



NEWSLETTER

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

www.mcgill.ca/maut

Vol. 36, No. 1. November/novembre 2010

VP Communications...

Terry Hébert

terence.hebert@mcgill.ca

Many of my colleagues at MAUT are convinced that I'm dyslexic. Mostly I suppose this is because I often say MUAT instead of MAUT. Maybe there is something to that. I have a great loyalty to the MU part which perhaps explains this frequent error on my part. My idea of the university may be old-fashioned, but I hold to the notion that academic freedom and collegiality are the central pillars that form its foundation. In this issue of the *MAUT Newsletter*, you will read an article about why we should revisit how we make decisions about our pension plan, by Greg Mikkelson. We also touch on issues of academic freedom that you should know about. A summary of a workshop by Jim Turk, the president of CAUT, on academic freedom especially as it applies to librarians, also appears in this issue. I think he touches on issues of importance to all MAUT members. Further, some of these issues are directly associated with the use of material in teaching and research, and Karen Jensen discusses these in her article summing up aspects of the CAUT meetings held in Ottawa last summer.

You are probably aware of this — at least in your bones, if you've been around Québec (or indeed Canadian) universities for any length of time: a study just released by the Fédération québécoise des professeures et professeurs d'université (FQPPU) shows that there is a widening gap between provincial and federal

In this issue

VP Communications.....	1
Pension Administration Committee	2
Health & Safety Matters	4
CAUT Librarians' Committee.....	4
Academic Freedom for Librarians.....	7
MAUT Donations.....	10
MAUT Executive & Council.....	11

funding for buildings and grounds and the need for space caused by rapid growth both for research and increasing student enrolments. The shortfall has disastrous consequences. The report, which looked at all 18 universities in Quebec, showed that funding to maintain buildings and grounds and for new acquisitions increasingly comes out of funds meant to support teaching and research. University administrations have had to dip into operating budgets to finance new space and equipment, and in the period between 1997 and 2007, financing coming from operating budgets jumped significantly from 26% to 45%. I urge you to read the summary of their report, entitled: *Le fonds des immobilisations des universités. Une nouvelle cohérence à trouver entre vocations, budgets et réalités*. You can find this at the following link:

www.fqppu.org. This study falls on the heels of an earlier report in 2008 which showed how the rise in administrative costs directly affects academic salaries. The view of students as clients and the targeting of specific research areas encourage both the commodification of the academy and intensifies competition between universities. The FQPPU suggests that Québec (and I would say the whole country) needs to reflect seriously about the long-term future of our universities. They conclude their most recent study with a number of sensible and important recommendations. They propose an *États généraux* to develop long-term plans for the sustainable future of university development and urge the protection of the independence of each university in establishing and controlling its own operating budgets among others.

Finally, you may have noted you get a lot more email from me as your VP Communications. Hopefully, all of it doesn't end up in your SPAM filters! First, I have to thank our library representatives at the Senate (Marc Richard, Jodie

Hebert and Joan Hobbins) for their cogent and rapid summaries of Senate sessions — which are informative and give you all a sense of the issues we face in real-time. You will also note that I now send you things from the Faculty Club as well. I declare my conflict of interest up front. Because of a congenital inability to say no, I now sit on the Faculty Club Council, initially against my better judgement as I always saw myself as a “Thompson House” sort. Recently, I have come to greatly appreciate the Faculty Club as a way to meet colleagues outside my faculty — as is my involvement with MAUT. My family and I have attended a number of events in connection with the club and have really enjoyed ourselves. So, I suppose I will continue to send you reminders of events held by the club in the hope of meeting you there. In the next issue of the Newsletter, you'll hear updates about Bill 38, Bill 100 and other issues of great importance to MAUT members. In the meantime... enjoy this issue. Your feedback is welcome anytime.

The Pension Administration Committee

Vote no on “Continuance” and yes for democracy

Gregory M. Mikkelson
gregory.mikkelson@mcgill.ca

Disclaimer: This invited article is included for discussion purposes, but the views expressed are not necessarily those of the MAUT Executive or Council.

Each time we elect a representative to the Pension Administration Committee (PAC), we get a curious notice about another decision that must, by Québec law, accompany that election: “Continuance of Voting Procedures”. This notice contains a brief description of the current voting system for pension representatives, along with the PAC's argument for voting “yes” to continue using that system. After briefly reviewing this argument, I would like to offer a counter-argument, along with a call to initiate some changes — not only in the voting system for PAC representatives, but also in the structure of the PAC, which is currently

weighted against faculty and staff in favor of the administration.

The PAC comprises nine members, of which only two represent “us” (i.e., the faculty), and two represent the staff. The other five — the majority of the committee — are appointed by the Board of Governors, the chair thereof, and/or the Principal (see <http://www.mcgill.ca/pensions/committee>). Currently, when electing one of our representatives, each non-retired member “[is]... entitled to cast one vote for each full dollar of personal holdings... and each retired member... entitled to cast nine votes for each full dollar of annual pension in payment at that date”. (Quoted from the 2010 continuance notice).

Unfortunately, the PAC's argument for continuance — and indeed the choice given to us — conflates the issue of the voting system with the issue of how many representatives we get: "If the majority of members vote against the continuance of this voting procedure, the process will defer to the minimum standard imposed by law: the number of [faculty and] staff representatives on the Committee will be reduced from four to two, with one to be elected by the active members and one to be elected by the non-active members, such elections to be conducted by majority vote of the members who are present at the Annual Meeting. The Pension Administration Committee therefore urges you to vote FOR CONTINUANCE." (*Ibid.*)

In other words, the argument for continuance rests on the coercive suggestion that if we do not accept the current voting system, faculty and staff will have to settle for even less representation than the minority position we already face.

In order to act on the merits of each issue, we need a chance to decide them separately. I thus propose that we initiate two separate changes: one, to ensure that faculty and staff represent a majority, rather than a minority, of representatives on the committee tasked with managing our money; and second, to ensure that we have a real choice about whether to continue the current, dollar-weighted voting system, or instead adopt a democratic system of one person, one vote. The remainder of this article will make a case for a democratic system.

First, the voting system does make a difference. A few years ago, I asked the PAC for the totals from past elections. They opted to send me only one set of results — for the most recent faculty election at that time. In that election, the voting system made a big difference: while substantially more *people* voted for one of the two candidates (446 to 391), those who voted for the other candidate had pension holdings with almost twice the *dollar* value, per capita, as those who voted for the first candidate. And so the second candidate

won the election, by a margin of \$171,424,325 to \$109,393,701.

This outcome was, I submit, unfair. The most obvious reason is that it gives individuals in some departments and faculties much greater voting power than individuals in other academic units. For example, the disparity between salaries in the Faculties of Management vs. Arts means that an average Management professor's vote counts roughly *twice* as much as that of an average Arts professor with the same years of service. Even if such salary differences were acceptable, they would not justify giving those in higher-paid academic units more say about how our pensions are managed. In fact, one could arguably justify giving those with *lower* salaries greater say. Lower-paid professors will presumably depend more heavily on their pensions for retirement income. Higher-paid professors, in contrast, will likely have more disposable income to invest elsewhere.

The second reason the current method is unfair is that it almost completely disenfranchises professors in the early stages of their careers. For example, even a professor who has already paid into the pension fund for five years suffers an approximately *12-fold* disadvantage relative to a 30-year veteran within the same faculty. Thus, even if the goal were to weight individual voting power according to years of service, the current dollar-weighted system grossly overdoes this.

If we put together the two kinds of disparity outlined above, we get a 30-year veteran in Management whose vote counts *24 times* as much as that of a five-year veteran in Arts. Is this fair? I submit that it is not. First of all, the salary differences between different departments and faculties presumably reflect "market forces", not scholarly merit or ultimately retirement needs. Second, certain types of investment decisions actually affect the long-term financial returns of those in the early stages of their careers more than those at later stages. For these reasons, a simple one-person-one-vote method of electing PAC

representatives would be much fairer than the current system.

I thus urge MAUT members to do what it takes to change the current voting system from one that is dollar-based to one that is genuinely democratic one where each person's vote counts equally — while at the same time at least maintaining, and

preferably increasing, the proportional representation of faculty and staff on the PAC. Finally, I urge individual faculty and staff to vote “no” on continuance the next time it comes up, in order to register your support for a truly representative democracy.

Health and Safety Matters

Wayne Wood, Associate Director, University Safety, Division of University Services

wayne.wood@mcgill.ca

Do you have any health and safety matters that you would like to have addressed? Are you experiencing any problems in this regard that you have been unable to resolve? Air Quality? Ergonomics? Fire safety? Research safety? If so, there are several avenues of recourse available to you.

For any issues related to the building(s) where you work, your first point of contact would be your Building Director, who handles liaison with the various service departments that take care of the premises. If your concerns relate more to the internal operations of your department, then first get in touch with your Chair or unit head. If you work in a department with laboratory operations, another useful point of contact would be your faculty representative or your Departmental Safety Committee.

In cases where an issue transcends your own department and impacts on the University

community at large, you might prefer to get in touch with your MAUT representative on the University Health and Safety Committee (UHSC), the group responsible for general safety policy and for dealing with university-wide health and safety matters. The MAUT delegate is Professor Ron Gehr of the Department of Civil Engineering; he can be reached at ronald.gehr@mcgill.ca.

If you are just looking for information, advice or training on health and safety subjects, there is the office of Environmental Health and Safety (EHS). They have a well-developed web site where you go to can access a wealth of health and safety information or to register for one of their courses — <http://www.mcgill.ca/ehs> You can also reach EHS at ehs@mcgill.ca or local 4563.

Make good use of these resources — your health and safety matter.

CAUT Librarians' Committee Meetings Aug. 30-31 in Ottawa

Karen Jenson

karen.jenson@mcgill.ca

The Librarians' Committee is one of several standing committees of the CAUT Council. As a member of this committee since June, 2010, I attended meetings in Ottawa on August 30 and 31. The Committee usually meets twice a year, in August and March, with work conducted in the

interim by conference call or email. The Librarians' Committee has several functions, among them:

- To advise the CAUT Council, Executive Committee and other CAUT committees concerning the policies of CAUT in all areas affecting academic librarians;

- To propose policies, guidelines and information papers respecting academic librarians and academic librarianship, in liaison with other committees when appropriate;
- To review and comment upon policy proposed from other CAUT sources in the light of the concerns of academic librarians;
- To work with the CAUT staff in the organisation of conferences, workshops or other appropriate educational mechanisms relating to academic librarians and academic librarianship.

To this end, the meetings dealt with policy statements and model clauses due for five-year review, such as the Policy Statement on Academic Status and Governance for Librarians at Canadian Universities and the Policy Statement on Scholarly Communications. The Librarians' Committee also submitted comments to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee as it works to review the CAUT Policy Statement on Academic Freedom.

Much of the work at these meetings involved planning the next CAUT Librarians Conference, scheduled for Oct. 28-29, 2011.

Since both the CAUT President and Executive Director are *ex officio* members of the Committee, members were updated on two topics of interest to academic staff at McGill. On Aug. 27, 2010, James Turk and Michael Ornstein, director of the Institute for Social Research at York University and a member of CAUT's Research Advisory Committee, appeared before the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology to discuss elimination of the mandatory long-form census. Another pressing issue was the Ontario government's July request that all collective bargaining be suspended pending consultation with provincial unions and employers. The aim was to have no net increase in compensation for workers in post-secondary education and other public sector areas for two years, and CAUT was involved in developing a response to the

government on this matter. The latest news is that a provincial arbitrator awarded University of Toronto Faculty Association members increases amounting to 5% in total compensation over two years, rejecting the request of the university administration that he comply with the attempt to impose a wage freeze policy on unionized public sector workers. More details and the actual ruling made by arbitrator Martin Teplitsky are available at: <http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=930>.

Copyright Modernization Act

Bill C-32, the *Copyright Modernization Act*, received first reading in Parliament on June 2, 2010. The *CAUT Intellectual Property Advisory* issued in August (available at http://www.caut.ca/uploads/IP_Advisory4_en.pdf) provides an overview of C-32, identifies its positive and negative aspects and discusses what the education/library community can do in the coming months to improve the legislation.

Academic staff are creators, owners and users of copyright works and have a particular interest in a balanced copyright law. CAUT has advocated a series of copyright proposals that ensures the interests of all parties are respected and suggests that the "education/library community can take justifiable pride in its grass roots mobilization to pressure the government on copyright reform." The most important of these proposals are:

- expanding fair dealing,
- limiting anti-circumvention measures to copyright infringements,
- enacting a "notice and notice" system for Internet Service Providers (ISPs), and
- restricting entitlement to statutory damages.

Of these four, the second item remains a concern in the current form of the bill. CAUT advocates limiting anti-circumvention measures to copyright infringements, stating that circumvention of digital locks should be permitted if the purpose of such

acts do not infringe copyright. Currently, some copyright owners attach technological measures to their works that prevent unauthorized copying and track use of material by the purchaser. These digital locks can prevent legitimate activities such as fair dealing. Bill C-32 provides for a blanket restriction on circumventing digital locks (with a few narrow exceptions). CAUT's view is that "by allowing rights holders to prevent their duplication for purposes such as fair dealing, C-32 destroys a fundamental statutory right essential to free expression, scholarly work and the learning process."

Access Copyright Post-Secondary Educational Institution Tariff

A related issue has been the statement of royalties filed by the Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency (Access Copyright) in March, which was not published by the Copyright Board in the Canada Gazette until June 12. The *Statement of Proposed Royalties to Be Collected by Access Copyright for the Reprographic Reproduction, in Canada, of Works in its Repertoire: Post-Secondary Educational Institutions (2011–2013)* is available at <http://www.cb-cda.gc.ca/tariffs-tarifs/proposed-proposes/2010/2009-06-11-1.pdf>. The current license agreement ended Aug. 31, and prospective users of works in the repertoire had until Aug. 11 to file objections. Objections were filed by CAUT, the Canadian Federation of Students, the Canadian Library Association, and by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC).

The proposed Access Copyright post-secondary educational institution tariff for 2011–2013 is vastly different from the previous license agreement. Full details are available in the joint objection filed by CFS and CAUT (http://www.caut.ca/uploads/CAUT_CFS_Objection_to_ACT.pdf). With the expiration of the license set for Dec. 31, 2010, Access Copyright asked AUCC member institutions to sign an Interim Agreement to cover the period from Jan. 1 until the Copyright

Board rules on the tariff. Recent surveys show that most member institutions are not signing, while some are already collecting additional fees from students to cover the eventual increase from the flat fee of \$3.39 per FTE student (plus ten cents per page copied for use in a course-pack) to \$45 for university students, eliminating course-pack fees. This change is particularly disappointing to libraries that have long used digital course reserves, relying on direct licensing arrangements with publishers for electronic journals and reducing the size of course-packs.

The CFS and CAUT objection further points out problems with expanded definitions, such as that for "copy," which would now including projection of images during lectures, posting links to digital copies, and transmission by email or fax. The term "Course Collection" has replaced "Courseware" and is far broader in scope, covering digital copies that are emailed, provided as links, or stored in secure networks. Problems will now arise with reporting on such uses, surveys and compliance audits, and with requirements for the licensing agency to have direct access to faculty, librarian and student email accounts to monitor what is being used. The position of CAUT is that the proposed tariff exaggerates the degree of reporting required to inform distribution: "The Orwellian and universal reporting Access Copyright demands does not come close to meeting the test" that the reporting burden should be the smallest and least intrusive required to achieve just outcomes. Libraries are currently unsure as to how much extra staff will be required to compile and submit the "mountain" of data for both print and digital material used by all departments on campus each month.

The latest news is that on Oct. 13, Access Copyright filed an application to the Copyright Board for an interim decision on the proposed tariff to ensure that royalties continue to flow to creators and publishers over the course of the process. They hope that an interim decision will provide clarity to

institutions and to Access Copyright, and will preserve the *status quo* until the tariff is certified by the Copyright Board.

In Quebec, we are covered by COPIBEC (Société québécoise de gestion collective des droits de reproduction), a not-for-profit collective founded in 1997 by the Union des écrivaines et écrivains québécois (UNEQ) and the Association nationale des éditeurs de livres (ANEL). COPIBEC, acting on behalf of authors and publishers, has concluded an agreement with the Conférence des recteurs et principaux des universités du Québec (CREPUQ) concerning reproduction of literary works in Quebec universities between 2007 and 2012.

Nevertheless, COPIBEC has a bilateral agreement with Access Copyright, so Access Copyright is responsible for authorizing the reproduction outside Quebec of works from the COPIBEC repertoire. COPIBEC is also responsible for administering reproduction of copyrighted materials within Quebec on behalf of thousands of authors and publishers from outside Quebec, including those in other Canadian provinces. It will be important for educational institutions to continue to oppose signing interim agreements until the proposed tariff better reflects rights outlined in the *Copyright Act* and supported by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Academic Freedom for Librarians : What is it, and Why does it matter?

A workshop organized by the MAUT Librarians' Section and presented by James Turk, Executive Director of CAUT, August 25, 2010.

Deanna Cowan

deanna.cowan@mcgill.ca

On August 25th, 2010, the MAUT Librarians' Section welcomed James Turk, executive director of CAUT, as the guest speaker for the third of a series of workshops organized by the Section's Professional Issues Committee. Of the approximately 50 attendees, most were current McGill librarians, but several former McGill librarians, McGill faculty members (current and past MAUT executive) and Concordia librarians were also present. The following is a brief summary; the full text of his presentation is available on the MAUT Librarians' Section website, http://www.library.mcgill.ca/mautlib/2010.08.25_McGill_Librarians.pdf.

Academic Freedom

Harry Arthurs, former President of York University, described academic freedom as "a central, arguably *the* central value, of university life."

In its statement on the purpose of the university, the University of Toronto affirms, "Within the unique university context, the most crucial of all human rights are the rights of freedom of speech, academic freedom, and freedom of research."

A CAUT statement on the subject, consolidating and representing the views of academic staff at 122 Canadian universities and colleges, includes the following:

Academic freedom includes the right, without restriction by prescribed doctrine, to freedom of teaching and discussion; freedom in carrying out research and disseminating and publishing the results thereof; freedom in producing and performing creative works; freedom to engage in service to the institution and the community; freedom to express freely one's opinion about the institution, its administration, or the system in which one works; freedom from institutional

ensorship; freedom to acquire, preserve, and provide access to documentary material in all formats; and freedom to participate in professional and representative academic bodies.

and goes on to state:

Academic freedom does not require neutrality on the part of the individual. Academic freedom makes intellectual discourse, critique, and commitment possible. All academic staff must have the right to fulfill their functions without reprisal or repression by the institution, the state, or any other source.

It is important to remember that these and similar statements about academic freedom apply to librarians as partners in the university's scholarly and intellectual functions. The terms of employment of librarians should be analogous to those of faculty members, including a similar system of ranks and procedures for promotion and tenure, and access to provisions such as time to devote to research, sabbaticals, study leaves, etc.

Turk pointed out that academic freedom is sometimes mistaken as an individual right, when it is actually a professional right, necessary for academic staff to fulfil their responsibilities and for universities to fulfil their mandates. While the importance of academic freedom is almost universally acknowledged, it is consistently vulnerable and consistently at risk. A large part of the mandate of CAUT is defending those whose academic freedom has been abridged, even though most such cases no longer come to our attention because each unionized association can handle most violations through grievance/arbitration protocols under provincial labour relations acts. That said, the number and nature of cases is growing, partly due to the changing nature of universities themselves.

University governance

In the 1950s and 1960s, Canada's post-secondary education system expanded greatly, and many new universities were founded. However, the federal government ended its 50-50 cost sharing with provinces in the 1970s and began limiting block transfers in the 1980's, making massive cuts in the 1990s. This was accompanied by cutbacks in provincial funding on a per student, constant dollar basis, which has resulted in university budgets being restricted, tuition fees raised, teacher/student ratios increased and corporate involvement intensified. Funding has increasingly shifted to a "directed research" focus, and governments have introduced performance indicators and similar measures associated with corporate management.

According to Turk, principals now see themselves as CEOs, not as academic leaders; professors are being converted into service providers and students into customers. Universities have come to be seen as large corporations to be managed, in which the notion of "collegial governance" is seen at best as a naïve anachronism and at worst as equivalent to allowing the inmates to run the institution. The dispersed authority of departmental committees, faculty councils, senates and boards is being replaced with power exercised by the central administration – academic staff are being pressed to acquiesce to a more hierarchical model that values efficiency and decisiveness rather than the consultation and collective decision-making that has served universities so well and is well suited to fulfil purposes of post-secondary education.

Academic Librarians

Academic librarians are being deprofessionalized: support staff, contract staff and student assistants are now doing much of the work once done by librarians. Positions are being eliminated, replaced by Wikipedia, Google, self-service and/or fewer service points; tasks are being automated or contracted-out to commercial

providers. Library administrators face different responsibilities and typically hold more power than they once did, resulting in stronger hierarchies and weakened collegiality.

This new managerial framework in universities is probably the biggest factor responsible for academic unionization since the '70s and '80s, and many librarians have joined their faculty colleagues in unions, or — as in the cases of the University of Western Ontario and McMaster — have unionized on their own, often with the support of faculty associations.

In the McGill libraries, there have been reports to a CAUT Investigatory Committee about many and varied academic freedom challenges and other problems. One sign of trouble is the exceptionally high turnover rate of academic librarians: more than 20% of librarians hired at McGill since 2004 have resigned. The CAUT report was shared with the McGill administration in October 2009. CAUT Council postponed a motion to begin the censure process at its April meeting when the McGill administration indicated it was prepared to enter into a process to resolve problems faced by librarians. However, CAUT warned that a motion to begin the censure process would be introduced unless the problems have been satisfactorily resolved or there is tangible and substantial progress toward resolution by that time.

In conclusion, Turk reminded us that *there is no academic freedom except that which we demand and win for ourselves.*

Q&A

A short question-and-answer period followed:

Q: Does the fact that there is no actual Director of Libraries at the moment impede any progress on these problems?

JT: No, all universities continue to function while filling administrative vacancies. In any

case, some of these issues wouldn't be decided just by the Director of Libraries alone, the Provost or other representatives of the administration would be involved. None of the proposed solutions would take the libraries themselves in unusual directions that the Director of Libraries would need to ratify.

Q: At Concordia, librarians are unionized along with faculty, but librarians themselves aren't even consulted about which new library positions should be created, etc.

JT: Life isn't always smooth on the faculty side either, but there is often more collegiality, granted. Collective agreements are by definition compromises. At the end of the day, all we have is the support of our colleagues; if there is overwhelming mobilization for an idea, it will likely go through. Librarians also need to educate faculty members about librarians' academic status; even names like "Faculty Association" imply that librarians aren't included.

Q: Earlier, you said that challenges to academic freedom are most often seen in Faculties of Medicine and in Libraries. Why these two groups?

JT: The most pernicious challenges to academic freedom come up in Faculties of Medicine and in Libraries for different reasons. In several provinces, doctors cannot be members of unions, and are therefore excluded from collective agreements. Also, many doctors have appointments in a Faculty of Medicine and in hospitals; for example, the chair of a university department is also often the chief of service in a hospital, which can lead to conflicts of interest. Salaries and payments to doctors can come from several sources — governments, universities — which can complicate matters. There are many situations where a doctor can run into problems, but fewer places they can turn to for help. In the case of libraries, academic librarians are vulnerable due to the use of new technologies

and the reorganization of work that lead to deskilling and redundancy.

Comment from the audience: It is unfortunate that new hires aren't given more information about academic freedom, and the rights and responsibilities that accrue; new hires tend to accept whatever they're told by the administration, and don't realize there are entitlements etc. they may not be aware of. [In response to this comment, MAUT is preparing an information document to be distributed to new hires.]

Dr. Turk closed the session by emphasizing that *the denial of one person's academic freedom is a threat to all of us.*

MAUT Donations

Brendan Gillon, MAUT President

brendan.gillon@mcgill.ca

Over the years MAUT has made charitable donations to a variety of educational causes. In addition, during times of crises such as the Tsunami in December of 2004 and the earthquake in Haiti of January this year, MAUT has made donations to assist in the reestablishment of educational institutions in the affected countries through Education International, which represents nearly 30 million teachers and education workers and has over four hundred organisations operating around the world to help improve education from pre-school to university.

As we all know, Pakistan is now in the aftermath of one of the worst natural disasters the region has experienced in decades. Within two weeks, the monsoon unleashed on Pakistan rainfall ten times greater than the annual rainfall, causing rivers to burst their banks and bringing about wide spread flooding. To date, over 1,600 people are believed to have been killed and some 20 million people have been affected, including 6 million in urgent need of aid. Entire villages have been swept

Postscript

After the presentation, Dr. Turk, the MAUT Executive and a number of McGill librarians met for an informal lunch, where anecdotes and opinions were exchanged. The recent events at Western and McMaster led to a short discussion about unionization, and although Dr. Turk's pro-union stance is well known, he observed that unionization in itself does not solve problems. The issues and the personalities in place before unionization are still there afterward; however, the existence of collective agreements provides a valuable framework for negotiation and better tools to resolve conflicts.

away in the swelling torrents. Of the 460 million dollars required for immediate needs, only 275 million have been donated. [BBC news: South Asia: 7 September 2010]

According to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), 2,863 schools have been washed away or severely damaged in just 11 districts in Punjab. The total number of destroyed schools is estimated at 5,000. [reported on the E-I website] The MAUT Council has donated \$1000 to Education International for its humanitarian relief program. Its general secretary, Fred van Leeuwen, said Their "program is more than a token of solidarity with our teacher colleagues in Pakistan. Teachers will play a significant role in Pakistan's recovery from this crisis. They will be setting up schools in refugee camps and providing education in affected areas, so it is crucially important that we help teachers get back on their feet as quickly as possible."

MAUT EXECUTIVE AND COUNCIL 2010-2011

EXECUTIVE	NAME	TEL	FAX	E-MAIL
President	Brendan Gillon (Linguistics)	4868	7088	brendan.gillon@mcgill.ca
President-Elect	John Galaty (STANDD)	1336	4619	john.galaty@mcgill.ca
Past President	Richard Janda (Law)	5097	8197	richard.janda@mcgill.ca
VP Internal	Ian Butler (Chemistry)	6910	3797	ian.butler@mcgill.ca
VP External	Meyer Nahon (Mechanical Engineering)	2383	7365	meyer.nahon@mcgill.ca
VP Communications	Terry Hébert (Pharmacology & Therapeutics)	1398	6690	terence.hebert@mcgill.ca
VP Finance	Craig Mandato (Anatomy & Cell Biology)	5349	5047	craig.mandato@mcgill.ca

COUNCIL	NAME	TEL	FAX	E-MAIL
	Helen Amoriggi (Education)	2474	4529	helen.amoriggi@mcgill.ca
	Madeleine Buck (Nursing)	4155	8455	madeleine.buck@mcgill.ca
	Deanna Cowan (Library)	09669	3890	deanna.cowan@mcgill.ca
Retired Professors	John Dealy (Chemical Engineering, Emeritus)	4264	6678	john.dealy@mcgill.ca
	Susan Gaskin (Civil Engineering)	6865	7361	susan.gaskin@mcgill.ca
	Kyoko Hashimoto (Music)	00264		kyoko.hashimoto@mcgill.ca
Chair, MAUT Librarians' Section	Karen Jensen (Library)	3513	8919	karen.jensen@mcgill.ca
	Robert Leckey (Law)	4148	4659	robert.leckey@mcgill.ca
	Audrey Moores (Chemistry)	4654	3797	audrey.moores@mcgill.ca
	Petra Rohrbach (Parasitology)	7726	7857	petra.rohrbach@mcgill.ca
	Filippo Sabetti (Political Science)	4812	1770	filippo.sabetti@mcgill.ca
	Alvin Shrier (Physiology)	2272	7452	alvin.shrier@mcgill.ca
	Maria Zannis-Hadjopoulos (Rosalind and Morris Goodman Cancer Centre)	3536	6769	maria.zannis@mcgill.ca

OFFICE STAFF	NAME	TEL	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 / Association des Professeur(e)s et Bibliothécaires de McGill informed of concerns and activities.

Postal Address: McGill Association of University Teachers
3495 Peel Street, Room 202
McGill University
Montreal, Quebec, H3A 1W7

Telephone: (514) 398-3942

Fax: (514) 398-6937

Editor: Terry Hébert (Pharmacology & Therapeutics)

Administrative Officer: Honore Kerwin-Borrelli

Is your mailing label correct? Mailing labels are supplied by Human Resources. If your address information needs updating, you can make the changes on Minerva (see <http://www.mcgill.ca/minerva-faculty-staff/>) or contact HR at 398-6765.