One of the recurring themes noted by MAC members during their discussions of member cases is a problem that is best labelled as bullying. In workplaces, bullying behaviour is an expression of power, where an individual with more power behaves abusively toward a co-worker with less power. Even so, bullies require “executive sponsorship” in order to continue their negative behaviours; that sponsorship by managers and supervisors ranges from ignoring such behaviour and its effects (doing nothing), to unconsciously or even consciously supporting the behaviour. Sometimes it’s just easier for managers to try to ignore such behaviour, hoping that it will stop on its own. That rarely happens, and in the meantime, victims suffer.

Bullying behaviour includes very passive forms of marginalization (e.g., not being invited to join social conversations or gatherings, eye-rolling, or other disrespectful gestures) to actively hostile and aggressive behaviours such as making rude, intimidating, or disrespectful comments, or even yelling and shoving. On the face of it, it’s hard to imagine that these sorts of behaviours could be tolerated in contemporary workplaces, but being bullied appears to be an unfortunate experience with which many employees in a range of workplaces are familiar.

The outcomes of bullying for the victim can include withdrawal, depression, inability to focus, lack of self-esteem, absenteeism, and job termination.

Sadly, many victims of bullying blame themselves, believing that they can stop the abuse if they just work harder, be nicer, etc. But bullies tend to carry on, unless the behaviour is openly labelled for what it is, and the “sponsorship” ends.

MAC Chair, Heidi Julien, is organizing an informal subgroup of AASUA Council to discuss the issue of bullying, with a view to trying to educate our community about the destruction it causes. Let’s uncover this behaviour where we find it, and support those victims who, through absolutely no fault of their own, are so negatively affected by it.

Heidi Julien, Chair, Members’ Advisory Committee
Bullying in Academia? Surely Not!

I have always had a visceral fear of and repugnance for bullying, linked to a basic fear of impotence in the face of violence (physical or mental). Fortunately, even in the single-digit age category, I have also always been a little taller on average than my peers, and the only actual bullying I ever personally experienced was at the hands of my elder brother and his friends(!). But treading an individual path often left me isolated, and I watched (and sometimes, but shamefully not always, intervened) as several of my smaller stunted friends took a beating or verbal thrashing. My generation was spared the extremes of bullying described in Tom Brown’s Schooldays, but Michael Palin and Terry Jones’s School Bully in Tomkinson’s Schooldays, from their 1976 Ripping Yarns TV series, is a wonderful Pythonesque rendering of this tale, only a few decades removed from what I witnessed as a schoolboy in England.

So all that was a lifetime ago, right? Not so, it turns out. As many an outsider has suggested, academia is full of people who never really grew up and left school (for a “real job”, as our fathers-in-law might say). And some learned behaviours have stayed with us. Although I suspected this before, my term as AASUA President, and with it an ex officio role on the Members’ Advisory Committee, has confirmed that the School Bully is alive and well and thriving in academia, and he or she can as easily be Tomn Brown’s nemesis as Tom Brown’s.

One of the sad things about bullying is that it is commonly a vertically integrated process. The bully is by nature someone who requires personal reinforcement by subjugating an inferior. But in frustration at his or her inability to fight back, the victim may also lash out at someone they deem inferior to them. Commonly, the most difficult thing our Membership Services Officers have to work out is who is the bully and who is the victim? The bully in one case might be the victim in another, and the downward chain might only stop (unforgivably) with a graduate student or a support staff member (but in that case we’ll usually hear about it quickly enough from Russell Eccles, NASA President!).

Normally there is an upward end of the chain too, and this is where things get sticky, but also where the resolution should reside. I will hide

in a cowardly manner behind Palin and Jones’s parable. After his first year as a “new boy” at Graybridge School in thrill to Grayson, the resident School Bully, Tomkinson (Palin) dopes him (inadvertently, of course — Grayson is headhunted for the post of School Bully at Eton). Tomkinson is acclaimed by all, including the Headmaster, as the new School Bully, along with all rights and privileges (the Head Teacher’s views on corporal punishment went both ways, it seems). The fairytale ending would have been for Palin’s character to end the cycle and introduce a new era of tolerance and mentorship, but the Pythons always had a close eye for reality, and Tomkinson reluctantly rises to the challenge of his new role by kicking an “oik” and putting the Headmaster in his place (“School Bully to you now, not Tomkinson!”).

Chairs and Deans have the responsibility and power to end bullying, and AASUA and the senior University Administration have a duty to back them up. Where the AASUA has difficulty acting is when we hear the whispers of problems, but no-one is willing to come forward on the record. Whistle-blowing on one’s colleagues takes great courage, but not doing so, especially when things go seriously wrong (and people’s careers or health are affected) can cause sleepless nights for years to come. Worse is to passively or actively join in the “fun”, and side with the bully and his or her clique — those memories should last even longer, especially with the abolishment of mandatory retirement!

The AASUA is committed to exposing and correcting bullying in our University, and takes an especially dim view where the victim is not one of our members (e.g., a student, post-doc, or NASA member). Expose and depose the bully!

Jeremy Richards, AASUA President
Student Ratings (USRIs): Use and Abuse?

Currently at the University of Alberta there is a growing interest in the evaluation of teaching, with several distinct groups on campus raising issues for discussion. In January, University Teaching Services (UTS) hosted a series of well-attended panel discussions on the evaluation of teaching, with input from instructors, students, and administrators. The discussions were focused on Universal Student Ratings of Instruction (USRIs) and their use by Faculty Evaluation Committees (FEC) across campus for determination of annual performance increments and for promotion. USRIs (anonymous IDQ forms) have also been the focus of the AASUA Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC), chaired by Professor Steve Harvey, since they are a source of significant stress for many faculty members. Indeed, negative USRIs and abusive, disrespectful comments can be hurtful, engender hostility and lead to an erosion of confidence and dissatisfaction with teaching.

The administrations’ Committee on the Learning Environment (CLE) has also produced a report on “Evaluation of Teaching at the University of Alberta” and recently forwarded this to General Faculties Council (GFC) for consideration.

The use of USRIs to evaluate every course taught by every instructor at the University of Alberta was introduced in the 1990s, with the stated goal of improving teaching. In addition to this formative use, the same mandated IDQs have been used in a summative way to provide FECs with an evaluation of an instructors teaching performance.

A large body of scholarly literature has attempted to measure the validity and reliability of USRIs. However, there seems to be no consensus regarding whether they actually improve teaching performance and learning outcomes. While many studies strongly support the use of USRIs, many do not. There is considerable controversy as to whether or not USRIs simply measure student satisfaction or instructor popularity and whether or not students are able to properly assess instructor competence.

There is widespread concern that the use of USRIs in a summative way leads to grade inflation and a dumbing-down of course content as instructors paradoxically strive to improve their teaching evaluation rather than to improve their teaching.

Some issues of concern about USRIs include:
- Are student rating forms reliable and valid?
- Are student ratings only a popularity contest?
- Do grades or marks that students receive in a course affect the ratings of the instructor?
- Does class size affect the student ratings?
- Does gender of the student and/or instructor affect student ratings?
- Does the level of the course (1st year, 2nd year, etc.) affect student ratings?
- Does the rank of the instructor (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, etc.) affect student ratings?
- Does student workload affect student ratings?
- Does the time of the class (8:00 am vs 10:00 am) affect student ratings?
- Are USRIs meaningful if not completed by the majority of a class or if the ratings are generated for items (e.g., textbooks, tutorials, seminars, instructors) that were not involved in the course?

(Continued on page 5)
Peer Support in Teaching

Have you ever wished you could discuss your teaching skills, student feedback, interaction/leadership skills, or USRI evaluations with a peer in confidence?

Peer consultation is a service provided on our campus by effective teachers who volunteer their time to interact with colleagues to discuss teaching and learning. These teachers strongly believe that effective teaching skills, responsiveness to learners, and collegial support are keys to effective student learning at our university.

Peer consultation can lead to improvements in teaching by:
- Fostering discussion and dissemination of best teaching practice with colleagues.
- Encouraging personal reflection and increasing an instructor’s perception of his/her teaching.
- Increasing student motivation and fostering better student-teacher communication.
- Increasing students’ awareness of what goes into course planning and delivery.
- Increasing an instructor’s self-confidence and leadership abilities in the classroom.
- Encouraging the use of new strategies/technologies in the classroom.

Peer consultants on our campus volunteer to provide confidential one-on-one support, collegial discussion and/or give encouragement and suggestions. They are available to meet with colleagues to review syllabi, observe in the classroom, observe in the clinical setting, and obtain meaningful and useful feedback from students.

Having been recipients of peer consultations, and now by functioning in the role of peer consultants, these individuals have richly increased their teaching and learning knowledge and helped them to positively influence the learning experiences of students.

If you think a peer consultation might be encouraging or helpful to you, we suggest you call 492-2491 or E-mail uts@ualberta.ca where someone will be happy to connect you with a supportive colleague.

Walter Dixon, AASUA Vice-President

It’s Awards Season!

Nominate a Librarian...Distinguished Service Award

The CAUT Librarians Committee encourages colleagues to submit nominations for the Academic Librarians’ Distinguished Service Award.

This award was established in 1994 to recognize outstanding service at either the local, regional or national level by academic librarians or faculty who have contributed to the advancement of the status and/or working conditions of academic librarians at Canadian universities and colleges.

Additional information may be found on the CAUT Web site at: www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=323 or by contacting the CAUT Librarians Committee Chair, Francesca Holyoke, at holyoke@unb.ca

The deadline for submissions is April 3, 2009.

Recommendations should be addressed to: Chair, Librarians Committee, c/o Canadian Association of University Teachers, 2705 Queensview Drive, Ottawa, ON K2B 8K2.

2009 CAFA Awards

- 2009 CAFA Distinguished Academic Award
- 2009 CAFA Distinguished Academic Early Career Award

The deadline for nominations for both awards is April 24, 2009. Nomination details and forms are available at: www.ualberta.ca/cafa

For more details, visit the HRS Web site at: www.hrs.ualberta.ca/index.aspx?Page=2071

Staff Family Access to Physical Education Facilities

Free access for family members of academic staff to the Van Vliet centre was temporarily suspended last year. It has now been reinstated (effective January 1, 2009), and this benefit will be extended to family members of Trust/Research Academic Staff from July 1, 2009.

(Continued on page 5)
APOs Are Getting PREPD

The Administrative Professionals Officer (APO) community and their supervisors are preparing for the implementation of the Performance Review, Evaluation, and Performance Development (PREPD) process, a newly ratified component of the APO Agreement.

By April 15th of this year, APOs will submit their completed Annual Report to their supervisors for review and feedback so now is the time to become more aware about the PREPD and Annual Report processes. You can contact the Staff Learning and Development Department, General Inquiries at staff.learning@hrs.ualberta.ca for advice or registration for information sessions on the PREPD process, including performance development planning, guidance, and reporting. Contact information can be found online at:

www.hrs.ualberta.ca/Contacts.aspx

Your opinion and feedback are important and we encourage you to bookmark the APO Committee Web site (www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/aasua/nav01.cfm?nav01=31984) so that you are kept informed about events and processes that represent and impact you.

Sandra McFadyen, Chair, APO Committee

Newsletters Distribution

In the interest of the environment, the AASUA will distribute a limited number of print copies of The AASUA Compass to each University department only. Members will receive the newsletter by E-mail and online at our Web site (www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/aasua). If you have any questions, contact our office at 780-492-5321.

Benefits Update (Continued from page 4)

- Health Spending Accounts
  Members will have recently received individual letters from Sun Life about their Health Spending Accounts. It is important to note that balances can only be carried forward for one year, which means that any positive balance from 2007 will expire on March 31, 2009. Expenses must be incurred in 2008 to claim against carried forward 2007 credits, and claims must be submitted to Sun Life by March 31, 2009, for reimbursement.
  For more details, visit the HRS Web site at: www.hrs.ualberta.ca/index.aspx?Page=2051

Be Involved!

- Do you feel that your voice is being heard? Do you have ideas about improvements to your workplace? Do you want to help develop relationships that enhance your work life? The AASUA is always looking for new members for its Committees and for member involvement. Anyone interested in serving on an AASUA committee should contact a Committee Chair or the AASUA President, Jeremy Richards.

The Teaching and Learning Committee of the AASUA encourages members to voice their concerns on this issue by contacting any of the Faculty Members of the AASUA Teaching and Learning Committee listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Harvey (Physiology)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve.harvey@ualberta.ca">steve.harvey@ualberta.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gow (History)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.gow@ualberta.ca">andrew.gow@ualberta.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Bagnall (Surgery)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kbagnall@med.ualberta.ca">kbagnall@med.ualberta.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Milner (Biochemistry)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rachel.milner@ualberta.ca">rachel.milner@ualberta.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karsten Loepelmann (Biological Sci.)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kloepelm@ualberta.ca">kloepelm@ualberta.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dyck (Agriculture)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.dyck@ualberta.ca">michael.dyck@ualberta.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Mouat (Augustana)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmouat@augustana.ca">jmouat@augustana.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Swaffield (Business)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim.swaffield@ualberta.ca">jim.swaffield@ualberta.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Ritter (Education)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:briter@ualberta.ca">briter@ualberta.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steve Harvey
Chair, Teaching and Learning Committee

Student Ratings (USRIs): Use and Abuse? (Continued from page 3)

Although USRIs have been used for more than a decade at the University of Alberta there is no data that shows they have actually improved teaching on campus. Clearly there is a need to reevaluate the use of USRIs at this university and this was the consensus view arising from the recent UTS seminar series.

Some other current issues of concern include:

- Should student ratings be confidential (i.e., traceable) rather than anonymous?
- Should student ratings be published?
- Should USRI ratings be the primary measure of teaching performance, as commonly practiced by FECs?
- Should small differences in USRI ratings be used for ranking purposes or merit increments?
- Should numerical (decimalized) ratings be derived from statement on the form?
- Should the University of Alberta adopt the recommendation by CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers) that teaching performance should be simply evaluated as ‘outstanding’, ‘satisfactory’, or ‘unsatisfactory’?

Steve Harvey
Chair, Teaching and Learning Committee

Remember to note on your calendar the date of the APO Annual General Meeting: Thursday, May 21 from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m. in Council Chambers, University Hall.

www.hrs.ualberta.ca/Contacts.aspx

In the interest of the environment, the AASUA will distribute a limited number of print copies of The AASUA Compass to each University department only. Members will receive the newsletter by E-mail and online at our Web site (www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/aasua). If you have any questions, contact our office at 780-492-5321.
UAPP Pension Update

A number of people have expressed various concerns stemming from the recent UAPP Communiqué reporting the —10.7% investment returns in the third quarter of 2008 and announcing a 1.5% increase in employee (and also employer) contribution rates effective July 1, 2009. The discussion below is an effort to address the bulk of the broad range of questions raised, and to comment on some other pension matters.

Defined Benefit Plans Provide Predictable Pensions

The UAPP is a defined benefits pension plan. In defined benefits plans, plan members share costs and risk to ensure a lifetime pension based on earnings and service. In particular, the UAPP provides protection against three types of risk: (1) longevity (outliving your retirement assets by, effectively, providing a life annuity); (2) the investment risk of sharp fluctuations in the market value of pension assets (especially downward as in the last few months), particularly at the point of retirement, but also during retirement; and (3) inflation risk (a 60% sharing of inflation risk in the case of the UAPP). To do this, contributions are made as a percentage of salary covered by the pension plan that, along with reasonable projections of earnings, (and other factors), are expected to realize the amounts needed to meet the pension obligation.

We pool our assets to share costs and to share the noted risks. Depending upon things like individual longevity, fluctuations in the market during our working/contributing lives and over our retirement, fluctuations in inflation rates, and variations and differences in career paths, individuals may gain or lose somewhat relative to how they might have made out financially in a defined contribution plan (where you get the contributions made on your behalf and the returns that they earned, good or bad, when you retire to handle as you choose). Clearly some redistribution may occur, but, over the long haul, the member can expect to get what he/she pays for. Defined benefits plans reduce the variability of individual pension benefits and offer greater predictability.

Contribution Rates Need Adjustment when Events Are Different than Expected

The UAPP levies contributions that are expected (with earnings) to cover the future pension promise. If markets perform less well than expected, as now, extra contributions are required. If they do much better than expected, contribution rates can be reduced—e.g., the case for many defined benefit pension plans during the 1980s and 1990s.

In the case of the UAPP, we inherited (and still have) a significant unfunded liability on the pre-1992 portion of the plan and, as a result, never enjoyed any improvements. The post-1991 portion of the plan started “fresh” with no unfunded liability. (The pre-1992 and post-1991 components are addressed below.) As of 2007, the post-1991 portion was 97% funded—that is, the assets were projected at that moment to be adequate to meet 97% of the future liabilities/pension payments. The drop in the market reduced that ratio to about 79% at the end of November 2008. Clearly, there is a funding deficiency. The UAPP is not yet required to change contribution rates but, given the bad financial conditions, the UAPP Board decided to make an interim adjustment with a 1.5% increase in contribution rates to employees and an equal 1.5% increase to employers. Those additional contributions will be directed to the post-1991 portion of the plan.

Prior to 2001, the UAPP was managed by the Province. Faced with fiscal difficulties, the Province decided to change the funding of the plan in the early 1990s. That led to the distinction between the post-1991 and pre-1992 components. The pre-1992 portion was deemed by the Province to have a large unfunded liability. Under a plan initiated at the time, the pre-1992 liability is to be eliminated by the end of 2043. The cost of paying off that liability is shared between the Province and the employees and employers. The Province contributes 1.25% of member salaries and the balance is split equally between employees and employers. Currently, employees and employers are each paying 0.87% of salary towards that pre-1992 unfunded liability. The employee and employer contribution rates on that component are adjusted after each actuarial valuation of the UAPP (e.g., at least once every three years). Given the current state of financial markets, unless there is a dramatic improvement by the end of 2009, the pre-1992 unfunded liability will be much larger and further contribution rate increases will be unavoidable (likely by July 1, 2010). The emergence of (large) unfunded liabilities and the need for substantial contribution rate increases are conditions currently faced by essentially all defined benefit pension plans.

Developments on the Unfunded Liability

Post-1991, the employees and employers under the UAPP played a much greater role in the management of the UAPP. However, lingering concerns about Provincial involvement and other factors, led the UAPP to become a non-statutory pension plan as of January 1, 2001 (that is, an independent plan sponsored and managed by the employees and employers rather than by the Province).

In the fall of 2007, the Province initiated discussion with the UAPP about the
possibility of the Province paying off the pre-1992 unfunded liability of the UAPP. The sponsors of the UAPP had pressed this cause for some time but it only became feasible from the Province's perspective after the Province came to a settlement with the Alberta teachers on paying the much larger unfunded liability of the teachers' pension plan. A proposal was advance by the UAPP, but a provincial election and the summer break intervened, followed by declining energy prices, financial market meltdown, a slowing/declining economy, and diminished fiscal prospects. The Province has recently informed the UAPP that the discussions are on hold.

Distribution of the 1.5% Contribution Rate Increase

Some have expressed concern that the uniform 1.5% increase in the UAPP contribution rates appears to be regressive because the contribution rate paid on salary up to $46,300 is 8.27%, whereas the contribution rate on salary from $46,300 to $136,112 (the maximum salary, this year, which is pensionable under the UAPP) is 11.21%. That is, 1.5% is larger in comparison to 8.27% than to 11.21%. The difference in the contribution rates arises because the UAPP is integrated with the CPP. That is, the Canada Pension Plan pays benefits up to $46,300 but the UAPP, which provides better pension benefits, supplements the CPP to $46,300 and then it pays the full benefits above that salary. Therefore, to realize the level of benefits provided by the UAPP, members contribute a lower percentage (8.27% rather than 11.21%) on income under $46,300. All, members will pay a uniform 1.5% more of their salary that is covered by the UAPP and from which they can expect UAPP benefits.

The Contribution to the Pre-1992 Unfunded Liability

UAPP members contribute 0.87% of salary toward funding the pre-1992 unfunded liability. That 0.87% is paid on all salary, not just to the $136,112 maximum upon which UAPP benefits are calculated. Those earning in excess of $136,112 this year do not make an 11.21% contribution on salary beyond that limit, but they also receive no pension benefit on salary beyond that limit. For example, for someone earning $150,000, the contribution to the pre-1992 unfunded liability is based on $150,000 but that person’s UAPP pension is based on $136,112. Hence, they contribute disproportionately to the unfunded liability. In addition, and regardless of salary, those hired since 1991 contribute to the pre-1992 unfunded liability although they did not contribute to that liability nor will they receive benefits as a result. About 60% of the current UAPP membership at the U of A was hired after 1991. Certainly for them, but more generally, the current 0.87% levy is effectively a flat tax imposed on all UAPP members on all salary in order to cover the unfunded liability of the pre-1992 portion of the UAPP with which the Province endowed the UAPP.

A Supplementary Academic Pension Plan Is Coming

About half or more of our members have salaries in excess of the pensionable salary cap ($136,112 this year) when they retire, and so receive pensions negatively impacted by that cap to at least some degree (i.e., lower than if there were no cap). The University recognized this as a recruitment and retention problem, and in last year’s collective agreement with the AASUA, negotiated a supplementary pension plan to be introduced starting July 1, 2009. That plan will provide some retirement benefits on salary above the cap (i.e., it will supplement the UAPP pension), be independent of the UAPP, provide substantially smaller pension benefits than the UAPP on the portion of salary covered, be a defined contribution (not defined benefit) plan, and be paid for by the University. This is a topic for later discussion.

Conclusions

I hope this commentary adds insight rather than confusion or just repeats what you already know. Perhaps these summary conclusions will help:

1. The July 1.5% increase in the UAPP contribution rate is to ensure the security of future UAPP pension benefits (including your pension).
2. Unless financial markets realize a dramatic turnaround before the end of the year, additional contribution rate increases are to be expected.
3. The pre-1992 unfunded liability is a costly millstone for UAPP members and employers. Efforts to see the elimination of that liability have recently realized some positive shifts in position but, as yet, no final resolution.
4. The University will introduce an Academic Supplementary Pension Plan as of July 1, 2009. This will supplement the UAPP pensions of high salary members. About one-half of UAPP members are expected to realize some retirement benefits from this new plan.

Mel McMillan, AASUA Representative, UAPP Sponsor’s Working Group
E-mail, FOIPP, and Video Surveillance

As many may know, written records of your University work are subject to disclosure through FOIPP (Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy) enquiries. But, you should also be aware that e-mails sent by or to University accounts are stored for a month on AICT servers, and perhaps longer on departmental servers (or, of course, on your own computer if you download your e-mail as opposed to simply reading it on Webmail). In Alberta, such communications appear to be subject to FOIPP rules (although this ruling has been challenged in Ontario). Deleting your e-mails does not delete them from University storage archives.

Although staff communications with the AASUA are confidential in nature and the AASUA itself cannot be “FOIPPed”, we are concerned by the potential for e-mail communications stored on University servers to fall under FOIPP disclosure rules. As many may know, written records of your University work are subject to disclosure through FOIPP (Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy) enquiries. But, you should also be aware that e-mails sent by or to University accounts are stored for a month on AICT servers, and perhaps longer on departmental servers (or, of course, on your own computer if you download your e-mail as opposed to simply reading it on Webmail). In Alberta, such communications appear to be subject to FOIPP rules (although this ruling has been challenged in Ontario). Deleting your e-mails does not delete them from University storage archives.

Several members have also enquired recently about the increasing number of video cameras around campus and in some classrooms. The AASUA has been advised that cameras installed by Campus Security and AICT serve security and maintenance functions only, and tapes are not archived (they are written over, usually weekly). However, several Departments have independently installed video cameras in classrooms, and there is no central control of this equipment. Because of the FOIPP issues raised above and related academic freedom and intellectual property concerns (especially in relation to the taping of classes), members are advised to monitor the deployment and use of these cameras, and to report any concerns to the AASUA.

Congratulations!

Jeanette Buckingham (Past President 2000–2001), who retired at the end of 2008, was recognized at the January 22 Council meeting for 40 years of service to the University and for her long service to AASUA.

The AASUA Welcomes Linda Wagner

The AASUA office welcomes Linda Wagner, our new receptionist/administrative assistant.

www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/aasua