

the FABric

UNIVERSITY OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FACULTY ASSOCIATION

February 2013

www.upeifa.org

Vol 8, No.2

Welcome to the Janus Edition of the FABric

For FA Members, January is truly the Janus month: by virtue of the temporal idiosyncrasy that is the academic year, we're looking backwards with a sense of achievement and nostalgia for the term just finished, but brimming over with enthusiasm for that which has just begun. But as the days begin to lengthen—harkening to a not-too-distant spring—the deep cold of the mid-Atlantic winter begins to bite.

So, gentle reader, as the wind howls around your office and that pile of marking on your desk begins to take root, take up a mug of warm comfort and relax a little with the latest edition of *the FABric*. All your favourites are here—the President's State of the Union, Collective Agreement Dates to Remember—but there are a few surprises, too!

In this issue:

- *President's Report (p.1-2)*
- *What Are We Reading (p.2-3)*
- *Deans Honours and Awards Ceremony, Call for Nominations: Hessian Awards, Merit Awards (p.4)*
- *Heard in the Hallways: Reactions to the New Collective Agreement (p.5)*
- *Speakers Corner & An Interview with Dr. Robert Gilmour, Jr. (p.6-12)*
- *Roundtable Discussion about Work/Life Balance (p. 12-16)*
- *AGM & Student Perception Surrounding the Value of Education (p.16-17)*
- *Collective Agreement Dates to Remember (p. 18-19)*
- *Welcome to New FA Members (p.19)*
- *We Want Your Input & FABric Editorial Policy (p.20)*

State of the Union: The President's Report

Much has transpired since I wrote this column for the last issue of *the FABric*. Shortly afterwards, we concluded negotiations for Bargaining Unit #1, and then about a month later, for Bargaining Unit #2. In both cases, it took over a month after ratification to finalize the fine print for each of the new collective agreements before signing. We continue to be involved in follow-up efforts to ensure implementation of some of the negotiated improvements. Sincere thanks to all those involved in the negotiation efforts on our behalf. While I believe that we have reached fair collective agreements, it is disheartening that some administrators appear to begrudge us those negotiated improvements and seem to be resisting their implementation. Don't they agree with us that UPEI is a great university, and therefore its academic staff deserves to be treated with respect?



Betty Jeffery,
President, UPEIFA

Our Bargaining Unit #1 negotiations were noteworthy in many respects, including the fact that we stood in solidarity with the three other campus unions to ensure that what the UPEIFA bargaining units received on the salary and pension front was also offered to them. A joint committee has been formed as a result of a negotiated BU #1 Memorandum of Understanding “to address the clarity of language and the appropriateness of

procedure ... outlined in F6.4 to F6.20" and has begun its work. We are represented by Doug Dahn (Grievance Officer) and Geoff Lindsay (member of the Bargaining Unit #1 Negotiating Team). Some of you may be aware that, by virtue of Article F6.22, the Fair Treatment Policy and the Policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarly Work form part of the BU #1 Collective Agreement and cannot be amended without our written consent. A joint committee, on which we were represented by Nola Etkin and Lori Weeks, has been working on a revised Fair Treatment Policy. That work has now concluded, and the Policy has been sent to the Human Resources Committee of the Board of Governors. Nola Etkin, Carlo Lavoie, and Kathy Gottschall-Pass reviewed proposed changes to the Policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarly Work, and we are hopeful that agreement will be reached shortly.

In this issue you will find calls for nominations for the Scholarly Achievement Award and the Hessian Teaching Awards. I would encourage each of you to consider nominating a worthy colleague.

Many issues affecting individual Members continue to arise. The Faculty Association Executive takes violations of the Collective Agreements and Certification Orders very seriously, as well as what appears to be deliberate attempts to mistreat Members in one Faculty, in particular. Constant vigilance is required on the part of each and every Member: stand up for your rights, and the rights of your colleagues. Hard work goes into negotiating a collective agreement—but it also takes hard work to defend that agreement.

What Are We Reading?

Between writing lectures, grading, researching, preparing conference papers, writing articles, peer-reviewing grant applications and serving on committees, a few FA members still find time to curl up with a good book. This is a sample of what people are reading this month.

Carolyn Peach Brown (Environmental Studies):
I just finished reading 419 by Will Ferguson which

was a Christmas gift to a family member. I read it because I have lived and worked in Africa for over 20 years and like to read books by African authors or that are related to Africa. I was curious as to how the story would evolve.

Satadal Dasgupta (Sociology and Anthropology):
Right now I am reading the Puja issue of the Ajkal newspaper in Bengali. Confused? Let me explain. In the month of October the Bengali Hindus of the State of West Bengal in India and of Bangladesh worship the goddess, Durga. This is a major festival which is observed with great pomp and pleasure for five days. All the daily newspapers and weekly, fortnightly and monthly literary magazines of Calcutta publish "puja issues" containing serious articles, short stories, novellas and poems. I read several of them to keep my touch with the evolving Bengali literature.

Shannon Murray (English):
I'm reading two for fun at the moment: Stone's Fall by Iain Pears (almost finished) and How to be a Woman by Caitlin Moran (just started). I picked up Stone's Fall because I had enjoyed an earlier novel by Pears called An Instance of the Fingerpost. This one is also historical fiction, though more recent, in which we go back further and further in time to solve the mystery of a financier's defenestration: all against the backdrop of spies and early global arms dealers. Moran's book is for Monday night's book club meeting. She's an award-winning English columnist, and her book is part autobiography, part feminist comic musings.

Scott Greer (Psychology):
I'm currently reading Neil Gaiman's Neverwhere, just finished the hardcover Avengers vs. X-men, and I'm perusing a 10-pound coffee table illustrated history of Baroque architecture.

Betty Jeffery (UPEIFA President/Library)
I've just finished reading The House of Silk by Anthony Horowitz. This novel, written with the full endorsement of the Conan Doyle estate, is a must-read for Sherlock Holmes aficionados. I was inspired to read this by a recent visit to 221B Baker St.

Henry Srebrnik (Political Studies):
I'm reading Telegraph Avenue, the new, and very funny, novel by Michael Chabon. It takes place in Oakland, California,

and describes (among other things) the problems faced by two co-owners of a small record shop, one African-American, the other Jewish, as a new “big box” chain store threatens to put them out of business.

Karen Samis (Biology): *Love in the Time of Cholera*. I recently discovered the book in an unpacked box from a previous move and decided that it must finally be time to read it. I have a love-hate relationship with this author; Gabriel Garcia Marquez. As someone who tends to prefer short stories, I find his writing to be too extravagant and detailed. But, he continually manages to win me over.

Gloria McInnis-Perry (Nursing): Over the Christmas holidays I read *How Big Is Your God?* by Paul Coutinho, SJ. This book encourages one to experience the divine in both a traditional and non-traditional way. Why am I reading this book? I needed a spiritual inoculation. My life over the past few years has been bombarded with extraordinary stressors: my husband’s journey with cancer; in-laws and best friend’s death due to cancer; empty nest syndrome; the stress of a recent tenure file submission, and—oh yeah—the menopause. Existential crisis perhaps? Or just a needed reference to remind me that out of the chaos and confusion will come the calm and beauty that life has to offer.

Sarah Glassford (History): I just finished *The Girls* by Lori Lansens, the fictional autobiography of conjoined twins. The girls’ stories are told in such a way that their conjoinment becomes secondary to the universality of their experiences of love and loss. Added bonus: the evocative Southwestern Ontario setting, where I grew up.

Richard Lemm (English): I’m currently reading two new poetry books, *Here for the Dance* by UPEI’s Laurie Brinklow and *The Lease* by UPEI graduate (2008) Mathew Henderson; *Just Kids*, the memoir by performer, poet, and visual artist Patti Smith; *Rome: A Cultural, Visual, and Personal History* by art critic and social historian Robert Hughes; and Canadian fantasy fiction master Guy Gavriel Kay’s *Tigana*. Oh yeah, and Michael Jackson’s (the Scotsman) *The Malt Whiskey Companion*.

Lyndsay Moffatt (Education): *The Brother Gardeners: Botany, Empire and the Birth of an Obsession* by Andrea Wulf. It’s a fantastic history of the transformation of English gardens via trade with North America. Lovely reading for the winter months!

John McIntyre (English): Right now I am reading *Dreams of a Totalitarian Utopia: Literary Modernism and Politics* by Leon Surette. I’m not reading it out of some misbegotten nostalgia for Franco and Mussolini, but rather I am reviewing it for an upcoming journal issue.

Larry Hale (Biology): I’m reading 419 by Will Ferguson for no other reason than it won the 2012 Giller Prize. I like to read books on the Giller and GG fiction shortlists. People more knowledgeable than I have deemed them worth reading, and I find that they’re not often wrong.

Malcolm Murray (Philosophy): *The Dirty Bird* by Keir Lowther. Very entertaining and disturbing, if those two moods can cohabit. The narrative voice comes from a boy suffering some sort of psychological disruption. Lowther renders the boy’s emotionless, disconnected, and periodically hallucinogenic, rendition of social mores into a perfectly sane landscape, while the adults around him—draped mainly in poverty, bitterness, impatience, and alcohol—try to cope with the boy’s escalating dysfunction.

Richard Raiswell (History): I just finished *The Werewolf of Paris* by Guy Endore. Written in the early ‘30s, it is the *Dracula* of the werewolf genre—Endore invents quintessential tropes such as the silver bullet. But it is more than that, for the whole text can be read as an allegory of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-1, with the violence of the werewolf standing in for the savagery of the conflict. It’s strong stuff. Definitely not for kids.

Mark Barrett (University 100): I’m currently reading the Miles Davis autobiography. As someone who appreciates improvisation in music, I’ve always been a big fan of the blues and more recently jazz. As I read Miles’ description of the bebop movement in New York City during the 50’s, I can’t help but wish I could have been there to hear some of those incredible jam sessions.

Deans' Honours and Awards Ceremony

The Faculty Association awards two medals which are presented at the Deans' Honours & Awards Ceremony in the Autumn.

This year the winner of our Gold Medal for the student with the highest standing in third year was Kathleen Boswall (Faculty of Science) and the winner of our Silver Medal for the student with the highest standing in third year in a faculty other than that of the gold medal winner was Adam Doucette (Faculty of Arts).

Gordon MacDonald (Mathematics) presented the gold medal; Andrew Zinck (Music) presented the silver.



Call for Nominations ... Hessian Merit Awards for Excellence in Teaching

The University of Prince Edward Island's Hessian Merit Awards for Excellence in Teaching honour faculty members who are recognised as possessing outstanding competence in teaching. These awards publicly acknowledge individuals whose work has contributed to instructional excellence at UPEI.

Nominations must be made collaboratively by three or more sponsors, including students, full-time or sessional faculty or staff, and/or alumni. Nomination forms are available through the FA Office (315 Main) or through the FA website, www.upeifa.org.

The deadline for nominations is noon, **22 February 2013**. For further details, follow the links at: <http://www.upeifa.org>

Call for Nominations ... Merit Awards for Scholarly Achievement

The UPEI Faculty Association invites the nomination of candidates for the University's 2012-2013 Merit Awards for Scholarly Achievement. These prestigious awards consist of a cash prize of \$500 and a plaque. There are three awards, one in each of the following categories:

- i. Arts, Business, and Education
- ii. Science
- iii. Atlantic Veterinary College, and Nursing

Nominations may be made by any member of the university faculty, including the nominee. Deadline for receipt of complete files is March 11, 2013, and should be forwarded to the Faculty Association Office (315 Main).

For information on the nomination procedure, follow the links at <http://www.upeifa.org>

Call for Nominations ... Merit Award for Excellence in Teaching by a Sessional Instructor

The Merit Award for Excellence in Teaching by a Sessional Instructor honours a sessional instructor for outstanding performance in teaching. The award publicly acknowledges an individual whose work has contributed to instructional excellence at UPEI.

Nominations must be made collaboratively by three or more sponsors, including students, full-time or sessional faculty or staff, and/or alumni.

Nomination forms are available through the FA Office (315 Main) or through the FA website, www.upeifa.org. The deadline for nominations is noon, **22 February 2013**.

For further details, follow the links at: <http://www.upeifa.org>

Heard in the Hallways: Reactions to the New Collective Agreement

In early November, Communication Reps found Members in the corridors and asked: "What do you think about the new Collective Agreement?" The responses are printed here.

"It looks to me like a pretty reasonable deal, considering the current climate, and hopefully there is a positive relationship with the administration as we move into the future."

"That was simply huge, as the students might say."

"I'm glad it's signed."

"I'm so glad it turned out to reflect the hopes and changes for this place."

"I'm looking forward to many more great initiatives that admin and faculty work on together."

"It rocks!"

"It makes me feel that my contribution is valued."

"Very happy ... feels good!"

"I like it. I'm all for it! I was curious about important dependants and that was answered."

"I like some of the things ... I'm only aware of some of the highlighted things that have been sent to us ... I like what the Faculty Association is trying to do for sessionals."

"I think it's great! Having endured six strikes on three campuses during my career, I want to thank the negotiating team for their efforts on our behalf."

"That's one small step increase for faculty, one giant leap for faculty morale."

"Glad it is settled; the committee did a fantastic job."

"Beats the [indistinct] out of being on strike."

"After paying full tuition for 11 ½ years for 3 children I am looking forward to the tuition waiver for the final semester of my youngest child. Can it be made retro-active?"

"I am impressed with the caliber of the negotiating team. I think we did really well given the current economic circumstances."

"Quite pleased with the new Collective Agreement."

"Surprised that we got any pay increases."

"This is great news."

"Excited about the tuition waivers for children of faculty. A lot of faculty started in the mid 1990s who have children in high school now, so it is very good timing to implement this."

"While more work needs to be done to support Sessional Instructors, there was good progress made, definitely in the right direction."

"Glad that the things that were on the table earlier were removed, especially things that made teaching seem like punishment."

"This is the best result I have seen in contract negotiations since coming to UPEI in 1992."

"Consistently there are always other things that we will want to consider in negotiations such as an incentive package for retirement etc. but we need to celebrate what was accomplished here."

"What a wonderful outcome."

"Hats off to the Negotiations Team. A job very well done—and much appreciated. Next time around, let's talk vet care waivers for those whose family members have more than 2 legs."

Speaker's Corner: Tabling and Un-Tabling Motions

Chris Vessey, Speaker, UPEIFA

Normally, when a motion is on the floor, the only things that can be discussed are the motion itself, or germane amendments (subject to the usual rules regarding amendments). Other unrelated business cannot be considered, as it is “out of order.” If for some reason it becomes urgent to deal with an entirely different motion, then a motion to lay on the table is put forward, which temporarily suspends further consideration or action on a pending question (that is, a motion that hasn’t been voted on). This allows some other business that is unrelated to then come to the floor and be processed. Following the interruption, the motion on the table may be taken from the table and debate resumed.

Motions to table cannot interrupt a speaker who has the floor. They must be seconded, but are non-debatable, nor are they amendable. A simple majority vote is required to table. Most importantly, a motion to lay on the table is not permitted to be used to stall debate or to “kill” a motion. It is the Speaker’s responsibility to allow its use only within the proper context. If you want to kill a motion, you should move that the question be postponed indefinitely.

Finally, if a motion is tabled in one regular meeting, it must be taken from the table at that same meeting, otherwise it is considered dead. However, the motion to table should never be used for the intentional purpose of killing a motion. It should be taken from the table, then postponed indefinitely, if that is the desire, or the motion to be killed might be simply withdrawn (with permission from the seconder).

Future Tense: Research at UPEI, An Interview with Dr. Robert Gilmour, Jr., Vice-President Research

Editorial note: Dr. Lisa Chilton (Arts) and Dr. Sheldon Opps (Science) crafted the following questions for Dr. Gilmour, who provided his responses in writing. Dr. Richard Lemm (Arts), who facilitated the exchange, added two questions concerning creative arts research.

Lisa: How do you see research at UPEI changing over the next few years?

VP Gilmour: I see more Faculty embracing the constellation concept, as developed for the UPEI research strategic plan, whereby research involves groups of Faculty, as opposed to individual Faculty, particularly in the area of sustainability (with all that that entails—climate, environment, sociology, economics, education, business, culture, history, etc.) and in engineering (with all that that entails—physics, math, computer science, nanotechnology, renewable energy, etc.). Even at a small institution like UPEI, it will be possible, particularly if external collaborators are recruited, to conduct research on a multifactoral problem, as opposed to a problem circumscribed by a traditional discipline.

For example, addressing coastal erosion could involve Faculty interested in the causes of erosion (climatologists, geologists, computer scientists), the remediation of erosion (engineers, physicists, mathematicians), and the impacts of erosion on local economies (business faculty, economists, faculty in tourism and government), outlook (psychologists, sociologists) and culture (musicologists, linguistics experts, historians). Another example might be child/adolescent development, including the types of projects that Kate Tilleczek, Bill Montelpare and the CIDA

grant group are pursuing, which involve health-related professions, education, government and business. The group pursuing research in medical history is yet another example, and there are many others, some nascent and some more fully realized.

Lisa: In your opinion, what are the advantages and disadvantages of tapping into industry dollars to fund research at UPEI?

VP Gilmour: The major advantages are that Faculty may gain access to technology and resources that would not otherwise be available to a small institution, particularly if we collaborate with large industrial firms, as well as access to creative and innovative thinking, particularly if we work with smaller companies just starting out. In the past, an additional advantage was that Faculty could work on problems that the federal agencies would be unlikely to fund, given that their focus was on basic, rather than applied, research. However, in the current climate, that view has changed, to the point where working with industry conveys the advantage of being able to compete more successfully for federal and provincial funding.

The major disadvantages are that industry typically wants to control the research agenda and timeline and to retain all the intellectual property and resulting revenues. In extreme cases, their control may extend to prohibiting public presentation or publication of results. In an attempt to attract industry funding, researchers also may be tempted to do what is necessary to secure financial support, as opposed to conducting research that has intellectual merit.

I believe the philosophy of the university in this regard should be that we conduct research only that will advance legitimate Faculty research agendas, i.e., no outright “prostitution,” although we can and should be creative in coupling fee-for-service activity with hypothesis-driven research, particularly where funding sources for the latter are scarce. In addition, we must be able to publish or otherwise disseminate the results of our research, if we so desire, even if they do not reflect favourably on the industry partner. To what

extent we retain the intellectual property rights and the prospect of financial gain from the research are secondary considerations that can be negotiated on a case-by-case basis.

Lisa: What advice would you offer Faculty at UPEI who are struggling to find funding for their research?

VP Gilmour: I would advise Faculty to persevere if they strongly believe in their project, i.e., keep applying for funding from whatever sponsors are available, even if past applications have not been successful. That said, I also would suggest that Faculty take a hard look at their research (and ask an objective external expert to do likewise) and move in a new direction, if warranted. In addition, I would advise them to identify new collaborators, both better to enable their own ideas and to expose themselves to different perspectives. The latter could involve something as simple as organizing a new seminar series populated with researchers in their area.

My own experience in this regard was that in the late 1990s I applied several times for funding from the National Institutes of Health for what I thought were highly innovative projects and was not successful. I then enlisted the help of several individuals in physics, applied math and engineering and by 2002 I had three R01 grants (at around \$2.5 million each)—same ideas, but now I was part of a team that could realize those ideas. My ego took a hit (why didn’t the NIH think I could do it all by myself?!) and I had to learn to work with a diverse group of Faculty, but my lab was much better off and some nice work got done.

Lisa: What advice would you offer UPEI Faculty who are finding it difficult to produce publishable manuscripts?

VP Gilmour: Sorry, Lisa, but I don’t understand this question. Do you mean they don’t have compelling results, or that they don’t write well or that they don’t have the time ...?

Lisa: What do you consider to be the biggest obstacle that you had to overcome in your efforts to achieve your own research goals?

VP Gilmour: Me. Once I left the large group at Indiana that had pretty much prescribed my research agenda and went out on my own at Cornell, I needed to learn to be more selective in the projects I took on and not to chase after every shiny idea or agree to collaborate with everyone who was nice to me. I needed to be more critical of my own work and to focus on the “big picture,” rather than the little projects that were interesting, but weren’t leading to significant advances in health care—my area. If I had been a physicist or mathematician or historian, I might have taken a different tack, but I wasn’t and so I needed to recognize the “rules” in my area, and play by them, if I was to get the funding to explore problems I wanted to explore and to publish papers that would communicate my discoveries.

Over the years, I have had countless students and colleagues comment that the “system” is keeping them from doing the research they want to do (“I can’t get published or funded or invited to the big meetings,” etc.). I don’t believe that. Certainly, one can be an iconoclast, if one likes, but then you have to accept that you may not get to do the research you would like to do. Researchers, at least in my area, live and thrive (or not) “at the pleasure of the court,” i.e., we don’t generate the revenues to do our own research, which means we need to secure those resources from external sources. If you want to be Columbus and discover new worlds simply for the thrill of discovery, great!—but you need to convince Queen Isabella that she should give you the ships and provisions, which means convincing her that she will get a (large) return on her investment. This sounds calculating and anti-intellectual, I know, but it’s a reality, at least for those who do research in the sciences, and those who ignore it do so at their peril, IMHO.

Of course, the situation may be different in the humanities, although my impression is that visual artists and writers and musicians historically have often lived and died “at the pleasure of court” as well, but perhaps that has changed over time.

Lisa: What do you like to do when you are not at work?

VP Gilmour: And when would that be? :)

I have two golden retrievers and I enjoy taking them on long walks (vice versa, actually). I also enjoy kayaking and gardening, especially now that I won’t have to worry about the deer eating everything I plant. I am an “audiophile,” so I enjoy listening to music and improving the sound of my stereo. I also have committed myself to playing the trumpet, which I used to be pretty good at, to not limiting my reading to when I am on an airplane, and to cooking, which is a work in progress.

Sheldon: Small institutions have seen a dramatic decrease in research funding from NSERC, including Discovery Grants and, now, the elimination of the RTI and MRS programs. What ways do you envision that UPEI could address this dire situation?

VP Gilmour: As you know, the elimination of the RTI and MRS programs was primarily a budget decision and the government targeted the most costly programs to save as much money as possible with the fewest number of decisions. I don’t frankly know what the impact of those cutbacks will be on UPEI (perhaps you could help me out there), but I presume they will be minimal, given the predominantly large instrument core facilities those programs supported. However, the reduction of NSERC Discovery grants is a more pervasive (and insidious) trend, possibly best exemplified by Chemistry, which seems to be concentrating their support on fewer and fewer more established groups.

So what can we do about this? For one, UPEI is the charter member of a group, the Alliance of Canadian Comprehensive Research Universities (ACCRU), which was specifically established to lobby federal agencies with respect to this issue. I don’t think this strategy will be very effective, but UPEI will continue to participate. My own bias is that if we are to

compete with larger institutions, we need to bring larger initiatives to the table, which means creating proposals from groups of Faculty, as opposed to individuals. In addition (and I hope this doesn't sound callous), if we are to get more grants, we need more Faculty (i.e., new Faculty) and we need existing Faculty to develop new research programs. On the science side of things, the new school of engineering and the new climate change unit should help in both those respects, but I am afraid the situation on the Arts side with respect to hiring a significant number of new Faculty is not very encouraging, particularly in this budget climate.

As you may have heard, SSHRC projects now should emphasize establishing partnerships with industry, government and not-for-profits, with an eye to maximizing immediate impacts. Whether Arts and Education Faculty are willing and able to adjust to this new mandate remains to be seen, but finding out will be a point of emphasis for me in the coming months, as will devising mechanisms to assist Faculty with applying for SSHRC funding (e.g., writing workshops, pre-submission peer review, post-submission debriefings, writing retreats).

Sheldon: Compared to the USA, there are significantly fewer research funding agencies available in Canada. This would seem to pose a challenge for you, given your American experience. How do you see yourself adapting to the Canadian system? What ideas do you have in mind for finding alternative funding sources?

VP Gilmour: This is indeed a challenge for me and correspondingly for the Faculty, particularly for Arts Faculty and for health-related professions Faculty whose research is disease-specific. However, there may be a few sponsors that we have not approached who could provide funding, such as the Canadian Institute for Military and Veteran Health Research. I recently nominated Bill Montelpare for its Board

of Directors. The nomination was successful and Bill now plays a significant role in an organization that provides a substantial amount of funding for health-related research. I expect Bill's involvement to increase the visibility and access to funding from this sponsor for a number of our Faculty, including Bill. As I get more settled, I plan to look for more of these kinds of opportunities, recognizing that they most likely will be limited.

Another strategy is to encourage Faculty to engage with collaborators from other countries. My initial impression is that at least some of the Faculty tend to be a bit isolationist (we are on an island after all) and have not had sufficient motivation in the past to seek out collaborators "from away." Now may be a good time to do that, again recognizing that the opportunities may be limited (e.g., involvement of Canadian Faculty in the European Union grant program is limited to those who provide expertise that cannot be obtained from researchers in any member countries, a pretty stringent requirement). In addition, there will be administrative issues associated with these types of awards (as I am finding out with my own NIH and Max-Planck Institute subcontracts), but nothing insurmountable.

Collaborations with new industry partners, both Canadian and foreign, may be another source of research support. To better access that support, we are in the process of encouraging Faculty to realign, where appropriate, their research agendas with federal agencies that require industry partners (e.g., ACOA, IPEI). In addition, we are revamping our technology transfer unit, Three Oaks Innovations, to create a more effective interface between the University and industry. Finally, I have had multiple discussions with representatives of ACOA, IPEI, the BioAlliance, Springboard, IRAP and NSERC to better understand their agendas and how the university can better align with those agendas, recognizing that we are operating (like it or not) in a climate of a federally-mandated emphasis on short-term economic impacts from research.

Sheldon: Related to questions 1 and 2, have you entertained the idea of increasing the number of internal funding opportunities at UPEI, as well as the size of internal research grants?

VP Gilmour: I am a big believer in internal grants and I would love to increase the number of such opportunities at UPEI. However, in the current budget climate, increasing programs funded through UPEI resources will be a challenge. That said, we—me—need to look for additional sources of funding for internal grants, including resources that may be provided by donors. In the meantime, we need to refocus the current internal grants program, which in my opinion tends to try to be all things to all people and, in the process, may not promote the most effective use of our limited resources. To that end, an in-depth discussion of the internal grants policy will be forthcoming from the grant review committee.

Sheldon: What do you see as your role, and the role of Research Services, in facilitating successful external and internal grant applications?

VP Gilmour: The Office of Research Services (ORS) has numerous roles to play with respect to facilitating successful grant applications, both on the pre-award (prior to submission) and the post-award (following a successful submission) sides.

On the pre-award side, ORS is responsible for ensuring that the guidelines for a particular sponsor have been followed, that the submission contains all required materials, assurances, and approvals and that the grant is submitted on time in the appropriate format with the correct budget. ORS also should provide guidance to Faculty and students regarding what funding opportunities are available in their area and how they should approach a given sponsor with respect to the sponsor's points of emphasis (e.g., making sure you have a good training plan for high quality personnel for your NSERC grant).

On the post-award side, ORS should assist, where appropriate, with tracking and preparing progress and activity reports, as well as media releases. In addition, we should provide an effective interface between the researcher and research accounting and should provide guidance with respect to how the funds can be spent and whether categories of funds can be re-budgeted. It is my understanding that there have been issues with research accounting related to our rather antiquated accounting system. Those issues should be resolved with the new ERP, but since that system will not be on-line for some time, we are piloting a project in conjunction with the library to develop an in-house system tailored for research that is intended to be more accurate and user-friendly. We should know in the next couple months whether that project is successful.

More generally, ORS should provide opportunities for investigators to improve their grant writing skills via workshops, retreats, webinars, and access to relevant media and resources. I also would like to implement an internal peer-review process, whereby a roster of Faculty volunteers having diverse expertise is assembled, individuals are selected from that roster to provide pre-submission guidance to Faculty, and follow-up consultations are scheduled in the event the proposal is not successful.

Sheldon: Related to Question 4, a common complaint amongst researchers at UPEI is the inordinate amount of paperwork required to apply for grants, both internal and external. What ways do you envision to streamline grant applications procedures and the completion of administrative approval forms?

VP Gilmour: Unfortunately, granting agencies and industry are placing an increasingly larger burden on the University with respect to compliance, conflict of interest, responsible conduct of research, ethics, biosafety and accounting. To try to stem the tide of bureaucracy, we recently instituted a reduction of internal paperwork for ethics approval and are working on biosafety as well.

Efforts also are underway to accommodate, in an efficient way, the newer requirements for animal care. Frankly, I am not optimistic about reducing the paperwork burden significantly anytime soon. Instead, I believe the solution is the one that Jonathan Spears has applied successfully to the animal care arena, which is for him to sit with investigators individually and help them fill out forms, while explaining why certain pieces of information are now required.

Once the Research Office is at full strength, which should be this May, we plan to make Leslie Cudmore more available to help researchers with grant forms and Lisa MacDougall more available to help with ethics and biosafety forms, with the objective of educating Faculty to the point where they are more comfortable with these forms (“teach someone to fish ...”). We also are striving in both areas to make the required forms available electronically in a user-friendly format. Finally, I have delegated signing authority for as many forms as possible to others, to reduce the need for everything to go through the VP. We will continue to push the rock up the hill in this area, recognizing that it is likely to keep sliding back down.

Sheldon: Most researchers, especially at small institutions, don’t have sufficient time to write grants due to their high teaching loads and other service responsibilities. On the other hand, our research programs depend on continued funding and, hence, we are “slaves” to the grant-writing machine. Could alternative models be adopted that would allow researchers more time to conduct research, while Research Services shouldered a greater share of the workload in crafting research grants?

VP Gilmour: As I’m sure you recognize, this is a tricky business because the best grants will typically be written by those who have the greatest passion for and expertise in any given subject. That said, as we have in the past, ORS continues to engage professional writers to “polish” our CRC applications and we may be able to make that service available to more Faculty, provided there is sufficient Faculty interest and

financial support. In addition, it may be possible for ORS staff to assume a greater role in writing budget justifications and facilities descriptions, etc., but I would be wary of assigning them too large a role with respect to writing the body of the proposal. Regarding the more general issue of making more time available for research, I’m afraid that lies largely outside my demesne and is something that Faculty need to negotiate with their chairs, deans and VP Academic.

Sheldon: UPEI requires individuals to contact Advancement Services before approaching a potential funding donor. The rationale is that UPEI does not want to upset existing, or future, donors by approaching them multiple times with different funding requests. Although this is a reasonable practice, it may hamper individual researchers seeking alternative funding sources, for example, with greater priority being given to larger initiatives, such as building projects. Is it possible to revise this model so that Research Services could liaise with potential donors, with greater priority given to funding individual research projects? What is the working relationship between Research Services and Advancement Services?

VP Gilmour: I sympathize with your concerns in this area and have had several conversations with Tracey Comeau regarding sponsorship of research by donors. The system here is in some respects a legacy of the previous president and I believe it needs to be modified to better align with our current personnel and needs for donor funding. I don’t have anything too specific to suggest yet other than [to note that] Tracey and I have discussed creating a list of potential areas for donations based on discussions with researchers. I realize that Advancement has limited resources, but I am hopeful we can devise a strategy not constrained by a pre-determined shortlist of funding priorities. More to come on that.

Richard: Some Faculty involved in creative arts research/production have felt that they were a lower priority for the Research Office than other researchers.

Therefore, i) how will you facilitate funding, internal and external, for Faculty involved in creative arts research/production, and ii) how will you enhance the publicity about successful grant applications and research/creation achievements by these Faculty members?

VP Gilmour: To be honest, Richard, I really don't have good answers to either of these questions, other than we are willing and able (hopefully) to provide the same services for Faculty in creative arts research/production as we would for any other group of Faculty (see above). However, I suspect that there are some specific issues in this arena with which I am not familiar. That being the case, I wonder whether we could assemble a small (3-5) group of people, at least one of whom has been sharply critical of the research office's effort (or lack thereof) in this area (maybe everyone fits that description!) and discuss issues, since until I know what the issues are, I won't be able to address them. Would that be possible?

When the Ivory Tower Abuts the Real World: A Roundtable Discussion about Work/Life Balance

Lisa Chilton, History

Jason Doiron, Psychology

John McIntyre, English

Sheldon Opps, Physics

Jason Pearson, Chemistry

John: Thanks all of you for agreeing to be part of this discussion today. I guess one place we could begin the discussion of work/life balance is through one of the things that brings the five of us together—managing careers and young families.

Lisa: I think when you are a woman and you have young kids and you are trying to have a career in academia, that there is a sense that there are going to be very special challenges.

I think some people will allow that there are special challenges for men with young kids as well. But my sense is that sometimes people who have kids are better able to incorporate non-academic activities into their lives, and that this can be very beneficial. I am thinking here specifically of a very good friend of mine who is a colleague at the University of Cardiff, who has no family responsibilities at all (no children, parents, siblings...), and he is the most run-ragged person I know.

The pressure that he has taken on himself—to do administrative work, to make presentations, genealogy stuff, graduate student supervision—he just doesn't seem to be able to say "No, I can't." And so I think sometimes it gets a little bit overdone, the thing about how it's harder to find balance when you have family, because I think it is also sometimes easier to say "No" and have people believe you. I don't know whether it is fair to say that parenting can be helpful in terms of finding balance—but I sometimes imagine that this might be the case.

Jason P: Yes, I think it is a fair thing to say. I would add that even though I have a young family, it is not always my reason to say "no" to things. In fact, I find that the "non-work" aspect of my life actually helps to energize me and allows me in many ways to be more productive in the workplace.

John: I think one of the things about work/life balance, one of the challenges, is the notion that there is or should be a balance. Sometimes in this profession it's hard to even remember that fact. So I guess when you come to academia with children or you have children early in the process—as we say, you are forced to do things, whereas if you are more single-minded perhaps or more focused in some ways it can actually be more of a challenge. But of course, there are many other dimensions to the work/life issue besides this one. So maybe we could talk about what are some of the challenges in general—certainly there are other work life issues beyond the issue of children.

Jason D: It isn't necessarily that you are going to be more or less busy but I think you are doing more of a variety of things consistently over the day or weeks. For me, to some degree, it is managing my expectations about how much I can put into each of those things. So for some things I have to be okay with saying "that is good enough"—it has to be, because I have so much else on the go. Managing my own expectations is an important tool for me.

John: One of the challenges of academia that I encountered even before I had kids was boundaries. I mean that we are probably all here as academics because we've had the good fortune of finding something that we love that also provides us with a job, and so in that way work and life are sort of in sync. But, of course, the negative side of that is that there is no clear boundary. From the time we were graduate students, we have never worked set hours or days, and I don't know any of my colleagues who have ever worked nine to five. And so there is this inherent challenge—where does work stop and the other parts of our life begin?

Lisa: Part of the thing that I would say too, is exactly what is work? I am constantly feeling like I'm not doing enough work. All the administrative stuff that I do at the University somehow doesn't enter into my sense of what work is. Work is when I'm actually being a productive academic, so all those hours and hours that I spend doing all the administrative stuff, and all the time I spend talking with students outside the classroom, somehow, in my mind, I feel guilty about how much time that takes. On New Year's Eve I was asked "What do you regret about the last year and what would you like to change next year?" My response was that a New Year's resolution for me has to be that I work less—I need to cut back on the time I spend working. And then we talked a little bit more and it came out that I want to spend more time writing. So on the one hand, I want to work less so I have more time to do some of the other things I love, like exercising, art, more academic writing. So I think part of the thing is that when you love it, when you are passionate

about it, it is not just work. What is your definition of work? It becomes very difficult.

Sheldon: To me, balance represents a state that is realized when my decisions and actions are aligned with my priorities. It does not necessarily imply that everything in my life is equally balanced but, rather, that the balance requires compromise. The fact that I'm arriving slightly late for this meeting (for which I did give a heads-up to John about), demonstrates these notions: I'm late because my main priority was to get some physical activity over the lunch hour; so I'm willing to compromise being exactly on time if it means that I accomplish what my essential needs or priorities are. I still wanted to attend the roundtable discussion, but I had to make some compromises in order to honour my priorities. For me, I have still realized balance because I'm doing the things that I want to do in the manner that I want to do them. One of the great challenges in maintaining balance is due to our generation's inability to say "no" which, invariably, translates into greater demands on our time due to increasing responsibilities. Since there are only 24 hours in the day, I need to be realistic about how much I can take on if I want to remain true to my priorities. My number one priority is my family; so, the challenge in maintaining balance is always finding time to get the important things done while, at the same time, not compromising family time. Juggling all of that is the balancing act.

John: I do think in some ways, having heard from some of my colleagues at other institutions, I feel that UPEI is a relatively family-friendly place. I know stories differ from other institutions. But whatever the various issues in one's life are, part of the job requires establishing priorities and trying at least to stick to them. We've been talking about the challenges to finding balance that are inherent in academia. But I want to talk too about some of the ways where balance can come relatively easily. I was at the conference of the Modern Language Association in Boston over the Holiday break, and I actually took my wife and three kids along.

It was a way to align professional obligations with family commitments. Since the conference is a large one, there are panels and sessions all day and all evening until about 9 o'clock, so I went mainly to sessions in the evening or first thing in the morning. And I caught up with colleagues and I met with my publisher but I also took my kids to the Boston Aquarium and the Boston Science Museum. So this was a situation where—look at that—the two elements in my life were actually complementary somehow. But I don't know how often that happens.

Lisa: I think probably a lot of people who have kids work at sorting things out. I feel a bit uncomfortable about this being just about the parenting because there are also decisions about parents and other family members that are huge. Whereas kids are (sometimes) going to give you more energy, provide fun, dealing with parents who are really ill or needing physical care, that is a different kind of challenge. That is not invigorating; it sort of sucks your energy.

Jason P: I think ultimately, like Sheldon said, we all have only 24 hours in a day and we all have only a finite amount of energy. I'm sure that there will always be more tasks that require our time than we are able to meaningfully contribute to. The trick is to find the balance that is right for you and I suspect that this will be different for everyone. It has to do with what, in your life, contributes in a positive way to your energy and what detracts from it as well. That is a dynamic combination that we all have to navigate.

Jason D: I think it varies with individuals. I think balance means different things. As well, I think it's partly personality based—I like doing shorter-termed tasks that are interesting and engaging. I like to have many things going on at once in my life—children, family, teaching, research and community work. It all kind of invigorates me—I am not sure how “balanced” it all is, but it's a pace and a pattern that seems to suit me.

Lisa: I think, for instance, of colleagues who will not deal with emails on the week-end. I really respect that.

But that would kill me, because I would hate to have to deal with that many emails in one go—to have to spend hours checking emails. So I want to toss them off as soon as they come in, but it does mean that I'm looking at emails at 6:30 in the morning and at midnight. I really respect people who don't do that but it isn't a rule that I would like to follow.

John: I'm the same as you. I have a couple of colleagues in my department who make that a rule. But it wouldn't work for me. To me, I find that hard and fast rules present more problems than they solve. Email for instance—I fit that in around the edges, when I have a few spare minutes on the weekend or later on in the evening. It's not a bad time to do it, because the kids are in bed, the television is on in the background (after all, it's not like I'm writing a paper proposal in that email) so if I'm responding to students about basic inquiries or colleagues about meeting times, and keeping an eye on sports highlights, isn't that balance? I find that experience quite satisfying; I don't feel like I'm never able to get away from my work. It's quite the opposite.

Jason D: It's funny how we value certain types of balance—people who say that the week-ends are ours, so no emails and many of us seem to have the notion that that is great. But that wouldn't work for me. It wouldn't work for me to come to work Monday and have 30 emails to respond to. It works for me to fit it around the edges quite well. It gives me the opportunity to get it done earlier—you know when that email gets off first thing.

Jason P: For me, I have times during the day that are productive and times in the day when I'm not so productive. I'm a morning person so I try to deal with emails in the evening because I don't find emails to be a very onerous activity. For me, morning is a time better spent writing proposals or papers or something that really requires my concentration. So we've got, like I said before, a finite amount of resources and a finite amount of time but I think what we all need to do is

find the optimal way to be efficient within those constraints. And like I said before, we probably all have different ways of doing this.

John: So we have to question what does balance look like. To me and I think to others as well, there is no ideal balance—who knows what that would like that? I think the most we can hope for is to walk away with a general feeling of satisfaction from most things they do, like walking out of a classroom and thinking okay, that went pretty well, it wasn't perfect but it went pretty well. Or after having spent two hours with one of my sons building something or making art or baking something, you hope to have that same feeling. At the end of the day, you go to bed and you think, it was a good day. I got to spend time with my kids, the classes went well, and maybe I got to write a page or two (if I'm very productive). Something like that—so we can walk away from most things that we do reasonably satisfied.

Sheldon: Actually, maybe balance isn't the key question but, rather, what brings a sense of peace and happiness into your life. For some people, they may be happiest and most productive when their lives are seemingly out of control and imbalanced. I have a best friend who is like this—he is the happiest guy around, but lives in a state of chaos and disorder. Again, I guess it depends on your definition of balance.

John: Yes, I agree. Finding a balance is in part about finding what works for the individual. And I think sometimes, it's interesting to try different strategies to find a bit of balance.

Sheldon: Exactly. I tried the exercise of not checking email over the Christmas break and it was liberating. True, I knew that I would end up with a pile of emails upon returning to work, but I accepted this reality and was still ultimately able to detach.

Jason P: It is so important to have realistic expectations. My own personal experience is that every Friday I leave campus and I say, "I'm going to get this much done this weekend," and it almost never occurs that

I actually accomplish that much and I'm left feeling unproductive because I've come up short. But on those rare instances where I say "I'm going to do absolutely nothing work-related this weekend," I inevitably feel better about whatever I actually do accomplish. It is all about realistic goals.

John: I think that is good. The email issue keeps coming up and I'll raise another one which is marking. I have a colleague in the Arts who has two daughters and I remember noticing that he never seemed to take marking home. I asked him about that and he said "There is no point. All I do is just feel guilty the whole time." And now I've actually started to do the same thing on the week days. I take things home on the week-ends obviously. I walk out of here most week-days and I don't take marking home—usually I do take reading home. I am under no illusion anymore that any marking will get done in my home after 4 o'clock most weekdays—and that would be the case whether I have kids or if I was caring for a parent or some other significant commitment.

And I think that is exactly it—the need to let go a bit and to set reasonable expectations. And so now I don't have to carry the bulging briefcase to the car, take it into the house and back into the car and back to the office the next morning.

Jason D: You get to have that same result with a sense of accomplishment and there's something to be said for this. All bets are off for the week-ends. Once Friday hits, fit in the work where it feels right, when there is time, but I never plan to get a project for my work life on the week-end, I just can't right now.

John: Well, certainly the writing, I find I need large blocks of time and that is so hard to come by in this stage of our careers and this stage of our lives. I think we need a large block of time to sit down with, in my case, a book or a few articles, and to try to write something coherent about what is going on there. Again for me, dedicated time through the week is good for this. One year I tried to set aside between 4:00 and 6:00 on

Saturdays for writing, but it was terribly unproductive. I would probably have been better to be building piñatas or something.

Jason P: I find getting in early on campus is really productive time and it works well for me.

John: Well, speaking of work/life balance, I should probably let you all go now and attend to the many other elements of your lives on a Friday afternoon. It's been good to hear of your perspectives on this and I guess we can agree that balance will inevitably be a work in progress.

Time to be social!

There'll be fun-o-plenty to be had this term during Coffee Time and FA Time.

Be sure to mark your calendars, and come out to join your colleagues from across campus.

FA Coffee Times, 9:30-11:30am
(Faculty Lounge, Main Building)
13 February
21 March

FA Times, 4:00-6:00 pm
(Faculty Lounge, Main Building—except 5 April)
1 March
5 April (at The Wave!)
19 April (following the AGM)

Notice to all members of the Faculty Association

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Friday 19 April
2:00-3:30 pm

Location: MCDH 243

All members welcome!

And don't forget FA Time in the Faculty Lounge, Main Building immediately following the meeting.

Student Perception of the Value of Education

**Mark Barrett, Sessional Instructor
University 100**

Have university students changed over the past 10-20 years? Are their expectations different? Have their attitudes changed? Are they driven by the same desires and intentions? The following observations are about first year students and their perceptions concerning the value of a university education.

For over twenty-five years at UPEI, the University 100 program has been helping students make the transition from high school to university. The course provides an introduction to the university, to university studies, to the varieties and methods of intellectual inquiry, and provides an opportunity to build reasoning, writing and research skills. University 100 also encourages students in the development of self-knowledge and self-discovery.

One of the first writing assignments that University 100 students write asks, why go to university? In their answers, they are asked to comment on their personal motivations, goals, fears, and uncertainty in relation to

attending university. The exercise is useful because it promotes self-knowledge and awareness, i.e., we are often able to better understand our decisions and actions when we examine the reasons for taking them. Another benefit of the exercise is that it opens up further exploration of the topic itself so students can consider other points of view, or different arguments.

In their answers, many students say they have known since they were young children that they would attend university. The idea that parents and family members have instilled some sense of the value of education in these students is a consistent theme. Often this sense of value is expressed in terms of achieving an education to establish a meaningful career, financial security, and a family. This same sense of the value of education is expressed by mature students. In many cases they are returning to university to upgrade their education in order to improve their career options. Again, the consistent motivators are family, financial security, and a more meaningful work life.

One of the first lectures University 100 students are exposed to is about the value of education. This lecture confirms some of the ideas students have about attending university, mainly that having a degree opens the door to more career opportunities at higher pay levels than is otherwise available to people with less education. Students are also asked to consider self-development. How will four years of study affect their own growth as individuals? Will education transform them in some way, and if so, how?

This latter discussion is an important one, as student awareness about the value of education in this sense is generally underdeveloped in the first year. Students are largely focused on the results of gaining a degree in terms of the financial reward. Considering one's self development and gaining some form of intellectual independence are often at this stage a secondary consideration, and sometimes not a consideration at all. I'm not going to pretend I completely understand why this is the case, nonetheless, these attitudes are in some sense a reflection of the times we live in.

Obtaining a university education is an expensive endeavour, and our society is heavily influenced by the language of economics. Students and parents are looking for a return on their investment, and a university education is still one of the best ways to achieve this. Some of the main conclusions drawn from the lecture indicate that education provides opportunity in terms of securing a meaningful career, gaining financial security, and achieving personal growth.

The lecture is followed by a brief examination of the purpose of education. UPEI's Mission and Goal statement is found on the university's website and in the academic calendar. It says the university exists "to encourage and assist people to acquire the skills, knowledge, and understanding necessary for critical and creative thinking, and thus prepare them to contribute to their own betterment and that of society through the development of their full potential." Students break into groups to discuss the meaning of the statement and how it relates to themselves as learners and potential degree holders.

On the midterm exam, University 100 students are asked to write a persuasive essay justifying why they are in university. The essay asks them to consider the idea that students seem preoccupied with post secondary education as primarily a means to financial security and career development rather than as a chance for intellectual growth and personal development. The responses routinely show that the primary justification for getting a degree is financially motivated. A small minority of students place intellectual growth and personal development ahead of the former. Some students are able to make the all important connection between the two concepts. They argue that as you work toward your degree, apply yourself, and become genuinely interested in your studies you can't help but experience invaluable personal growth and some measure of intellectual autonomy. They explain that this development is part of the journey toward becoming the person they want to be—the person who will be truly capable of establishing a well paid, meaningful career, and becoming a citizen in all its aspects.

Collective Agreement Dates to Remember, January 2013 - April 2013

The Collective Agreement for Bargaining Unit #1 is outlined in what has become known as the "Red Book" (a copy of the Collective Agreement is also available on-line from the UPEIFA website, www.upeifa.org). Dates important for the time period covered by this issue of *the Fabric* through to the subsequent issue to be published in April are outlined as follows.

January 5:

*E2.5.2.2 On or before **January 5**, the Dean shall send a letter to each Chair with the names of the Members in the Department who are eligible for regular consideration of tenure in the next academic year.*

January 15:

*E2.9.4 and E7.11.4 The Dean/University Librarian shall include her/his letter in the candidate's promotion file, and shall forward the completed file to the Chair of the URC before **January 15**.*

January 31:

*G2.12 a) A seniority list of all permanent Clinical Nursing Instructors ... shall be posted by the Employer before **January 31**.*

February 1:

*E2.4.2.4 A Faculty Member who seeks early consideration [for tenure] as an exceptional case shall so request in writing to the Dean of the Faculty or School by **February 1** of the academic year prior to the one in which consideration would take place.*

*E2.4.3.2 The date by which the Faculty Member's request, or the Dean's recommendation [for deferral of tenure consideration], must be communicated is **February 1** of the academic year prior to consideration.*

*E2.5.2.3 a) Prior to **February 1**, each Faculty Member shall send a letter to the Chair indicating that he or she plans to apply for tenure. The Chair then informs the Dean that the tenure file is in preparation.*

*E2.5.2.3 b) Subject to exceptional circumstances set out in this Agreement, if a Faculty Member does not have tenure by **February 1** of the fourth (4th) year of full-time probationary appointment at this University, and if the Faculty Member has not initiated procedures for consideration of tenure, the Department Chair will direct the Faculty Member to submit his or her file for tenure consideration.*

*G1.4 Posting of Sessional Instructor Positions: b) Notices for both summer sessions shall be posted on or before **February 1**.*

March 1:

*B3.1 b) The appointment [of Chairs] normally shall be made by **March 1**.*

*E2.4.2.4 The Dean, in consultation with the Chair, shall decide whether the Faculty Member should be considered as an exceptional case [for early consideration of tenure] by **March 1**.*

*E2.10.5 The URC sub-committee shall decide whether or not a Faculty Member or Librarian is to be recommended for tenure, permanency or promotion. For promotion, the initial vote shall normally take place prior to **March 1**.*

G1.7.1 c) By **March 1** ... the Chair, or the Coordinator or Director of an Interdisciplinary Academic Program, or Dean, in the case where there is no Chair, of each academic unit shall update the seniority of each member of the Sessional Roster of that academic unit.

March 31:

E2.5.2.4 The Department Chair shall assure that a properly constituted Departmental Review Committee will be assembled prior to **March 31**.

E2.10.1 f) iii Elections to the URC shall be completed by **March 31** or as soon thereafter as is practicable.

E2.10.7 For promotion, the final vote of the URC sub-committee shall take place prior to **March 31**.

E4.1.1 b) (amended by a MoA) The list of potential references for combined tenure/promotion files shall be submitted by **March 31**.

April 1:

G1.4 b) Posting of Sessional Instructor Positions: Notices for fall semester and winter semester courses and two-semester courses shall be posted on or before **April 1**.

G2.10 d) Clinical Nursing Instructors who want to work in excess of their contracted hours shall notify the Dean in writing prior to **April 1**.

April 15:

E2.10.10 Prior to **April 15** the URC shall report their [promotion] recommendations.

Welcome to New FA Members

Anna Baldacchino, Education

Scott Bateman, Computer Sci/Info. Tech.

Carel Boers, Computer Sci/Info. Tech.

Monique Brisson, Education

Suzanne Campbell, Music

Zdenka Chloubova, Sociology/Anthropology

Marsha Costello, Education

Shannon Ferrell, Companion Animals

Susan Forsythe, Sociology/Anthropology

Darrell Gallant, Sociology/Anthropology

Gerry Lynn Henderson, Nursing

Madeline Hughes, Nursing

Beth Johnston, Business

Jean Kimpton, Business

Cindy MacDonald, Robertson Library

Garry MacDonald, Engineering

Kimberly MacDonald, Health Management

Rick MacLean, Canadian Studies

Kaitlyn McQuillan, Nursing

Leona Moran, Education

Robert Nicholson, Music

Ian Petrie, Political Science

Juan Rodriguez, Pathology/Microbiology

Melanie Rossong, Biology

Tom Thompson, Education

Colleen Walton, Applied Human Sciences

We want your input

Feedback, comments, articles, letters, images, etc. for future issues are always welcome! Contact the Newsletter Editor, Richard Raiswell, if you are interested in contributing a piece to the FABric, rraiswell@upeu.ca, 566-0504. The Newsletter Editor would like to thank all those who contributed to this edition of the FABric.

the FABric Editorial Policy

The FABric is the newsletter of the University of Prince Edward Island Faculty Association. The primary intent of the FABric is to keep all members of the UPEI Faculty Association up-to-date and informed. It is also the intent of the FABric to communicate UPEI Faculty Association activities and perspectives on issues to a wider community. The FABric is published three times per year: September, January, and April, and serves the following purposes:

- to provide a means for the exchange of ideas, views, and issues relevant to the Association and its members;*
- and to provide the Association's membership with information relevant to the operations of the Association;*
- and to provide documentary records of matters pertaining to the Association; and to serve all the functions of a newsletter.*

The UPEI Faculty Association

Room 315, Main Building, University of Prince Edward Island
550 University Ave. Charlottetown, PE C1A 4P3
Tel: 1-902-566-0438; Fax: 1-902-566-6043
Email: upeifa@upeifa.org
UPEIFA Website: www.upeifa.org

Contributions (letters, articles, article summaries, and other pertinent information) are encouraged, but anonymous material will not be considered for publication. However, under special circumstances, *the FABric* may agree to withhold the author's name. The UPEI Faculty Association Executive retains the right to accept, edit, and/or reject contributed material. The opinions expressed in authored articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the UPEI Faculty Association.

UPEIFA Executive

President:

Betty Jeffery, Robertson Library

Vice-President:

Nola Etkin, Chemistry

Past-President:

(Vacant)

Treasurer:

Debra Good, Business

Members-at-Large:

Cezar Campeanu, Computer Sci. / Info. Tech.
David Groman, Diagnostic Services
Laurie McDuffee, Health Management
Lori Weeks, Applied Human Sciences

UPEIFA Office Manager:

Susan Gallant

the FABric
February 2013
Vol. 8 No. 2
Published three times a year
ISSN 1718-3022