in the faculty of science.

Robaire has attained significant career milestones and leadership roles both within McGill and outside its gates. He was associate vice-principal for research at McGill for a number of years and served as first director of McGill's Centre for the Study of Reproduction. He has served as a board member on numerous provincial and national bodies. He is currently vice-president of the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation (an advisory body to Quebec's Minister of Education). In 2003–2004, he served as president of the McGill Association of University Teachers. Since 1988 he has served on the board of directors of Johns Hopkins Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing.

"At a time when pressures are mounting in universities to separate teaching, research and service, Professor Robaire reminds us that the three are vitally interrelated," Czernis said.

Following presentation of the award, Robaire delivered a lecture, partly autobiographical and partly reflective, on the challenges faced in universities today. Delegates responded with a standing ovation.

Robaire is the first recipient of CAUT's Distinguished Academic Award. He won a trip to Ottawa to accept a certificate and a personal award of \$1,000, and participate in celebratory events April 27. CAUT is shortly to publish his lecture.

Robaire was selected from among 15 distinguished nominees across the country by a panel of three past presidents of CAUT: University of Manitoba professor Tom Booth, Saint Mary's University professor Victor Catano and University of Toronto Professor Emeritus William Graham.

The CAUT Distinguished Academic Award will be presented annually.

Notes from Away: items from other Faculty Association websites

Deanna Cowan

deanna.cowan@mcgill.ca

McGill is not the only Canadian university examining its collegiality and governance. The **University of Calgary** Faculty Association *Newsletter* for February 2006 includes an article on page 2 entitled "Ailing Collegial Governance". The complaints aired in this article sound oddly familiar: committees populated increasingly by administrators rather than academics, information / documentation delayed or withheld, advisory committee recommendations ignored.... Also in this issue is an article about Gender Gap in the University, and an update on salary and staffing discussions, including the situation of Sessionals.

See <http://www.ucalgary.ca/UofC/departments/TUCFA/> > click on 'News and Events', then 'Newsletters'.



The May 2006 issue of *Faculty Focus: newsletter of the Faculty Association of the University of British Columbia*, includes an overview of UBC's recently-negotiated 2006–2010 Collective Agreement, and an analysis of the agreement as it affects Sessionals. The lack of an acceptable career path for Sessionals is mentioned, but even the tenure track is not smooth at UBC — the newsletter includes an update on a tenure wrangle, ongoing since 2001, which is now in the hands of the BC Supreme court for the second time!

See <http://www.facultyassociation.ubc.ca/newsletters/May2006.pdf>



Queen's University Faculty Association is also featuring the plight of Sessional Adjuncts in its May 2006 newsletter, *QUFA Voices*.

See http://www.qufa.ca/publications/qufa_voices_2006/QUFA%20Voices%201.2r.pdf



The 'about us' page of the Association of Academic Staff, **University of Alberta**, (<http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/aasua/nav01.cfm?nav01=27317>) states that the purpose

of the Association is "to protect independence of thought and freedom of teaching and research" ... I suppose that's how they justify the spelling in their notice of office hours: "8:00 - 4:30 p.m. (Monday **thru** Friday)" [my emphasis].

Way 2 set N x mple, dudes.



The **University of Western Ontario** Faculty Association's *Faculty Times*, April 2006, speaks of many issues that are also on our minds here at McGill. Reference is made to the complex structure of the institution, unclear and difficult-to-decode processes, cronyism, resistance to change and communication problems, and how bewildering this must seem to new academic staff.

The UWOFA President includes librarians in her list of concerns: "Once again, I have to report that the librarians and archivists negotiation, shortly to enter upon its second year, is not progressing well. ... More worrisome yet is that the administration, having used its government-granted fiat to insist that the librarians and archivists certify as a separate bargaining unit despite the fact that they are a part of the academic staff and recognised as such as a matter of course at other Canadian universities, is now using the librarian negotiations as a stalking horse for the faculty negotiations which will begin shortly. This is a particularly egregious behaviour."

Most of the rest of the issue is devoted to discussion and results of a workload survey

See <http://www.uwofa.ca/ft/current-copy.pdf>



Workload and stress are issues at **Université Laval** as well: the May 2006 issue of *Le SPULien, Bulletin socioprofessionnel du Syndicat des Professeurs et des Professeures de l'Université Laval*, is devoted to occupational health issues such as workload and psychological harassment.

See <http://www.spul.ulaval.ca/SPULien0605.pdf>



MAUT EXECUTIVE AND COUNCIL, 2006-2007

EXECUTIVE	NAME	PHONE	FAX	E-MAIL
President	Ralph Harris (Mining, Metals & Materials Engineering)	2608	4492	ralph.harris@mcgill.ca
President-Elect	Andrew Kirk (Electrical & Computer Engineering)	1542	3127	andrew.kirk@mcgill.ca
Past President	Michael Smith (Sociology)	6849	3403	michael.smith@mcgill.ca
V P Internal	Edith Zorychta (Pathology)	00494	7446	edith.zorychta@mcgill.ca
V P External	Jacques Derome (Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences)	5350	6115	jacques.derome@mcgill.ca
V P Communications	Deanna Cowan (Library)	09669	3890	deanna.cowan@mcgill.ca
Secretary-Treasurer	Estelle Hopmeyer (Social Work)	7067	4760	estelle.hopmeyer@mcgill.ca

COUNCIL	NAME	PHONE	FAX	E-MAIL
	Antonia Arnaert (Nursing)	5624	8455	antonia.arnaert@mcgill.ca
	Derek Bowie (Pharmacology & Therapeutics)	1581	6690	derek.bowie@mcgill.ca
	Ian Butler (Chemistry)	6910	3797	ian.butler@mcgill.ca
	Julie Cumming (Music)	00290	8061	jcumming@music.mcgill.ca
Retired Professors	John Dealy (Chemical Engineering - Emeritus)	4264	6678	john.dealy@mcgill.ca
	Terry Spithill (Parasitology)	8668	7857	terry.spithill@mcgill.ca
	Ian Strachan (Natural Resource Science)	7935	7990	ian.strachan@mcgill.ca
	Beverlea Tallant (Physical & Occupational Therapy)	4522	8193	beverlea.tallant@mcgill.ca
	Gloria Tannenbaum (Pediatrics / Neurology & Neurosurgery)	412-4400 x 22753	412-4331	gloria.tannenbaum@mcgill.ca
Chair, Librarians' Section	Lonnie Weatherby (Humanities & Social Sciences Library)	5031	7184	lonnie.weatherby@mcgill.ca
	Cynthia Weston (Teaching & Learning Services)	5704	6968	cynthia.weston@mcgill.ca
	Maria Zannis-Hadjopoulos (McGill Cancer Centre)	3536	6769	maria.zannis@mcgill.ca

OFFICE STAFF	NAME	PHONE	FAX	E-MAIL
Administrative Officer	Honore Kerwin-Borrelli	3942	6937	maut@mcgill.ca
Professional & Legal Officer	Joseph Varga	3089	6937	jvarga.maut@mcgill.ca

The MAUT / *APBM* Newsletter is published periodically during the academic year to keep members of the McGill Association of University Teachers informed of concerns and activities.

Postal Address: McGill Association of University Teachers
3459 Peel Street, Room 202
McGill University
Montreal, Quebec, H3A 1W7

Telephone: (514) 398-3942

Fax: (514) 398-6937

Editor: Deanna Cowan (Library)

Administrative Officer: Honore Kerwin-Borrelli