



The Beacon

Volume 6 • Issue 1 • Winter 2016

The Beacon is an information bulletin for StFXAUT members

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

I'm pleased to once again introduce our quarterly *Beacon* to all of our members. I hope you find this to be an informative and engaging vehicle for coming together in this collective enterprise we call the StFXAUT.

Since our last *Beacon*, negotiations over the latest one-time retirement incentive were finalized and the program was made available to our members; my thanks to Mary Oxner and Jacques Boucher who joined me in this effort. The StFXAUT's position was grounded in the principle that all groups represented by our bargaining unit be eligible (conditional on full-time continuing appointments), and we argued that the incentive be meaningful, the eligibility window not be too restrictive and that strong replacement language be included. Subsequent concerns from some members were then resolved to add a bit more flexibility into the program as it related to the continuation of teaching and to deal with the heterogeneity of our units. Of course there was the unavoidable issue that some members fell just outside of the eligibility window, and I appreciate the disappointment that came with this reality. Ultimately, this was a program that was uncommon in our sector, and we feel it had the potential to benefit both those who retired under the plan and those of us who remain.

Preparations for contract negotiations are advancing well, largely due to the efforts of our Contract and Benefits Committee. Cory Bishop's piece in this *Beacon* provides a brief update on the status of their efforts. Your input into the recent survey was very helpful to help name some of the issues and interests that will help guide our bargaining efforts; additional opportunities for members to add to and prioritize these items will be available. The Committee will help translate all this into contract language. Of critical importance to the Executive is the selection of our next Chief Negotiator and Negotiating Team. We are actively trying to identify members with an interest in and aptitude for taking on a leadership role on behalf of our members as we work toward concluding our *Fourth Collective Agreement*.

Along the same lines, capacity building and succession planning are on the Executive's agenda. Several members of the Executive, including myself, have terms expiring this Spring and so several positions of importance to the healthy functioning of the Association need be filled. Do you have an interest in representing our members, advancing collegial working relations, and protecting and enhancing our collective workplace rights and working conditions? Some rewarding service positions await you!

On our agenda for the months remaining this Winter term are multiple items continuing to help individual members, either through the grievance process or not, as they seek resolution to some of the issues they face; feedback on the new online student evaluation (more properly referred to as 'student opinion surveys' elsewhere) needs to be brought before our members. Furthermore, our Communications Committee is working on the second phase of the Unioniversity Infographic campaign we launched in the Fall with the Student's Union and

other campus unions. Look forward to a regular meeting of the Association on February 23 just after Reading Week for an update on these and other items.

As always, I thank you for your contributions, support, and interest. Good luck digging out from whatever snowbank you may find yourselves in after these past few storms.

In solidarity,
Brad

CONTRACT & BENEFITS COMMITTEE UPDATE

by Cory Bishop

Your StFXAUT Contract and Benefits Committee is pleased to provide a brief update on where we are and where we are going with regard to the upcoming negotiations for the *Fourth Collective Agreement*. First, a warm thank you to all members who completed the Initial Consultation Survey. Now that the data collection has been completed, we are mired in data and loving it. Members who did not find the time or inclination to contribute to the survey are encouraged to engage with opportunities to share your input that are coming your way over the next several weeks.

We have nearly completed our analyses of the numerical responses from the survey and are working through the text responses, which, naturally, are less amenable to averages and trend lines. At the regular meeting scheduled on the 23rd, we intend to present our findings to the membership and outline the next stages and steps leading up to, and including, the beginning of the negotiation process that stretches out before us. Our ultimate goal is to provide our as yet undetermined Negotiating Team with a robust and detailed set of data based upon which they will proceed to negotiate the next 3-4 years of our working conditions and compensation package. By way of sneak preview, workload equity was identified widely as a very important issue.

After we present the results of our analysis of the survey, we hope you will join us for an upcoming town hall style meeting (date TBA) at which we can discuss openly the issues that matter most to us. We will then follow up with a second survey, the purpose of which is to refine and rank the importance of various issues that were previously identified as important.

On behalf of the Contract and Benefits Committee, we wish everyone a rewarding and productive semester, and look forward to receiving your input, in one form or another.

THE VALUE OF SERVICE WORK

by Mathias Nilges

One of the unwritten rules of fine dining is that good service be prompt, attentive, and competent and at the same time practically invisible. The less one notices the service, in other words, while feeling expertly taken care of, the better. This is only one of many examples of a commitment to service that is bound up with the desire to create forms of work that are preferably kept invisible, at a distance, silent. Ideally, those who benefit from such service can enjoy it in part precisely because they do not have to engage with those who provide its benefits without—and indeed often precisely because—they do not have to engage with those who provide it. To be sure, already on this level it becomes clear that this kind of commitment to this kind of understanding of service work brings with it a number of problems. But what about the case of university service? Should we not address in more detail the fact that much of the service work that professors are expected to take on remains invisible? If much of the service work that some (or many?) of us carry out remains invisible to those who evaluate our performance at and our overall contributions to this university, does this not privilege those who take on more visible service work? And might this in turn not take away some important incentives for continuing to do important yet less visible work that provides important services to our profession, our fields, and our colleagues and students outside of StFX? More importantly, maybe, how should we think about visible and especially invisible service work that is carried out by colleagues who are presently not (yet who no doubt hope to one day be) tenure track employees? This set of questions may help launch a conversation about the status of service

work at StFX, a conversation about a category of work that is an integral part of contractual obligations but that also remains strikingly vaguely defined and circumscribed. The point of this brief essay is not to provide better definitions of academic service work nor does it seek to (or claim that it is able to) propose a more accurate system for understanding and valuing such labor. Rather, I wish to raise a few questions aimed at starting conversations about academic service work that strike me as conspicuous in their absence.

A few examples may help illustrate what I have in mind. Service work is an integral part of our contractual obligations, and service work is taken into account when making decisions regarding tenure and promotion. In addition to contractual obligations and decisions regarding rank and tenure, service work is also crucially involved in our ability to build a professional reputation—with students, with administrators, with each other, and with our colleagues in our fields more widely conceived. Service is clearly important, but not all service is valued equally, and the way in which service work is valued, I would argue, is not consistent across contexts. When I first began working at StFX, I was given to understand that service work would be an important aspect of my growing professional portfolio and that it would play a significant role in decisions regarding tenure and promotion. But how much service work is enough? How much is too little? Indeed, how much might be too much? That not all service work is equal became clear quite quickly. There are committees, for instance, that are very labor intensive, and there are ones that are less so. That this is true is readily apparent. But is

this difference officially recognized as such? Would I have to worry that some committees on which I was placed without much input (in part due to the fact that I knew little of the committees I was asked to join) would be valued less than others? Did I pick the right committees? Should I be on more of them? Fewer? Colleagues provided me with additional information and some guidance, but it quickly became evident that few people had any information or advice that amounted to more than the rather vague suggestion that I ought to “do enough.” Now, in one sense, this seems easy enough. In another sense, however, this lack of formality is a daunting prospect for assistant professors who work hard to prepare for their tenure review. Many universities keep service work for pre-tenure faculty intentionally at a minimum. This is not the case at StFX. At least, there is no general commitment to reducing service work expectations for junior faculty to help them prepare for tenure of which I am aware. Some departments, in particular in the sciences, I am told, appear more helpful here and do concrete work to address this issue, trying to keep service work away from junior faculty in order to allow them to hone their teaching skills and to afford them additional time to develop their research agenda. But should we not have a fully formulated account of how departments might do this at StFX proper? Should not all departments follow suit and develop a policy for service work expectations that can help in particular junior faculty map and plan their future at and contribution to our university?

Some may ask in what ways the lack of formal regulations regarding service work or the lack of somewhat more clearly defined expectations and definitions becomes a problem. As suggested above, preparing for tenure

and being given coordinates that help junior faculty do so is important. While there cannot be a universal measure of service work, it does seem very much possible to develop more concrete definitions and regulations with regard to an important criterion based on which we will be evaluated. After all, what we do on the level of academic service directly influences our other work at StFX. During my first years at StFX, I served on a number of university and departmental committees. Excited about the opportunity to help shape the future of my department, I volunteered for very labor intensive departmental committees, and I enjoyed doing my part. However, during my third year review, the Dean of Arts asked me why I chose to sit on so many departmental committees. “You know that they don’t really factor into tenure decisions very much, right?” I was asked. No, I did not know that. Was that true? If so, I wondered, what is the correct ratio of university service to departmental service? Why had no one mentioned this to me before? If this was indeed the case, then should I have not better spent the many, many hours that appeared to have been ill-advisedly spent on departmental committees on research and writing instead? But, I wondered in turn, if departmental service in fact counts little for tenure and promotion, then would this not create a situation in which, out of necessity, departmental service work and the aim to develop the future of a department would be relegated to the status of volunteer work low on the list of priorities we consider when we budget our time? This could not possibly be the way in which service work is set up at StFX...or could it? Even after having been granted tenure and promotion, I must admit that I have very little concrete information that would allow me to formulate a more precise account of how service work is set up at our university. Tenure affords me the

luxury of having to worry less, as the vagaries of service work are no longer bound up with decisions that could potentially result in a denial of tenure and a severe blow to my academic career. But the feelings of worry and confusion that determined my pre-tenure engagement with service are now replaced by a feeling of guilt whenever one of my non-tenured colleagues asks me for advice regarding service work. How can it be that a purportedly important part of our work, one that, we are told, in part determines our professional future, could be shrouded in so much mystery? Is it not time to determine some ground rules that will help in particular junior faculty develop a meaningful and also strategic relation to service work?

One problem in developing a more coherent account of service work and the expectations that pertain to it is that, as suggested above, not all service work is equal. What I mean here, however, is less that there are more or less labor-intensive committees. That point is readily apparent, I presume. Instead, I would argue that we do too little to register, appreciate, and reward service work that remains largely invisible. Yes, we sit on committees and we attend meetings at StFX, and there is the sense that there exists an audiovisual index of service work—we hear from and see some colleagues more than others (both in person and digitally), and, it seems, this provides us with a way of determining individual efforts with regard to service work. From the perspective of local professionalization, therefore, it would seem that one of the most significant strategic criteria for service work is selecting high-visibility activities. But should that really be one of the guiding principles for service work? Surely that would be a rather cynical, largely self-serving approach to academic service

that deforms the very principles at which such work ought to be aimed. Yet, there is, it is important to note, a substantial amount of work that tends to go unnoticed, and this lack of visibility is a problem as it may pave the way for a problematic, cynical, utterly opportunistic approach to academic service. We have research awards, we have teaching awards, and we may occasionally recognize some service work (internally and publicly). However, a great number of colleagues are engaged in a significant amount of service work outside of StFX that makes crucial contributions to academia—and it is this work, I would argue, that is too often bound up with a problematic contradiction, simultaneously carrying the highest risk of going unnoticed while also often constituting some of the most impressive and notable kind of service work. And this problem is not solved by leaning on an academic version of one of the cornerstones of contemporary corporate management that seeks to extract additional, unwaged labor from employees by suggesting that some activities are a matter of professional pride and commitment, of caring for one's discipline, and that as a result asking for payment or acknowledgment of such work is a matter of bad taste. Of course we all care deeply about academia and about our respective fields. We would no doubt continue to do a whole host of activities without acknowledgment, appreciation, or salary. But this does not mean that the problems and challenges of such work should be ignored by suggesting that such work is a matter of professional pride, dedication, and our love for our fields. While the latter is true, the fact that it is true cannot amount to a defense of the invisibility and lack of regulations that frequently determine service work. The problem is not simply recognition. The problem is a lacking commitment to discussing the

complexities of a kind of labor that is an integral part of academic work and of the evaluations that determine our future.

In my field, this kind of work includes supervising M.A. and Ph.D. theses at other universities, holding positions in professional organizations, assisting in organizing conferences across the globe, serving as adjudicators for prizes and awards, serving as peer reviewers for academic journals and evaluating book proposals and manuscripts for academic presses, and so on. Some of our colleagues do this kind of work for high-ranking academic journals and internationally renowned university presses, for instance. Yet, what is elsewhere in the academy regarded as a mark of great accomplishment arguably receives far too little attention at home, at StFX. Similarly, some of our colleagues have been invited to serve on editorial boards of prestigious journals or book series, and some of these positions are an expression of how highly their work is valued by their colleagues and by their discipline. Being invited to join the editorial board of an excellent series at a high-ranking publisher or a top academic journal is no doubt a mark of academic achievement that should be celebrated, valued, and that should be appropriately factored into professional evaluations. And even if we do at times register such accomplishments, there is little sense that performance evaluations try to register the difference between, say, not serving on the board of journals or presses and doing so, or between serving as a reviewer for a low-ranking journal or press and having been invited to review work for top journals or presses in a particular field. The latter deserves to be recognized and celebrated in the same way that we have tried to highlight our colleagues' contributions to research and teaching. Should we not

advertise significant accomplishments in service to the academy, in particular if such service receives far too little differentiated attention during evaluation processes? Might it not make sense to establish a service award that recognizes the all too silent third major coordinate of our professional activity and basis for evaluation?

At the very least, I would argue, we must do more to avoid under-valuing important service work that by its very nature is less visible. Failing to do so creates an opportunistic approach to service culture that runs the risk of causing us to choose visible over invisible service work for entirely understandable reasons: worries about tenure, promotion, and so on. But if visibility and vaguely defined notions of committee workload override the commitment to a truly differentiated and fully developed account of the multiple kinds of service work that our faculty actually carry out, then we lose something important. Not only does the approach to service work become deformed into a version of opportunism aimed at strategic local professionalization with an eye on tenure and promotion, but we also lose track of the important ways in which often invisible service work outside of StFX importantly showcases StFX academics across academic fields on an international scale. How could it be possible, for instance, that some of our colleagues are engaged in profoundly labor-intensive, non-salaried, and highly prestigious service work that makes an important contribution to academia in Canada and beyond without being recognized for it at StFX and without receiving the credit they deserve during evaluation processes? We are concerned with improving our ability to register the qualitative differences on the level of teaching and research. Why, then, are we not similarly committed to the same

effort on the level of service, in particular since service is such a crucial component of university life and learning at StFX and of the presence of StFX faculty outside of our university? None of the three coordinates of evaluation is clearly measurable. Yet, we know that there are ways of developing some fundamental distinctions that allow us to register quality and to get a better and more concrete sense of the kinds of research and teaching that are being done. Surely, it would be possible to develop a more precise way of valuing and evaluating service work. There are, after all, precedents for this that we could consult.

I will close what has become a longer than intended initial reflection on service work at StFX with a very important problem to which, I would argue, we have dedicated very little thought, yet which presents problems that are just as important and in many ways even more urgent than those faced by junior faculty who find themselves hard pressed to articulate a coherent plan for service work at StFX. This problem is service work for non-tenure track and limited term contract faculty. As is the case with service work more generally, the approach to LTA service work across the university is largely informal. Departments appear to be able to decide how this ought to be handled. I am aware of several cases in which LTA faculty are doing service work. Yet, since service work is not part of their contract and thus not part of the ways in which their salary is calculated, we should more accurately refer to this kind of work as volunteer, non-salaried service work. Such work, I would like to suggest, is profoundly problematic. To be sure, one could argue that it seems like a friendly gesture to invite LTA faculty to join committees. It might afford them additional ways of feeling integrated into their place of work, it affords them

additional input into university structures, and it very simply allows for additional ways to contribute to a community of scholars, which many of those who are in this situation will surely see as a positive opportunity for themselves and for their professional development. One might further suggest that we largely leave it up to LTA faculty whether or not they would like to join committees. They can do so, if they wish, but they are not and, of course, cannot be required to do so. But is all of this really a coherent position? Is the choice regarding committee work truly a choice for LTA faculty? In part because I am convinced that we must have a sustained conversation about this and develop a coherent policy, I will take an overly strong standpoint here that is aimed at producing a position that can hopefully help us discuss this matter: no, the absence of formalized pressure on LTA faculty to join committees and the suggestion that it is a matter of individual choice does not mean that we are not creating a potentially problematic and exploitative position for LTA faculty with regard to service work. In particular LTA faculty who seek to land a tenure-track position, at StFX or elsewhere, do not have the option of a free and independent choice. Simply put, if I were faced with the possibility to join a committee at the institution at which I hope to find permanent employment, I would not understand this as a free choice. Instead, I would naturally assume that I would have to do whatever I can do increase my chances at finding permanent employment, even if this means taking on more, un-salaried work in order to try to show my enthusiasm, eagerness to work, and sense of professional dedication. In turn, not choosing to join a committee, I would fear, might signal the opposite. Of course, I might be told that no one expects me to do service work. But could I be sure? Could I be sure that my

refusal to serve on committees might not negatively impact my professional future, especially in a scenario in which there are more than one LTA faculty in one department who are vying for the department's and the university's attention? The absence of a clear policy, in other words, creates not freedom but instead a situation filled with unequal power relations, various forms of pressure and anxiety, and ultimately a strikingly unfair situation for LTA faculty. Not formalizing regulations regarding service work for non-tenure

track faculty is a crass oversight that creates unfair labor conditions.

I would like to close with a suggestion that is, again, overly polarizing but that may hopefully serve as a stepping stone for a discussion that we must not avoid: either we categorically abolish service work for LTA faculty, or we create opportunities for service work for LTA faculty that are based on clear rules and that carry with them a stipend or alternative form of remuneration (such as support for on-campus housing, and so on).

ISSUES IMPACTING PART-TIME ACADEMIC INSTRUCTORS

by Philip Girvan

Canadian post-secondary institutions have become increasingly dependent on temporary or Contract Academic Staff (CAS). CAUT director of research and political action, Sylvain Schetagne, notes in the October 2015 issue of the [CAUT/ACPPU Bulletin](#), that “[m]ore than 30 per cent of academic staff in Canadian post-secondary institutions are faced with short-term insecure employment and struggle to find decent work”.

Last Fall, a survey on the conditions of Contract Academic Staff in Nova Scotia conducted by the Association of Nova Scotia University Teachers (ANSUT), in collaboration with Dr. Karen Foster, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Social Anthropology at Dalhousie University, was circulated. StFX is no stranger to this shift from full-time tenured staff to precariously employed short-term contract staff, and the StFXAUT will find results from the survey a useful resource.

Table 1 lists the numbers of contract workers (both Limited-Term Appointments and Part-Time Academic Instructors) working at StFX over the past several months.

Table 1

Date	StFXAUT Membership	Limited-Term Appointments	Part-Time Instructors	Percentage of LTAs and PTIs
May 2015	393	32	65	24.6
June 2015	289	17	20	12.8
July 2015	294	14	29	14.6
August 2015	309	20	17	12.5
September 2015	379	24	51	19.7
October 2015	385	25	62	22.6
November 2015	401	25	76	25.2
December 2015	386	25	64	23.1

While percentages of Part-Time Academic Instructors (PTAIs) and Limited-Term Appointments (LTAs) contracted by StFX are below what CAUT indicates is the national average, important issues, some of them unique to StFX, many of them common to part-timers working in post-secondary educational institutions across Canada, are impacting the work and life of part-time academic staff members.

Two meetings were held in November to get a better idea of these issues. Approximately 20 part-time staff took part. Three meeting participants spoke with me. All three mentioned that the meetings were their first opportunities to meet other PTAIs, share stories, and discuss common issues. Bruce Sparks, a PTAI with the Writing Centre, serving as a Member-at-large with the StFXAUT Executive Committee, and involved in the organization of both meetings, noted that the impetus for the gatherings came from PTAIs who wanted a space where they could voice, “common concerns and [discuss] issues that arose because of the nature of the employment”. Randy Lauff, Senior Lab Instructor in the Biology Department, and as well as a PTAI over the last twenty years, emphasized the importance of the PTAI’s meeting at this time as it would allow them to communicate issues to the StFXAUT during the lead-up to collective bargaining “with one voice”.

Challenges and issues discussed included compensation, the lack of availability of pension funds, inadequate health care and lack of other benefits, the inherent difficulties of pursuing research on one's own time with no support from the university, the fact that the PTAIs are required to annually reapply despite having taught a particular course for several years, and a perceived lack of respect. One PTAI who requested to remain anonymous for the purposes of this story informed me that “it's not just the lack of security, but that you're not accumulating any kind of rewards or benefits for service over time. That, of course, applies as well to any kind of professional funding for research or library work”. This speaker indicated that the lack of acknowledgement of Part-Time Academic Instructors’ merit and experience “can sort of be professionally demoralizing at times.”

Sparks noted that “there's a sense that the university really doesn't take you that seriously. You're not a real academic even though you're teaching academic courses for credit...you're excluded from a lot of things: awards, grants, sometimes you're excluded from departmental activities, and other times you're expected to be part of the departmental activities”.

PTAIs emphasized that the perceived lack of respect does not just come from university administration, but from full-time faculty as well. One PTAI said “tenured professors sometimes expect that whatever's offered and regardless of how inconvenient a part-time person will jump at whatever's offered, even if it's the day the term's starting. I think we have a right to say no in the way that they do too... but there's always the attitude of well 'you're kind of in a desperate situation how could you turn down the offer?'”. There are even concerns over what the PTAIs should call themselves. The term 'faculty' is perceived as possibly infringing on the identity of the full-time faculty. Spoke Mr. Lauff: “we call ourselves part-time faculty. [That] the faculty don't like [it] is my understanding because faculty is their realm”.

Details are being sorted out, but a roundtable is scheduled to take place Friday, February 26. It is expected that this roundtable would be an opportunity for administration, full-time faculty, and possibly students, to address perceptions of PTAs and get a better understanding of their situation.

ALUMNI SHOUT-OUT

by Philip Girvan

The *Beacon* regularly features interviews with StFX University Alumni on the topic of their relationships with StFXAUT members who challenged, inspired, or helped in some way. This issue's interview is with Glenn Horne (BBA Honours '07, BA Honours '08).



Glenn Horne: My name is Glenn Horne. I am the Municipal Clerk Treasurer for the County of Antigonish. I'm originally from Canso, Nova Scotia. I first came to X in 2003 and graduated in 2007. Liked it so much I came back and did an additional degree and graduated in 2008.

The first degree I took was in Business Administration with a Honours in Leadership Studies. Second was in Arts with a Honours in Political Science.

The Beacon: At your time at X was there any particular professor, or research librarian maybe, somebody that was helpful or inspirational or mentored you and helped you on your career path?

Glenn Horne: There were a number. I think I've taken lessons from a lot of professors that have assisted me in my career and life and in a lot of different ways. In particular, Todd Boyle in the Business Department was my thesis

adviser for my business degree, and he also employed me through a summer and part of a year as a research assistant, and so I learned a lot from him. That was my first non-recreation based job, so doing research and that kind of thing was far different than life-guarding and swimming instruction and all that kind of stuff that I was doing before that. He was really helpful in that I found he included me a lot in all kinds of discussions he had with other professors and researchers. He provided a lot of guidance on how to write, how to present, how to research, how to do formal research, and also the topics that he was looking into I found quite interesting as well so that was a really good experience.

Other business professors as well – I can recall Neil Maltby...I had him for Introduction to Business and International Business, I believe the course was called. I found him to be a great teacher, but also he challenged his students quite a lot, which I really enjoyed. You might think something's going to be a walk in the park, and then you kind of realize that the expectation is a lot higher here than maybe you expected and try to meet that expectation.

The Beacon: Going back to Todd and some of the skills that you learned while you did research for him: have you been

able to apply either some of the stuff you studied, some of the skills you learned working with him in your current position, perhaps past positions as well, but particularly here with the Municipality.

Glenn Horne: Definitely the ability to actually do research. I don't profess to be a researcher in my day job, but, you know, the rigours of researching: I do still employ a lot of those things. Rigorously documenting what you're looking for where and how you're looking for it. I find that quite helpful in policy development which is where I apply it most often now. Likewise when I went on after Todd and did my BA and then MA I used a lot of those techniques... mostly in the arts and policy realm, but still the same kind of techniques so that was quite helpful.

The Beacon: In your current position, there's people that apply for municipal grants all the time.

Glenn Horne: Yep.

The Beacon: And having learned a bit about methods, and the need for rigour, and the need to consider so many different things at once I should think that that is helpful as you evaluate these grants.

Glenn Horne: Absolutely. And likewise with program and policy development, it's the same kinds of things.

The Beacon: I think that's pretty good unless there something else you'd like to add?

Glenn Horne: I was going to mention I had the business experience and then I had a really positive arts and political

science experience and probably one of...the one thing from my time at StFX that stands out more than anything else were two seminars that I took as part of my Political Science degree: one with Doug Brown and one with Jim Bickerton. They were both around Canadian politics. Jim was my thesis adviser and Doug was the second reader on my thesis. Those seminars were fun. They were challenging. At that time of your educational career, they surround you with your peers who are among the smartest people that you know...All of the honours students in political science: you're either international or you're Canadian. And all the honours students have to take certain seminars and two of the seminars I had taken were solely on Canadian politics and the various subjects within Canadian politics. That was the focus of the semester-long seminar.

So rather than your traditional classroom venue, it was literally ten students and the professor sitting around a boardroom table going through discussions and analyzing various scenarios and debating and challenging one another and whatnot, and I found those conversations, like I said, in addition to being fun, very challenging. You had to do your research, come into class and be prepared to defend any position that you've taken on anything, and that, in particular, is very much applicable to what I do now. Because I have to be as well-versed as I can be in whatever I'm looking at or about to discuss, or debate or bring to council and also be prepared to back up what I know, and, if it's a principled discussion, be prepared to defend that perspective. Those were really fun training grounds, and those are experiences and skills that I definitely took on further.

REPORT ON THE STFX AD HOC COPYRIGHT COMMITTEE

by Rita Campbell, Special Projects Librarian

The Ad Hoc Copyright Committee existed from May 2015 to December 2015. The mandate was to make a recommendation on the renewal or cancellation of the Access Copyright License. Rita Campbell represented StFXAUT on the Ad Hoc Committee.

The Committee recommended non-renewal of the Access Copyright license, and the President's Council agreed. Therefore, Access Copyright's license expired on December 31, 2015.

From January 1, 2016, use of copyrighted material by StFX faculty and staff will be governed solely by the Canadian Copyright Act, with particular importance on the fair dealing and educational exemptions clauses. As well, the Library negotiates usage permissions when subscribing to electronic resources. Permissions for usage of copyrighted material that falls outside fair dealing, educational exemptions and Library licensing agreements will be cleared by a "central permissions service" - after such a service is set up.

The Committee drafted a *StFX Policy on the Use of Copyright-Protected Materials*, which, I believe, is still awaiting approval by the President's Council.

The Committee drafted *StFX Fair Dealing Guidelines* (http://sites.stfx.ca/library/campus_copyri ght/fairdealing_guidelines) based on the Universities Canada "Fair Dealing Policy for Universities." The *StFX Fair Dealing Guidelines* are on the Campus Copyright website (http://sites.stfx.ca/library/campus_copyri ght).

Information about the cancellation of the Access Copyright license was

communicated to the campus community via faculty meetings, etc., with sessions offered to those who wanted practical information.

Lost opportunities: The university was paying more than \$100,000 annually to Access Copyright. To my knowledge, there has been no move to have some of this money transferred into copyright support. Therefore, the role of acquiring permissions will likely be simply added as extra responsibilities of librarian(s) and/or library staff. As well, only basic changes will be made to Moodle to alert instructors to copyright when they add documents to Moodle. Anything more sophisticated would have had a one-time cost. There is no indication that any of these funds will be made available to purchase permissions in cases where it is necessary to pay.

The Ad Hoc Committee recommended an ongoing copyright support team to respond to copyright related questions and develop instructional sessions. Currently, that team is understaffed with only the Interim University Librarian and a limited-term appointment librarian spending time on this.

Caution: There is a slight possibility that the university lawyers will recommend that the least risky option be taken with the "W:" drives, which would be to terminate them, thus avoiding any possibility that there is material on them that violates copyright. There are other options, such as communication and education; requiring an "acceptance of terms" sign-off by users of the "W:" drive, and making them by-request only.

There will be a standing committee on copyright set up at some time in the future.

CAUT'S NEW ACTIVIST WORKSHOP

by Susan MacKay

On Thursday, November 26, I had the opportunity to participate in the inaugural New Activist Workshop, hosted by the [Canadian Association of University Teachers](#) (CAUT) in Ottawa.

Before I reflect on what I learned during the workshop, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to the StFXAUT Executive Committee for supporting and encouraging my participation in, what I deem to be, a significant professional development and educational opportunity.

The goal of the day-long workshop was to encourage a new generation of academic staff to become involved in their associations and to explore challenges confronting academic workplaces and current post-secondary education (PSE) issues, such as collective bargaining, grievance handling, equity, casualization, academic freedom, communications and media relations, and membership engagement.

The format of the fast-paced workshop consisted of open discussions; small group discussions; the opportunity to present and summarize learning with the larger group and CAUT staff members who were present that day; and plenary presentations.

The day began with the eighteen faculty members from various Canadian faculty associations being divided into small working groups who would remain together for the duration of the workshop. I had the privilege of learning alongside quite a dynamic group: Dr. Marie Battiste (Saskatchewan), Dr. Gul Caliskan (St. Thomas), Dr. Étienne Dako (Moncton), and Dr. Matt Reid (Northern BC).

Before our small group morning session, a larger discussion took place about important issues affecting academic workplaces and current PSE issues, of which four main challenges were identified: casualization, corporatization, equity, and membership renewal/mobilization engagement.

Our group was tasked with identifying and analyzing issues of equity and how these affect faculty associations and academic environments. After an engaging group discussion, Gul and I presented the summary of our discussion to the larger group, and I then shared some examples of how members of the StFXAUT are engaged in their ongoing commitment to creating an equitable campus environment:

- 1) The AUT hosted a CAUT Equity Workshop in November 2014;
- 2) The Status of Women and Equity Committee (SOWE) members contributed an article to the [2015 Winter edition of the Beacon](#) to further educate and raise awareness about equity issues;
- 3) The SOWE released an anonymous survey to the membership in August 2015;
- 4) AUT members were invited to participate in StFX's first Equity Summit held in September 2015; and
- 5) The recent campus-wide [Unioniversity poster campaign](#), in collaboration with four other campus unions, including the Students' Union, to highlight the value of all campus labour and how it directly contributes to and supports students' academic experiences (several participants viewed the posters and thought they might also incorporate this idea on their campuses).

The intensive day of learning culminated with each group applying their newly-acquired knowledge and activist skills into one of four scenario-based, skills-building exercises: formulating and presenting a grievance strategy, preparing a poster and event campaign, producing a movie using one's smart phone, and preparing and hosting a press release. Our group created a poster campaign around whose theme was engaging the campus and greater community about the importance creating healthy, equitable university campuses.

The workshop was beneficial in numerous ways. I further solidified my understanding and knowledge about PSE issues in Canada and how they significantly affect AUT members and our academic community (e.g., the continual reliance on Contract Academic Staff (CAS), representing approximately 30% of faculty association members in Canadian universities; academic freedom; and the corporatization of education).

What is most significant is that I learned that my role as executive assistant is an activist one—not solely administrative, as I had previously thought it to be. It is about educating; communicating, connecting, and engaging with; serving; and, especially, listening to you, the members, as we collectively strive for and commit to creating a collegial, respectful, and equitable campus community for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Please note there will be a StFXAUT regular meeting on **Tuesday, February 23** from **5:15 PM – 6:30 PM** in the **Schwartz Auditorium**.

The primary focus of this meeting will be the results of the survey conducted by the StFXAUT Contracts and Benefits Committee.

REMINDERS

- 1) The Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) offers [Health and Dental Benefits for Retirees](#). To learn more about monthly premiums for residents of Nova Scotia, please [click here](#).
 - 2) Please remember to send your event notices and campus updates to the StFXAUT list serve to keep all members informed.
 - 3) Remember to access your [Professional Development Fund \(PDF\)](#). **Article 1.22** of the *Third Collective Agreement* entitles each member to an expense account, against which you can submit a [PDF Expense Claim Form](#) for reimbursement of expenses such as travel, iPads, laptops, software, professional registration fees, conference fees; and graduation robes.
-

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING WORKSHOP

by Brad Long

On Friday, January 29, about a dozen members came together for a Collective Bargaining workshop, facilitated by CAUT's John Eustace (former Acadia English professor). This workshop allowed participants to better understand the process of bargaining and some of the relevant legislation that governs the process, and to be more comfortable with the mechanics of writing, presenting, and responding to proposals. Nature conspired against us for Day 2 of this workshop, with the Friday night storm resulting in a campus closure on Saturday, but it was an informative experience nonetheless. I would like to thank Susan Mackay in this public manner who not only attended the workshop but helped organize it and took care of all the small details that created a comfortable learning environment for everyone.

KEY DATES

Some of the upcoming deadlines in the [Third Collective Agreement](#) include:

April 15:

- Applications for URPTA, based on research or publication, shall be made to the appropriate Dean, at the Faculty members' initiative, by **April 15** of each academic year (**Article 2.7.1: 3.1**).

May 15:

- Each Librarian shall submit to the University Librarian a copy of an Annual Report of professional activities by **May 15** of each year (**Article 3.3: 1.0**).
 - The Performance Evaluation shall take place by **May 15** or the Lab Instructors contract termination date, whichever is earlier (**Article 4.6: 2.0**).
-

YOUR 2015-2016 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

[Brad Long](#), President
[Peter McInnis](#), Past President
[Chris Frazer](#), Vice President
[Rita Campbell](#), Secretary
[Martin van Bommel](#), Treasurer
[Charlene Weaving](#), Chief Grievance Officer
[Bruce Sparks](#), Member at Large
[Cory Bishop](#), Member at Large
[Kris Hunter](#), Member at Large
[Wendy Panagopoulos](#), Member at Large

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CONTACT THE STFXAUT OFFICE:

#219-42 West Street (Old Municipal Building) • (902) 867-3368

[Email](#) • [Website](#)