



University of Victoria Faculty Association

THE

FA RELAY

Spring 2016 Volume 1 Issue 1



INSIDE:

MESSAGE FROM THE FACULTY ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

Q&A w/BUDD HALL

CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE SURVEY RESULTS

RESEARCH PROFILE - WANDA HURREN

CONTENTS

FEATURES

- 4** **FACULTY FOCUS**
A Spotlight on Community Engagement -
Q&A with Budd Hall
- 6** **RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP PROFILE**
Wanda Hurren

COLUMNS

- UNIVERSITY SENATE REPORT** **7**
How it works & Whats in play
- MEMBER ENGAGEMENT EVENTS** **8**
Fall 2015 & upcoming Spring 2016
- COMMITTEE REPORT** **10**
Constitution & Bylaws survey results
- MEMBERSHIP SERVICES** **12**
Evaluation ratios explained
- MEMBER SOUND OFF** **13**
Serials cancellations reveal tension between
academics and their publishers
- BEST OF THE BLOGS** **14**
A selection of online articles in academia

CONTACT US

EDITORIAL & COMMUNICATIONS

e: comsfa@uvic.ca
p: 250.721.7208

MEMBERSHIP SERVICES

e: msofa@uvic.ca
p: 250.472.4923

GENERAL INFORMATION

e: adminfa@uvic.ca
p: 250.721.7939



MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

As I look back on this past year and forward to the 2016/17 academic year, I am struck by two things. First, 2015 was a year of accomplishment for your Association. This past spring we bargained and ratified our first Collective Agreement with unprecedented support from our membership. Second, in doing so we opened significant opportunity for the Association: whereas the Association has done little else than bargain for the past decade, we are now entering an extended period when we can focus our resources and energies on issues outside of bargaining.

This past fall the Executive Committee of the Association has been engaged in intensive discussion on the direction of the Association. Foremost in our minds has been the need to enhance the Association's capacity to act on behalf of our members, and to strengthen our relationship with members across all faculties. To this end we have embarked on several initiatives:

- At the fall OGM we proposed that the Association should develop an annual advocacy agenda that would be presented for ratification at the Annual General Meeting and, if ratified, be used to guide the Association's external activities each year. This proposal was well received by the members present at this meeting. Look for a survey coming soon that will solicit your views on what goals and activities should become the Association's priorities for 2016/2017.

SEE PRES. MESSAGE ON PAGE 14

ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE

HELGA HALLGRIMSDOTTIR
President

PATRICK VON ADERKAS
Acting Vice President

MONICA PRENDERGAST
Secretary

REBECCA WARBURTON
Treasurer

DOUG BAER
Past President

RICHARD PICKARD
Acting ADRC Chair

ANTHONY VICKERY
ATP Rep

KATHLEEN MATTHEWS
Librarian's Rep

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE
Lynne Marks
Leslie Butt
Elena Pnevmonidou
Stephanie Willerth
Rebecca Raworth

STAFF

GENERAL MANAGER
Esme Friesen

MEMBERSHIP SERVICES
Reuben Kellen

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
Maria Furtado

COOP STUDENT
Jordan Crocker

THE FA RELAY

PUBLISHER
University of Victoria Faculty Association

CO-EDITOR
Esme Friesen

CO-EDITOR
Monica Prendergast

LAYOUT
Esme Friesen

CONTRIBUTORS

BUDD HALL
Faculty Focus

WANDA HURREN
Research & Scholarship Profile & Back Cover
Photo

DOUG BAER
Senate Report

PATRICK VON ADERKAS
Member Sound Off

FACULTY FOCUS

A SPOTLIGHT ON COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT - Q&A WITH BUDD HALL

Q. HOW DO YOU DESCRIBE THE WORK YOU DO?

A. I often refer to myself as an activist scholar. I refer to myself that way because for the first 20 years of my life, I worked in an international NGO that had a focus on adult learning and social change around the world. We were activists looking for ways through a stronger focus on learning to build social movements dealing with violence against women, the environment, poverty, illiteracy and more. We did research, specially participatory research with other civil society or social movement activists into how to get more visibility or more action on the critical issues of the day that our members, most in countries of the global South were telling us to focus on. I was an outspoken proponent of participatory research, that approach to research that believed that research was not neutral, could be linked with strengthening community capacity to change and should be driven by the expressed needs of persons who are most often excluded or pushed out of the good things in life.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR HISTORY HERE AT UVIC?

A. I came to the University of Victoria in 2001 as the Dean of Education. I had been the Chair of the Adult Education and Community Development Department at the University of Toronto, which was a progressive action-oriented academic space. I came to UVic because the Faculty of Education said they were looking for someone with an interest in indigenous education and international perspectives. Thanks to the fact that Dr. Lorna Williams joined the Faculty as the first head of Aboriginal Education, we made excellent progress.





Budd Hall

Q. HOW DID UVIC'S OCBR FORM?

A. In 2006 after finishing my term as Dean, I was delighted to find myself in the midst of growing interest in what was being called 'community based research' at UVic. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) had begun funding what they called "Community University Research Alliances" and there were many other activist scholars at UVic that emerged from the woodwork to apply and get funding. The VP for Research at the time, Dr. Martin Taylor, asked me and my colleague Peter Keller, the Dean of Social Science, to carry out a feasibility study on setting up what became the Office of Community Based Research (OCBR). I was the founding Director.

With the help of Maeve Lydon, who still serves as the Assistant Director of the successor organization the Institute for Study and Innovation in Community University Engagement (ISICUE), we made links with the United Way, with various homelessness action groups, with anti-poverty groups, with social economy groups, with the Friendship Centre, and with many of the neighbouring First Nation communities. Our purpose was to give visibility to faculty who saw themselves as engaged, as activists, and who were working in respectful and on-going ways with community groups. We wanted to break down the idea of a knowledge monopoly that academics possessed. We wanted to make it OK for faculty members to have a career without having to give up or put aside their values or their political hopes.

Q. WHAT ARE YOU FOCUSING ON RIGHT NOW?

A. Currently I teach Community Development. My favourite course is an undergraduate course called International Community Development Through Activism. In January of 2016, this course will be taught in cooperation with the Intercultural Centre in Victoria and will focus on the Refugee situation in Victoria and around the world. I am still an enthusiastic supporter of ISICUE, am active in the Centre for Global Studies and hold a UNESCO Chair in Community Based Research. ■

... I was delighted to find myself in the midst of growing interest in what was being called 'community based research' at UVic.



Wanda Hurren

RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP PROFILE

already in our surroundings, and noticing what catches our attention when we look around. While it is sometimes taken up as a meditative practice within Buddhist philosophy, contemplative photography can also be a way of becoming familiar with our everyday surroundings wherever we might be. The images gathered in contemplative photography show the aesthetics of a place as experience by the people in that place. The action of attending to aesthetic aspects and then sharing them through photos creates a deeper link between people and places, and it is one approach to cultivating an aesthetic sensibility.

I undertake a studio plus exhibition approach in studies of cultivating an aesthetic sensibility and I have worked with people in schools, a seniors and youth intercultural community centre, a hospital, a university campus, and the main branch of a major bank. Within a studio + exhibition approach, I provide participants with an orientation to contemplative photography and over the course of several weeks; they take photographs of what they consider to be aesthetic aspects of their location. Along with the participants, I select and mount an exhibit of their photographs, located in their community, work, or study place. Currently, examples of these exhibits can be seen on Ward 7 A/B of the Victoria General Hospital (The Art of Nursing), and the stairwell of the main branch of the Scotia Bank in Victoria (*Aesthetics at Work* - see back cover). ■

WANDA HURREN

Locating my arts-based inquiry within curriculum studies, my research focuses on links between cultivating an aesthetic sensibility and how we think and do our work. Aesthetic surroundings are linked to well-being, creativity, and productivity. While some schools and workplaces pay attention to the design of the building, and the amount of light and colour in instructional and work spaces, incorporating these components often requires costly design, construction, and/or renovations. Cultivating an aesthetic sensibility, however, is a simple approach to paying attention and calling up the aesthetic components in any place of work or study, and it is an approach that does not require costly building designs or renovations. Instead of making changes to the places where we think and do our work, cultivating an aesthetic sensibility requires changing how we see the places where we think and do our work. The underlying premise informing this research is that if we take the time to cultivate an aesthetic sensibility in the places where we think and do our work, we then have the opportunity to enhance how we think and do our work in those same places.

Beginning with a federally funded research program over 14 years ago I have been investigating contemplative photography in communities, schools, and workplaces as one approach to cultivating an aesthetic sensibility. Contemplative photography involves paying attention to what is



Photo by Wanda Hurren



HOW IT WORKS - The *Senate* is one of two important forums through which Association members can participate in decision-making with respect to matters affecting the university as a whole and, by implication, the manner in which academic work is carried out. The other is through the Faculty Association (its meetings, its voting procedures, committee work, etc).

There are 16 senior administrators who vote on Senate (the President, who chairs, three Vice-Presidents, 10 Deans, the Head of the Island Medical Program and the Chief Librarian), along with 32 elected faculty and 16 students. There is also one elected librarian, one sessional faculty member and three “convocation Senators”. At most Canadian universities with Senates (almost all have one), administrators tend to vote as a “block” on all matters. Here, however, on matters of controversy over the past decade or so, some UVic Deans have displayed a slight bit of autonomy by not always consistently voting with fellow administrators.

Much of the business of senate is routine, such as the approval of new programs, curriculum changes, student award terms of reference, among other things. These matters are of importance to the institution but are rarely controversial. Senate is also used by the administration to update the academic community on matters it considers important, with the senior administration frequently using Senate meetings as a “town hall” to present matters of interest (e.g., presentations on enrollment numbers or on how UVic is doing in the various university rankings).

Senate also appoints individuals to its various standing committees. In some cases, there are membership requirements (e.g., a certain number of – but not all – committee members must be senators). Currently, the power to appoint committee members is held by the Agenda and Governance Committee. The terms of reference do not enjoin this committee to seek more than one candidate for each position. Nor do they outline a process by which additional candidate names can be suggested at Senate, though they certainly do not preclude this.

Most recently, a motion to approve a slate of candidates for a number of 6-month fill-ins positions (for committee members who will be on leave) and a small number of 3-year appointments was presented and a concern was raised regarding the need to provide space for additional nominations. Rather, the President (as Senate Chair), after consulting with the Senate Secretary, called for any additional nominations from the floor - there were none.

WHAT'S CURRENTLY IN PLAY - December's Senate meeting included a presentation of the final draft of the Strategic Research Plan as an “information” item. It is not the case that Senate's jurisdiction is wide-ranging and covers administrative decisions such as how financial resources are allocated. So, in this instance, Senate approval for the final draft was not sought, though it is probably the case that a formal motion in this regard would have passed.

Senate was given a set of minutes prepared by the Senate Secretariat following announcements at earlier Senate meeting that future minutes would be less verbose. Some senators expressed the concern that the new form was terse to the point of being uninformative, and the Chair of Senate (President Cassels) indicated that this concern would be taken into consideration.

Undergraduate students presented a motion calling for amnesty for any student missing an assignment deadline or exam dated February 3, 2016, when a rally was held at the provincial legislature. In response, the Provost had written a tactful memo to Deans, Chairs and Directors asking colleagues to take “reasonable steps” to avoid academic penalties for students who participate in the event and giving Deans authority to make a final academic decision where there is a dispute. But the administration was not in favour of going further and establishing a Senate-mandated amnesty rule, and neither were most Senators.

- Doug Baer, Past President, UVic Faculty Association;
dbaer@uvic.ca





CLOCKWISE FROM TOP LEFT: FA LIBRARIANS COMMITTEE; COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT SIGNING; PROMOTION & TENURE CELEBRATION; SEASONAL OPEN HOUSE X 2; CAUT DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD AT NOVEMBER OGM; ATP SOCIAL; COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT CELEBRATION AT THE UVSS FARMER'S MARKET.



UPCOMING - SPRING 2016

FEBRUARY

- Departmental Liaison Orientation Workshop and Social
February 24, 2016 - Swan's Hotel and Brewpub

MARCH

- Panel on Academic Freedom
March 16, 2016 - Michele Pujol Room, UVSS SUB

APRIL

- FA Annual General Meeting
April 12, 2016 - Location TBD

Contact Maria Furtado at adminfa@uvic.ca for more event info.



COMMITTEE REPORTS

CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE

CURRENT MANDATE

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee (C&B) has been tasked with developing proposed revisions to the Association's governing documents, both to reflect our new status as a certified union, and to make it easier for the Association to meet Members' needs. The Committee's work since May 2014 has focused mainly on the areas relating to Members and governance. The Committee's role has been to research and recommend bylaw revisions to the Executive Committee, which will in turn present a revised Constitution and Bylaws to the membership for ratification.

The key areas under review include:

- Membership
- Meetings
- Dues
- Governance Model

A lot of work has been done to date, with all Association members being given the opportunity to weigh in on a survey conducted this past December 2015.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The members of the C&B are Tim Iles, Anthony Quas, Stephanie Willerth, and Martha McGinnis-Archibald (Chair). Please contact C&B Chair at mjmcginn@uvic.ca with any questions or for more information on the survey results.

MIL-RATE

When asked if the threshold for ratifying changes to the mil-rate should be lowered from 75%, 71% of the 432 voter's either agreed (60%) or were neutral (14%).

Question 1 - The threshold for ratifying changes to the mil rate should be lowered from 75%.

Response	Count	Percentage
Agree	246	56.9%
Neutral	60	13.9%
Disagree	126	29.2%
Total: 432		

The results further supported revising the procedure for changing the mil-rate. A mail or electronic ballot alone was the top choice of 77% of 425 voters; by contrast, a vote at a General Meeting was preferred by only 8%, and a double vote (both at a meeting and by mail or electronic ballot) was preferred by only 18%. 61% of 431 voters indicated that the mil-rate need not be specified in the Bylaws; 23% disagreed and 16% were neutral. 57% of 432 voters indicated that the threshold for approving changes should be lowered; 29% disagreed, and 14% were neutral.

Question 4 Below are three possible methods for ratifying mil rate changes.

Variable	1	2	3	Total
Option A - By a vote of the Members present at a General Meeting	33 8.2%	53 13.2%	316 78.6%	402
Option B - By mail or electronic ballot	325 76.5%	86 20.2%	14 3.3%	425
Option C - By a vote of the Members present at a General Meeting, followed by a mail or electronic ballot (status quo)	75 18.4%	240 58.8%	93 22.8%	408

“... next step is to make Bylaw revision recommendations... to the Executive Committee, who in turn will present the draft recommendations at the next AGM.”

The survey then presented three choices of approval thresholds for a mil-rate change: a simple majority, a two-thirds majority, or the current three-quarters majority. The current three-quarters majority was ranked as a first choice by 30% of voters, and a second choice by 13%. A simple majority was ranked as a first choice by 41%, and a second choice by 19%. The middle option, a two-thirds majority, was ranked as a first choice by 35% of voters, and a second choice by 62%.

Question 5 A fair threshold for changing the mil rate would be...

Variable	1	2	3	
Option A - A simple majority vote (50%, plus 1 vote).	169 41.4%	78 19.1%	161 39.5%	Total: 408
Option B - A two-thirds majority vote (67%).	141 34.6%	251 61.5%	16 3.9%	Total: 408
Option C - A supermajority - a three-quarters majority - vote (75%).	124 30.3%	55 13.4%	230 56.2%	Total: 409

GOVERNANCE

The survey results on governance showed the model electing Faculty representatives to the board of directors as the top choice of 38% (140) of 371 voters, and first or second choice for 58% (216). By contrast, the status quo was the top choice of 27% (103) of 380 voters, and first or second choice of 48% (184). An alternative involving Department instead of Faculty representatives was the top choice for 20% of 370 voters, and first or second choice for 50% (195). A fourth alternative involving a collective bargaining council was the top choice of 21% of 371 voters, and first or second choice of 47%.

Question 7 Below are four possible models for the governance of the Association.

Variable	1	2	3	4	
Option A - Faculty representatives on the Board of Directors, with a separate Executive Committee (as at Guelph and Western).	140 37.7%	76 20.5%	72 19.4%	83 22.4%	Total: 371
Option B - Department representatives on the Board of Directors, with a separate Executive Committee (as at Queen's).	72 19.5%	113 30.5%	114 30.8%	71 19.2%	Total: 370
Option C - Executive Committee as Board of Directors, with Department representatives on a Collective Bargaining Council to determine bargaining priorities.	76 20.5%	96 25.9%	116 31.3%	83 22.4%	Total: 371
Option D - Executive Committee as Board of Directors, with bargaining priorities determined by the Executive Committee after consultation with Members (status quo).	103 27.1%	81 21.3%	58 15.3%	138 36.3%	Total: 380

NEXT STEPS

The committee's next step is to make Bylaw revision recommendations based on the survey results to the Executive Committee, who in turn will present the draft recommendations at the next AGM. ■

MEMBERSHIP SERVICES

REUBEN KELLEN,

Membership Services Advisor
E: msofa@uvic.ca



EVALUATION RATIOS

One of the most significant changes from the Framework Agreement to the Collective Agreement (CA) is the switch to biennial evaluations for salary adjustments. Starting this year, only approximately half of all Faculties will be evaluated in any given year; with members who are not evaluated receiving the same adjustment they received the previous year. This brings added significance to the merit evaluation process.



Getting the ratio right...

Members are evaluated based on performance in either two or three categories, (depending on the appointment). Key to the evaluation process is the weighting or ratio between them, (teaching to research to service). This weighting ratio varies depending on the particulars of your appointment:

- Faculty with research-stream appointments, for example, have a standard ratio of 40:40:20 (40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service).
- Faculty with teaching-stream appointments have a standard ratio of 80:20 (80% teaching and 20% service), and no expectation with respect to research.
- Librarians have an ordinary ratio of 80:10:10 (80% professional performance, 10% research, and 10% service).

Every member gets a raw score in each applicable category, which is then adjusted according to the applicable ratio with the sum determining each member's relative position in their unit. Of significance here is that these ratios are for the purposes of *evaluation only* - they do not set standards for the assignment of your work and your workload may have a very different distribution than what is represented by your evaluation ratios.

If your workload has changed substantially due to an unexpected circumstance, then the CA at Section 19.29.6 requires the evaluation take that into consideration. You are not obligated to address the change directly in your evaluation materials, but I recommend that you include some reference to the change and its impacts on your work.

For changes that have been more predictable, it may be useful to consider Section 19.26 of the CA. This section allows you to propose an alternative evaluation ratio in advance of your next evaluation to your Chair, Director or Supervising Librarian. This alternative ratio should more accurately reflect your work and productivity, subject to the following rules:

- For faculty members, a ratio cannot go below 20%.
- Teaching-stream faculty have no research expectations, so there is no need to introduce a research element to the ratio.
- For librarians, there is no minimum ratio specified.

Although evaluation policies are not wholly focused on output, there is a recognizable emphasis on quantifiable output, particularly with respect to research. For this reason, even if you find you are spending more time on a particular aspect of your work, you may want to wait to change your ratio until that time translates to a concomitant increase in publications.



Getting an alternate ratio...

If you want to pursue an alternative ratio, it needs to be one your immediate superior will agree to - the Collective Agreement is clear that alternative ratios can only be implemented on the basis of an agreement. This, however, must be done in advance of the evaluation period for which an alternate ratio is being requested.

Alternative ratios must also be limited to a particular time-frame and cannot be applicable for longer than five years. This doesn't mean that after the specified period has ended you must go back to the standard ratio. What it does mean is that any approved alternative ratio has to be periodically reviewed and renegotiated.

The FA can help you develop an alternative ratio and to negotiate its implementation. Our services are available to members who have concerns about the evaluation process and/or an interest in taking strategic action to improve their individual positioning for future evaluations. ■



MEMBER SOUND OFF

SERIALS CANCELLATIONS REVEAL TENSION BETWEEN ACADEMICS & THEIR PUBLISHERS

As a result of faculty pressure following the announced cut of Wiley and Blackwell titles, the University Librarian, Jon Bengtson, and the University Vice President Academic and Provost, Valerie Kuehne, were able to convince Wiley to split the fees over two years, which means we will be revisiting this issue. Eighty percent of surveyed faculty felt that cancellation would affect their research and fully 90% disagreed with the process used by the Librarian. The Wiley & Blackwell title crisis also revealed tensions in the inextricably knotty relationship between academics and publishers.

Publish or perish doesn't even begin to describe this complex relationship. Our academic reputations depend as much on our every published article, as the publishers' profits depend on selling each of those articles. The motivations are different. Publishers are not academics, but canny business people providing a service to the academic world from which they expect to make money. Academic publishers make a lot of money these days, because they have successfully built large stables of journals, which provide economy of scale. Articles and journals are efficiently processed in centralized facilities, often located in developing countries where labour costs are low. But nowhere is the cost of labour as inexpensive as in the halls of academia, where labour is free.

The relationship between publishers and academics is best described as follows: the cunning publisher sells our own work back to us. We are uncritical consumers because we have no idea of the cost. Instead, we supply the industry with the products, we perform quality control, i.e. peer review and editorial work. Then we buy these same products. Our reward is, to overstate it, immortalization in print, and fame in this lifetime. This link to reputation brings out tension. Although publishers of good journals and academics depend upon one another for their reputations, it is publishers who are making billions of dollars.

In my opinion, we are loath to tackle publishers, because we're too busy doing other things. It is also confusing. To me at least, it seems that publishers behave entirely differently when it comes to library matters than they do when it comes to editorial boards, and, well, soliciting articles. Are these the same publishers to whom we gave so much of our time? It's a real Jekyll/Hyde dilemma.

When it comes to consumer choices, not everyone would be as passive as an academic. I live on street of retirees. Recently, one of my 80-year-old neighbours told me that she had called the local cable provider to say that she would not be willing to pay the newly announced higher fees. She wanted the same package at the same prices or she would discontinue service. The company agreed to give her the same bundle of channels at a price she could afford. The cable company's response was not pure charity. Over the last few years Canadian cable companies have been losing hundreds of thousands of customers because of how they bundle their products.

If this was one of my classes, I am sure that most of you would be dying to interject. We could happily fill an hour or more discussing the relationships between writers, publishers, scientists, journals, career progress, publications, citations, and innovations. However, if we are to have a fruitful discussion on the relationship between academics and publishers, a fresh dialogue would need to happen. When a very successful publisher sticks to inflexible pricing and gives us poorer choices than we would expect on bundles of journals, you need to know why this is standard practice. You could do worse than read the in-depth analysis by Larivière et al. of what has been described as the most profitable obsolete technology in history. Click on the link to read their recent article analyzing trends in academic publishing from 1973-2013. <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0127502>.

Like many of you, I've served my time on editorial boards and done a great deal of reviewing. It has always struck me how we are too busy to solve this problem of over-pricing of our own work. It would be nice to see a more muscular response by the Librarian when the next bundle comes up for discussion. The hope is that we have some sort of consultation and input before the next big decision is made.

- Patrick von Aderkas, Acting VP, UVic Faculty Association;
pvonader@uvic.ca

- The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is working on developing revisions to our bylaws that will bring the Association into compliance with legal requirements for a certified union. At the same time, this Committee has also been examining options for improving our governance model and enhancing our democratic infrastructure. Look for a dedicated bulletin on the various recommendations on bylaw revisions later this term. Any changes to the Bylaws need to be ratified by a 75% vote in favour. (see C&B survey results on pages 10 - 11)
- We are also examining ways through which we can enhance the service capacity of the Executive Committee. Among other things, we are looking at adopting a portfolio system to assign specific duties and responsibilities to each of your elected representatives on the Executive Committee.
- One of our foci this year will be to continue to advocate for our members as researchers and scholars. We provided faculty feedback to the VP Research office on revisions to the guidelines for Internal Research and Creative Grants; similarly, we advocated against the unilateral move by the Libraries to cancel its subscription to over 1500 Wiley Journals. The Association and the Administration have formed two joint committees to work our changes to policies relevant to our work as

researchers and scholars: a new policy on intellectual property, and, a new policy on financial accountability for research account holders. We will keep you posted on our progress on these two fronts.

- We have also been working on developing a council of departmental representatives. The role of the representatives will be to share information on FA activities and issues with their departments and also to bring departmental concerns to the attention of the FA.

These initiatives are just a snapshot of what we have been working on since concluding collective bargaining last spring. Let me conclude by reminding you that the Association is here, and supported by your dues, to serve your needs and interests. Please help us know and understand these interests by coming to our general meetings, by continuing to participate in our surveys, and by communicating directly with me or any member of the Executive Committee or FA staff.

Your engagement is greatly appreciated.

Thank you,



Helga Kristín Hallgrímsdóttir

BEST OF THE BLOGS

By *Monica Prendergast*

This column offers members a selection of articles from a variety of online sources that address issues of interest to those who work in higher education. I welcome suggestions from members for future newsletters. Please send a link to the item and a one or two sentence description to secretaryfa@uvic.ca.

The first two items address a pressing topic for members as well as for our students: Anxiety.

Today's Anguished Students and How to Help Them
Chronicle of Higher Education

What is Social Anxiety?
The Atlantic

This next piece is a longer read but worthwhile for its focus on the future of higher education at an international level.

Universities 2030: Learning from the Past to Anticipate the Future
Inside Higher Education

Finally for this issue, if you missed it, here is Margaret Atwood's piece on fear and freedom.

We are Double-Plus Unfree
The Guardian

CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS!

FEATURE CONTENT

RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP PROFILE

FACULTY FOCUS

MEMBER SOUND OFF

ART & DESIGN

GUEST EDITORIAL

The FA Relay welcomes content submissions.

Contact our Editorial Department at:

e: comsfa@uvic.ca

p: 250-721-7208

Send us your input and ideas!

Aesthetics at Work



*Aesthetics at Work installation at Scotiabank Main Branch, Victoria, BC
Photo and Art by Wanda Hurren*

FACULTY ASSOCIATION ELECTIONS

The Nominations and Elections Committee's

Call for Nominations

Starts February 16, 2016

Contact the FA Office for more information:
uvicfa@uvic.ca 250-721-7208



University of Victoria Faculty Association