

The Newsletter of Ryerson Faculty Association

Spring 2012 Vol. 26 No. 2

Message From the President

Dear Colleagues,

Congratulations to all our colleagues who received tenure and promotion this year. Well done.

At Ryerson we are entering our 5th straight year of budget cuts in a period when the number of students at our university has increased and when, for the next decade, enrolments will continue to grow. And, all this in an environment of fiscal austerity being imposed on us by both the provincial and federal governments.

A few weeks ago members of the Executive met with the university administration and we expressed our views about the negative impacts the cuts are having on teaching and learning, and on research at our university.

The university budget is, however, almost entirely dependent on funding from the provincial government and on fees from students (increases in the latter are regulated by the government). In the 2012-13 Provincial Budget the Liberal government announced that it was going to

increase funding for post-secondary education and training by an average 1.9 per cent over the next three years. While this appears to be more than the 1.5% annual increase proposed by the Drummond Commission, that is not the case. The 1.9% includes Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) funding for capital projects, training and employment programs, and student support – including the tuition rebate which the Drummond Commission proposed eliminating. It should be noted that the increase in operating funding is front loaded. It is 2.2 per cent in the first year, 0.4 per cent in the second year and 0.6 per cent in the third year.

University operating grants will increase by an average of only 1.1 per cent per year over the next three years. All of this is devoted to funding enrolment growth as the Ontario government has actually decreased or eliminated funding in other envelopes in order to fund enrolment increases. In addition, the government has, once again, chosen not to “fund inflation” thereby



Anver Saloojee, President

effectively cutting the amount of money going to post-secondary sector. Funding below inflation is tantamount to a cut in funding. As an OCUFA report on the Budget noted, “Even if one accepts the government’s assertion that it is providing funding for enrolment growth, **the constant-dollar value of per-student funding will decline by 5 per cent over the same period.**”

The future of collective bargaining in the public sector in Ontario is now murky at best. The government indicated that it expects the parties negotiating new Collective agreements to “reach responsible settlements.”

Cont'd on Page 3 ...

Contents

| | |
|---|-------|
| <i>Important Dates</i> | 2 |
| <i>R.U. - Award Winners</i> | 2 |
| <i>President</i> | 3-7 |
| <i>VP Internal</i> | 8-9 |
| <i>Services</i> | 11 |
| <i>Grievance</i> | 11-12 |
| <i>Professional Affairs</i> | 12-13 |
| <i>Equity</i> | 13-14 |
| <i>Negotiating</i> | 14-15 |
| <i>Health & Safety</i> | 16-17 |
| <i>New Faculty Members</i> | 18 |
| <i>Retirees</i> | 18 |
| <i>Promotion to Tenure</i> | 18 |
| <i>Awards</i> | 19 |
| <i>Scholarship Awards</i> | 19 |
| <i>RFA Executives</i> | 20 |
| <i>New Executive Committee Member/s</i> | 20 |
| <i>Important Notice</i> | |

Contact Us:

www.ryerson.ca/rfa



87 Gerrard St. East
Main Floor
Room EPH 232



416-979-5186



416-979-5317



rfa@ryerson.ca



Important Dates

RFA General Meeting

May 10, 2012

ILC, International Room

* * *

RFA Season Opener

September - 2012

"Location TBA"

* * *

RFA General Meeting

December, 2012

"Location TBA"

* * *

RFA Season/Holiday Party

December 5, 2012

Oakham House

RFA List Serves

If you are not receiving information sent out on rfa-announce and/or rfanet, please advise the RFA Office at ext. 5186 or by e-mail: rfa@ryerson.ca

We wish to keep you informed!

The RFA congratulates the following Ryerson University - Award Winners

The Chancellor's Award of Distinction

Ravi Ravindran - *Mechanical Engineering*

President's Award for Teaching Excellence

Frankie Stewart - *Mechanical Engineering*

Deans' Teaching Awards, (which recognize continuous teaching excellence and achievement in instruction):

ARTS

Carl Benn - *History*

Naomi Koerner - *Psychology*

FCAD

Art Seto - *Graphic Communications anagement*

FCS

Pamela Robinson - *Urban and Regional Planning*

Jennifer Lapum - *Nursing*

FEAS

Lynda McCarthy - *Chemistry and Biology*

Anwar Hossain - *Civil Engineering*

TRSM

Howard Muchnick - *Hospitality and Tourism*

David Schlanger - *Entrepreneurship and Strategy*

The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education

Greg Turko - *Professional Communications and Gateway Programs*

Provost's Experiential Teaching Award

Jasna Schwind - *Nursing*

Provost's Innovative Teaching Award

Janice Waddell - *Faculty of Community Services*



From the President....

Implicit in this is the threat that if responsible agreements cannot be reached the government is prepared to propose “administrative and legislative measures.” What exactly is a responsible settlement is not clear nor has the government spelt out what “administrative and legislative measures” it would institute to achieve its objectives.

With respect to pension, the government made two important announcements. Firstly, that in principle employees should share equally in the “ongoing cost” of their pension plans with the employer. It therefore expects public sector plans to move to a 50-50 cost sharing formula for ongoing contributions within five years. And secondly, that it intends to introduce framework legislation in the fall of 2012 to pool the investment management functions of smaller pension plans (there are 25 plans in the 20 universities in the system).

Neither of the above affects us at Ryerson because (a) we are already in OMERS, which is a well managed large Fund and (b) we currently pay equally into the pension plan with the employer. Further, in this last round of negotiation we were able to bargain a 1.5% “flow through” to the pension plan. As a result of the 1.5% flow through, we are convinced our pension plan is in much better shape than most in the university sector.

The Ontario Provincial Budget held the line on further decreases to the corporate tax rate, however, it upheld three years of corporate tax cuts that continue to deprive the province of billions in revenue, while imposing “more than half” of the 362 cuts in the Drummond Commission’s five-year plan.

In the area of research, universities will be hard hit. The three rounds of funding under the Ontario Research Fund - Research Excellence program were cancelled in late 2011. In this budget there are no further reductions to research funding. However, funding under the Research Excellence and Research Infrastructure programs of the Ontario Research Fund will be capped.

It is to the Federal Budget that we must look to see the most profound changes to research support.

The Federal Budget 2012 does not propose cuts to cash transfers to the provinces in support of education. The 3 per cent increase is insufficient to offset inflation and enrolment increases. In research, the federal government has targeted commercialization, at the expense of investments in basic research. The National Research Council (NRC) is being transformed into a service centre for industry. The NRC’s basic research program will be effectively eliminated, and the council will be “realigned” to meet business needs. The NRC will receive \$67 million in 2012-13 to support the “refocusing on business-led, industry-relevant research.” The NRC’s Industrial Research Assistance Program will see its budget double with an additional \$110 million per year. The Industrial Research and Development Program, which places graduate students in the private sector, will also have its budget doubled with an increase of \$14 million per year. The Business-led Centres of Networks of Excellence Program will be made permanent with a \$12 million per year funding commitment.

The federal granting agencies receive no new money this year, and face a cut in the next two fiscal years. According to the CAUT’s assessment of Budget 2012 “the government says that “savings” of \$37 million from “low priority” areas this year will be “reinvested” in programs designed to support academic-industry partnerships. What programs will be eliminated are not mentioned, nor is there any indication of whether the so-called savings will be “reinvested” in the next fiscal year. Overall, at best, it means a freeze in funding for basic research this year.

In addition, the granting agencies are facing budget cuts that the government says will not affect “support of basic research, student scholarships, and industry-related research initiatives and collaborations.” Ongoing funding for NSERC and CIHR will be \$30 million lower each by next year while SSHRC’s budget will be reduced by \$14 million.

The cuts come on top of a real inflation-adjusted decline in base funding for NSERC, SSHRC and CIHR. In the 2009 Budget, funding for the three granting councils was reduced by \$147.9 million over 3 years, leading to the elimination of a number of programs in support of basic research. Budget 2010 increased funding by just \$32 million per year.



From the President....

Budget 2011 allocated an equally modest boost of \$37 million, with an additional \$10 million allocated to the Indirect Costs Program administered by SSHRC.

Adjusted for inflation, the granting councils have seen steady erosion in their base budgets even with the recent increases. Between 2007-08 and 2011-12, funding for SSHRC will have declined by over 10 per cent in real terms. NSERC's funding is down a more modest 1.2 per cent, while core support for CIHR will have declined by 4.1 per cent.

On the other hand, the Drummond Report found little evidence that tax incentives encouraging private sector research, development and innovation, produce results – and they cost taxpayers \$356 million annually. Government funding for corporate research subsidies would be better spent as direct funding for university based research.

At a time when post secondary education is expanding in our province, we will continue to feel the deep impact of cuts. It is abundantly clear that both levels of government fail to recognize that university funding is not an *expense*. It is an investment in the future economic success and social vitality of our province. Without adequate investment in our post-secondary institutions, in research and in teaching and learning, we will be unable to produce the ideas, skilled workers, and research innovation we need to excel in a global economy.

The challenges posed by the fiscal crisis of the state are being compounded by the recommendations related to post secondary education in Chapter 7 of the Drummond Report. In it, Drummond recommend to the Premier the following:

- * If capital budgets are constrained, post-secondary institutions should consider using alternative financing and procurement, especially for buildings that do not qualify for government funding, such as residences.
- * As a part of mandate agreements with post-secondary institutions, tie outcome quality indicators to funding.
- * Evaluate the research funding system of post-secondary institutions and research hospitals as a whole, including how it is affecting university and hospital budgeting practices.
- * Maintain the existing tuition framework, which allows annual tuition increases of five per cent. However, simplify the design to maintain the overall ceiling but allow institutions greater flexibility to adjust tuition fees at the program level, within the ceiling.
- * Reshape student financial assistance provided by both the federal and provincial governments, including the newly announced 30% Off Ontario Tuition grant, to target more of the assistance to low-income students.
- * Compel post-secondary institutions to examine whether they can compress some four-year degrees into three years by continuing throughout the summer.

According to an OCUFA study, Ontario's faculty salary mass – the proportion of university operating expenses comprised by academic salaries – has been flat for many years. It has also fallen compared to 1990. That year, academic salaries represented 38% of total operating expenses. Today the figure is 29%. Faculty compensation settlements are now also below average increases in the rest of the public and private sectors.

In short, we face a provincial transfer for PSE that does not keep up with inflation and enrolment: nothing for granting councils this year (except a requirement to redirect \$37-million to industry-academic partnerships) and a cut of \$74-million in each of the following two years, nothing new to relieve debt-ridden students, cuts to Statistics Canada and cuts to Library Archives Canada. Thus, the budget cuts we face at Ryerson are part of the broader cuts facing the public sector, in general, and the post-secondary sector, in particular, in Ontario and in Canada.

Our colleagues at York University and at Osgoode Hall Law School have demonstrated the importance of standing up for academic freedom, university and department autonomy, and freedom from influence by the corporate sector in hiring decisions.

Former Research in Motion co-CEO Jim Balsillie, who founded CIGI, pledged \$30-million, to York University's Osgoode Law School which would be matched by another \$30-million in provincial funds.



From the President....

The collaboration would have led to the funding of 10 research chairs and 20 graduate scholarships over a decade. However, over 300 faculty members at York University argued the deal would have given CIGI an unprecedented say in the faculty hiring process, as well as over academic matters.

At the heart of the matter was a provision which allowed two CIGI employees on the partnership's steering committee to review the shortlist of candidates for the chairs. After the initial opposition surfaced a protocol was developed which provided for the appointment of an arm's-length panel of "scholars and experts" to settle any dispute about who should be interviewed. Despite this, a letter from 14 senators argued that allowing CIGI a seat at the table to shape hiring decisions is still "a shocking departure from our established practices." Hundreds of faculty members across the university continued a relentless campaign of opposition to the partnership with CIGI. They signed an open letter opposing the deal with CIGI. And on the Monday April 2, 2012, Osgoode's Faculty Council voted 34 to 7 against a revised version of the partnership, with eight abstentions.

In the face of this opposition, York University's administration formally announced that it had abandoned its attempt to partner with CIGI. Congratulations to our colleagues at York.

At Ryerson the RFA has, on behalf of all of you, expressed deep concern about the potential impact of Draft Senate Policy 45: Academic Governance Councils.

The RFA has received questions from our members about the Draft Senate Policy 45: Academic Governance Councils. We have discussed the draft policy as an Executive, we raised it with the Chairs and Directors Council of the RFA and with the Council of Representatives of the RFA.

The feedback we received was unanimous. Draft Policy 45 in its current iteration violates collegial governance, is undemocratic, lacks transparency, lacks accountability, centralises undue power in the hands of Deans and their hand picked appointees, undermines individual Schools and Departments, elevates the Chang School to the status of an academic unit and creates an unnecessary extra layer of bureaucracy in a system that does not need it. We find that this draft-policy represents a radical shift away from the principles of collegial governance as they have been practiced at our university. On behalf of the RFA, I have communicated the following to President Levy:

The RFA is fundamentally opposed to the Draft in its current form. Our primary concern is with the proposal that Deans now be responsible for approving Department/School Council reports to Senate, on the recommendation of Dean's councils. This proposal is a clear violation of the principle of bicameral governance on which Ryerson, like most Ontario universities, has been governed up to now. While administrative governance derived from the Board of Governors is mostly structured as a hierarchy of individual administrators; academic governance is the sole province of Senate and democratic and transparent Councils which are mandated by Senate and report only to it, and whose membership consists of a very significant majority of faculty members and students selected by a democratic and transparent process. Deans and other members of the administration may be members of these Councils but they never have any veto or sole voting power on these Councils. We will vehemently oppose any proposal which undermines these principles.

The proposed creation of Deans' Councils and a YSGS Council to advise Deans in their decision-making does not mitigate any of these problems but only serve to reinforce them. Firstly, these Councils are unelected, or in the case of YSGS barely elected since the eligibility for membership for faculty members is determined by their holding administrative appointments. Secondly, and possibly even more shockingly, these councils are to hold closed meetings open to visitors by invitation only. This reinforces the very undemocratic nature of these councils that would operate not only in the shadows of the university, violating the very core of collegial governance, but also away from public gaze in clear defiance of societal and governmental clamour for the accountability and transparency of publicly funded institutions.



From the President....

We have additional specific concerns which we will now detail:

1. The draft policy proposes the creation of a Dean's Council and "The membership of Deans' Councils will be determined by the Dean, who shall be Council Chair. Membership will include, as relevant, Associate Deans, Department/School Chairs/Directors, Program Directors as well as any other appropriate members". This violates both the principles of democracy (appointments by a Dean) and collegial governance. Currently, all academic Deans convene regular meetings of Chairs and Directors in their respective Faculties and it is not clear why this added layer of bureaucracy, comprising appointees of a Dean, is necessary. Nor is it clear as to exactly what will be the relationship between this Council and what might loosely be called the Chairs and Directors table.
2. These Deans Councils are advisory bodies that may make recommendations to the Dean on "academic policy affecting the Faculty or School". In a system of collegial governance, where we give Departments and Schools a great deal of autonomy, exactly what would the relationship be between the Dean's Council of appointees and a Department or School charged with running an academic program?
3. Faculty Deans are to "... establish a Curriculum Committee which reports to the Dean's Council on undergraduate curriculum matters. The Dean's Council, as a whole, may serve as the Curriculum Committee". Again, we have both collegial governance and democracy being sacrificed to a body appointed by a Dean.
4. The Dean's Council, which is an appointed body, with no elected members also has the power to establish other advisory committees as needed.

I urge all members to look at Draft Senate Policy 45, raise questions about the policy in department/school meetings, and relay your concerns to Senate.

Colleagues, it was my pleasure to nominate Professors John Morgan and Dave Mason for CAUT "Dedicated Service Award". It is an award for members who have made a significant contribution to their Unions/Associations. Both received the award and on behalf of our entire membership I would like to congratulate both Professors Mason and Morgan. It will be my great pleasure to present the awards to them at our General Meeting on May 10, 2012.

Professor Mason is also the recipient of the RFA's Distinguished Service Award and Professor Don Snyder is the recipient of the RFA's Career Achievement Award. Both are incredibly worthy recipients and on behalf of our entire membership I would like to congratulate both Professors Mason and Snyder. Again, it will be my pleasure to present Professors Mason and Snyder with their awards at the General Meeting.

This is also the time of the year when, as a community, we acknowledge the immense contributions of our colleagues to teaching, service and research. This year:

The Chancellor's Award of Distinction, which recognizes a Ryerson educator who has demonstrated a life-long career commitment to teaching and learning excellence through an outstanding and sustained record of educational leadership, was awarded to Professor Ravi Ravindran from the Department of Mechanical Engineering in the Faculty of Engineering, Architecture and Science.

The President's Award for Teaching Excellence, which recognizes a Ryerson educator who has demonstrated continuing teaching excellence and who has made contributions to advancing teaching and learning at Ryerson, was awarded to Professor Frankie Stewart from the Department of Mechanical Engineering in the Faculty of Engineering, Architecture and Science.

The Provost's Experiential Teaching Award, which recognizes a Ryerson educator who has advanced teaching and learning with a particular focus on experiential learning, was awarded to Professor Jasna Schwind from the Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing in the Faculty of Community Services.

The Provost's Innovative Teaching Award, which recognizes a Ryerson educator who has advanced teaching and learning through educational innovation, was awarded to Professor Janice Waddell, Associate Dean from the Faculty of Community Services.



From the President....

The Deans' Teaching Awards are awarded to Ryerson educators who have demonstrated continuous teaching excellence and achievement in instruction, as determined by their respective faculties. The 2012 Deans' Teaching Award recipients are:

- ◆ Faculty of Arts: Professors Naomi Koerner (Department of Psychology) and Carl Benn (Department of History),
- ◆ Faculty of Communication & Design: Professor Art Seto (School of Graphic Communications Management),
- ◆ Faculty of Community Services: Professors Jennifer Lapum (The Daphne Cockwell School of Nursing) and Pamela Robinson (School of Urban and Regional Planning),
- ◆ Faculty of Engineering, Architecture and Science: Professors Lynda McCarthy (Department of Chemistry and Biology) and Anwar Hossain (Department of Civil Engineering),
- ◆ The G. Raymond Chang School of Continuing Education: Professor Greg Turko (Professional Communications and Gateway Programs),
- ◆ Ted Rogers School of Management: Professors Howard Muchnick (Ted Rogers School of Hospitality and Tourism Management); David Schlanger (Department of Entrepreneurship and Strategy).

A hearty and extremely well deserved congratulation to all of you – you make us immensely proud of you and of our profession.

Colleagues, ours is an environment where there is a constant threat to academic freedom, to collegial governance, and to being able to work in an atmosphere where we are not continually being pressured by fiscal restraint. We have all done way more with way less. Unfortunately, we live in a province that has the lowest level of per-student public funding in Canada, and provides 27 per cent less funding to universities than it did in 1990. This underfunding drives up the student-to-faculty ratio, prevents the renewal of aging infrastructure, and puts pressure on universities to increase tuition.

Increased operating grants are the most effective way to improve the quality and accessibility of our universities. It is therefore essential that we renew our commitment to funding our universities. We fully concur with the OCUFA plan, which lays out an affordable; 8-year timeline, for increasing operating grants to bring per-student operating revenue to the national average by 2020. The investment is spread over several years, and can be back-loaded should that prove more affordable. The figure may also seem high (\$1.5 billion), but it is an investment we cannot avoid. In the long term, the only thing Ontario can't afford is under-funded universities. Adequately funding universities, making universities affordable and accessible should not be seen as a cost. It is an investment in the future of our province and our country.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all members of the Executive and all members of RFA Committees for their hard work on our behalf. The RFA is only as strong as its membership and as strong as its volunteers.

The RFA staff has been simply remarkable. Many of you interact with Agnes Paje who runs our office smoothly, and Preciosa del Monte who works part time in our office, as well as André Foucault, our Executive Director of Labour Relations. I have only heard positive comments from you about the work of André, Agnes and Preciosa. So on behalf of all the members of the RFA, I want to thank all three for their dedication to the RFA.

My work as your President is made immeasurably easier by the collective efforts of the members of the Executive, RFA Committee members and Agnes, Preciosa and André. So I thank you all.

In conclusion, I urge all RFA members to contact me, or any member of your Executive, to raise any issues of concern you may have. We are here to assist you in any way we can.

Anver Saloojee
President



Report from the VP Internal - Jason Lisi

VP Internal

It is hard to believe that it has been almost a year since my term as VP Internal started. There have been a lot of exciting developments, changes, and learning curves for me, and I would like to report on some of the more relevant details in this bulletin.

Reps' Council

One of the duties I have as VP Internal is to chair the Council of School Representatives (a.k.a. the Reps' Council). The Reps' Council is comprised of nominated Representatives from each school. The number of Reps per school is determined by the size of the school.

For the 2011-2012 academic year, a total of six meetings of the Reps' Council were held. The topics in the meetings varied, but always revolved around issues that were important for the Schools. For example, we discussed important issues around health and safety, grant reimbursements, the Ontario Health and Safety Act, and of course, due to this being a negotiating year, a significant amount of discussion was on bargaining and the new Collective Agreement.

Having been a Rep for a number of years, it was very interesting to be chairing these meetings. I tried to approach the meetings to support two-way dialogue, and allowed for Reps to table issues that could be discussed in an open forum. I am admittedly biased when I say that I feel the meetings went very well. I really look forward to the Reps' Council meetings starting again in Fall 2012.

There is one last note I would like to make about the Reps' Council, and that is, it has an extremely important role in making sure that the RFA is kept informed of issues that affect its members. Reps speak on behalf of their colleagues, and relay important information back to those colleagues. This is a great opportunity for newer faculty members, as it offers the opportunity to network, collaborate, and familiarize themselves with different dimensions of the University and the RFA. Having said this, there is a lot of merit in having experienced, tenured members as Reps', as well. Tenured, experienced Reps can bring different insights and experiences to the discussions that take place. If your School has two or more Reps, it may be worth looking into the idea of having both non-tenured and tenured faculty members as Reps.

Council of Chairs and Directors (CDC)

The CDC is similar in function to the Reps' Council, only, it focuses on issues relevant to our Chairs and Directors. As with the Reps' Council, I thoroughly enjoyed my role as Chair of the CDC. This year, I introduced some changes in the way CDC meetings were scheduled in an attempt to provide more flexibility and choice in meeting dates. Based on the turnout at the meetings, I think this worked quite well, and I intend to use similar methods next year.

Historically, the CDC has met once in the fall term and once in the winter term. After a discussion with the Chairs and Directors in the winter term meeting, it was agreed that having two meetings per term would be better than one. As a result, the CDC met three times this year. Next year, there will be a total of four meetings of the Chairs'/Directors' Council – two in the fall, and two in the winter.

The CDC was an entirely new experience for me, and I certainly benefitted from being part of these meetings.

For both the Reps' Council and the CDC, there was a considerable amount of discussion focused around the changes to the Ontario Health and Safety Act (OHSA) as a result of Bill 168. In particular, the changes place more responsibility on RFA members when it comes to issues of health and safety. Chairs and Directors, as supervisors of CUPE and OPSEU members have unique responsibilities under the new Act, and it is important that these responsibilities are clear, and that our Chairs and Directors are given the appropriate training to be able to deal with these responsibilities in accordance with the Act.



Report from the VP Internal....

And while Chairs and Directors may have unique challenges ahead of them in this regard, it should be noted that all RFA members are likely to have new responsibilities under the OHSA as well, whether it comes to classroom/lab safety, or as our roles as supervisors of teaching, graduate and research assistants. Currently, the University is preparing documentation and various training opportunities for employees that will aim to address the requirements for training and information. And while it may seem that Ryerson is lagging in getting this material completed, it should be noted that many universities are at a similar point with regards to their materials.

With regards to my position as VP Internal, I have already seen a growing impact around representations and investigations that are directly or indirectly linked to the added responsibilities. The University has to investigate issues surrounding non-physical safety, such as harassment and work environment, as you will see in the next section, entitled Representation, below.

Representation

This year the portfolio of the VP Internal was expanded to include the coordination of representation for RFA members. Representation involves cases where an RFA member is entitled to have an RFA representative present in a meeting in a non-grievance situation. Examples of such meetings may include investigations or fact-finders done by the University. In such cases, a member could be called into a meeting as a claimant, a respondent, or a witness. Meetings can be conducted internally by HR, or externally by a third-party organization acting on behalf of the university.

Prior to this change, the Grievance Officer managed representation. Managing the representation process can be very time consuming, and the need for non-grievance representation has grown. By turning this responsibility over to the VP Internal, the Grievance Officer has more time to dedicate to the grievance process. In my opinion, this has been a positive change, and I happy to take on this important role.

Since Fall 2010, the RFA has represented 75 members across eight different departments for non-grievance related matters. Since taking on this role, I have coordinated close to 40 members over 4 departments, and have acted as a representative for a few of these individuals myself. In general, I believe the number of non-grievance related representations will continue to rise as a direct result of the changes to the Health and Safety Act. Luckily, when I inherited this new responsibility, I also inherited a group of dedicated RFA members who volunteer their time to represent their colleagues. Many have served on the grievance committee in the past, and all have had experience in representations. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them for all the time and energy they put into helping their fellow RFA members. Without their commitment, I could not do what I am doing. Thank you!

One of the things I would like to do with representation is to add a little more structure to the process. Now that representation is separate from grievance, I would like to see more formal processes put into place to assist the volunteers who are doing the representation. As of now, I am not sure as to exactly what this will mean, but I will be working on some ideas over the summer to bring to the RFA Executive for discussion.

Conclusion

My role as VP Internal has definitely kept me busy! There have been a lot of positive experiences and changes for me (and this role) this year, and I have really enjoyed being part of all of it. I look forward to continued improvements as I continue into the second half of my term. If anyone has any ideas, suggestions, comments or concerns they would like to raise, I welcome the opportunity to discuss them with you.



Season/Holiday Party - December 2011, Oakham House



Pub Night - April, 2012, Oakham House



Report from the Chair, Services - Wayne Forsythe

The Services Committee planned and held a number of events during the Fall 2011 and Winter 2012 semesters. We had to improvise due to a flood that occurred at the International Living and Learning Centre (ILC) that made utilization of that space impossible. Before the water damage, a Drop-In event was held on October 12 with approximately 70 members in attendance. The Drop-In event for November 10 had to be cancelled. Drop-In's are informal events where members can enjoy light snacks and refreshments.

The Season/Holiday Party was held on December 5, 2011 at Oakham House. We welcomed approximately 370 people including RFA members, retirees and guests. The event was again an enormous success. We adjusted the themed food station offerings for the event (from 2010) and more dessert crepes will be available next year! I (on behalf of the committee) would again like to thank the staff at Oakham House and our student registration/setup team for helping to ensure the success of this event. Mark your calendars as the **2012 event will be held on Wednesday December 5.**

Continued repairs at the ILC caused the January 18 Drop-In event to be moved to the Thomas Lounge in Oakham House. Member feedback suggested that a lunch-time event may lead to higher attendance. Despite the more central campus location (compared to the ILC), attendance was only 35 and this experiment will not be repeated. The ILC is still being renovated and this led to the cancellation of the March 1 and April 10 Drop-In's.

A Pub Night was held on April 3 in the Thomas Lounge at Oakham House. A piano player/singer was arranged for entertainment. Special thanks are due to Stephen Swales for handling the organization of this event. A total 106 people attended and an enjoyable time was had by all.

The Season Opener will be held at the ILC in early September. Details will be sent out in the summer.

I would like to thank Anne-Marie Singh (Criminal Justice and Criminology) and Yi Feng (Finance, TRSM) for their services to the committee. This also marks the end of my 4.5 years (the last 2 as Chair) on the Services Committee. Stephen Swales (as new Committee Chair) and Kunquan Lan (Mathematics) continue to serve on the committee. Gerda Cammaer (Image Arts), Martin Greig (History) and Jane Sprott (Criminal Justice and Criminology) have joined the committee.

Committee Members: *Yi Feng, Kunquan Lan, Anne-Marie Singh, Stephen Swales*

Report from the Chair, Grievance - Sophie Quigley

The academic year 2011-2012 has been a busy year from a grievance standpoint, but it has been more manageable thanks to the help of our tireless Director of Labour Relations (André Foucault), Alternate Grievance Officer (Jesmen Mendoza) who has been carrying a substantial grievance load, Vice-President Internal (Jason Lisi) who has taken over the coordination of representation for our members, and many other colleagues, both on and off the Grievance Committee, who have kindly volunteered their time to support their colleagues.

The best news this academic year has been that, unlike in the preceding six academic years, we have not had any job terminations so far, either tenure related or otherwise. Tenure challenges now seem to be better managed than in the past because the Ryerson Administration has become more responsive to requests for support for our members as they make their way through the tenure process. As a result, our efforts are starting to shift away from cure and towards prevention, i.e., helping our members advocate for themselves, request the support they need, and present their accomplishments better. We welcome this trend and hope that it is a permanent change to the tenure experience at Ryerson. Unfortunately, we are still dealing with the after-effects of the glut of tenure denials of previous years and will continue to do so well into the next academic year, as four job terminations grievances will be slowly making their way through the arbitration process during the remainder of 2012. Nonetheless, we managed to resolve quite a few other job termination grievances last summer, with some settlements resulting in continued employment at Ryerson for our members, in particular, that of the grievance related to the hiring of LTFs at Ryerson.

Report from the Chair, Grievance...

Not too surprisingly, as our mode 2 population is now starting to mature, complaints and grievances related to promotion are on the increase; these cases have become a specialty of our Alternate Grievance Officer Jesmen Mendoza.

As explained in the report from the VP Internal, another area of increased activity is in providing representation for our members: with the advent of Bill 168, workers at Ryerson, including our members, are more aware of their rights to a harassment-free workplace and are more likely to file complaints when they feel that these rights are not being respected. Similarly, students are becoming more aware of their own rights and are also filing more complaints against their professors, instructors, and TAs. Finally, the university is also under increased legal pressure to provide a harassment-free workplace and study place. As a result, the university is becoming increasingly proactive in dealing with complaints and there has been a steady but sharp increase in investigations, fact finders, and reviews involving our members. Our members are entitled to representation in these proceedings and Jason Lisi is now working on institutionalizing the representation component of RFA work to better deal with the increased demand for representation. I have welcomed the respite provided by having most of this workload moved from the Grievance to the VP Internal portfolio, but this increased activity still results in an increased grievance workload as more and more of our members are facing the threat of discipline as a result of the surge in these investigations.

Finally, we have managed to settle a few specific individual grievances, and to get the backed up 2010 FCAD promotion applications processed, at long last.

In addition, we are continuing to support individual members, both formally through grievances and informally by providing advice and representation on a variety of issues such as hiring, tenure, compensation, discipline, leaves, accommodation requests, and workload.

As always, I'd like to remind you that the role of the Grievance Committee is not only to help you solve problems in your dealings with the university, but also to help you prevent these problems, if possible. So please feel free to contact us if you have any questions concerning our Collective Agreement or specific questions about your own workplace situation.

Committee Members: *Susanna Edwards, Kym Maclaren, Jesmen Mendoza, Cathy Ning,*

Report from the Chair, Professional Affairs - Kileen Tucker Scott

Last fall, the RFA Professional Affairs Committee supported "Too Asian?" Revisited: Racism, Offensive Content, and Freedom of Speech which was a free public forum held one year after the publication of the Maclean's "Too Asian?" article. This forum, a follow-up to the seminar held on the Ryerson campus last winter, took place on November 17, 2011 at OISE/UT and featured panelists Jeet Heer, PhD Candidate in History, York University; Florence Li, Co-Organizer, Youth Coalition Against Racism; John Miller, Professor Emeritus of Journalism, Ryerson University; and Naseem Mithoowani, Lawyer, Waldman & Associates. It was well attended with over one hundred participants.

In addition to assisting with the orientation of new faculty, one of the Professional Affairs Committee's privileged annual responsibilities is adjudicating the RFA-sponsored student scholarships. It was rewarding to review numerous applications from students across the university who excel at maintaining academic proficiency in their chosen field of study as well as demonstrating a commitment to Social Justice and/or Labour Relations through a variety of activities, both on- and off-campus. The names of the scholarship recipients are published in this newsletter. Recipients of the RFA faculty awards are: RFA Distinguished Service Award - Dave Mason and RFA Career Achievement Award - Don Snyder.

Report from the Chair, Professional Affairs...

The Committee also undertook a member-supported initiative to create the RFA Maureen Sims Award for Social Justice in memory of Maureen Sims who worked tirelessly on behalf of the RFA as Executive Director for a number of years and who passed away last summer. This award is directed toward the recognition of undergraduate students who demonstrate active involvement in promoting social justice, a concern in which Maureen was actively involved. The award will be managed by the RFA with the assistance of University Advancement. The criteria and procedure for conferring the award, as well as the mechanism for donating to the award, are currently being developed. Members interested in donating to the financial establishment of the award should refer to the University Advancement web page.

In the upcoming year, the Professional Affairs Committee will continue to work on behalf of the RFA and its members to promote and recognize excellence in Ryerson students and faculty, and to support the work of the RFA.

Committee Members: *Songnian Li, Gordon Pon, Ahmad Varvani-Farahani*

Report from the Chair, Equity - Jennifer Clarke

Over the past year, the Equity Issues Committee (EIC) has been actively working on a number of key issues including raising awareness around barriers to access, support, resources, and academic advancement for persons with disabilities at Ryerson. The EIC also collaborated with the School of Social Work, the Sam Gindin Chair in Social Justice & Democracy, and Ryerson Students' Union, in raising awareness around homophobia and transphobia in classrooms and the broader community for persons who identify as lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, two-spirited, trans-identified, intersexed and queer.

In the Fall Term, we focused primarily on planning and organizing the third annual equity Forum on Language, Culture and Equity that was titled: *Gesture, Language and Sign Language*. The forum was held on October 20, 2011 in the Ted Rogers School of Management, TRS1-067, from 7:00 – 9:00 p.m. The keynote speaker was Dr. Carol Padden, Professor, Department of Communication, University of California, San Diego. Dr. Padden is an internationally renowned linguist and MacArthur Fellow whose research focuses on the unique structure and evolution of sign languages - how they differ from spoken language and from each other, - and on the specific social implications of signed communication. The forum attracted both national and international attention and mobilized members of the Ryerson Disability Community, and members of the Deaf Community both on- and off- campus. People from as far as British Columbia, Alberta and Africa contacted us to be part of the event. When the EIC explored live streaming of the event, it was too costly. A total of about 490 people attended the forum.

The forum was well supported by Ryerson's Administration including the Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs, John Isbister; VP Administration & Finance, Julia Hanigsberg; VP Research & Innovation, Wendy Cukier; Dean, Faculty of Community Services, Usha George; Chair, School of Disability Studies, Kathryn Church; and the Sam Gindin Chair in Social Justice & Democracy, Winnie Ng. The RFA Professional Affairs Committee was also a donor.

The EIC worked very closely with an organizing committee that was comprised of faculty members and students from across the university as well as staff members from Human Resources and Employment Equity. The members of the sub-committee were Professors: Jennifer Clarke, Yunxiang Gao, Tariq Amin-Khan, Farid Shirazi, Anne-Marie Singh, Aparna Sundar, Kathryn Underwood and Kathryn Woodcock. Staff members were Sri Pathmanathan and Heather Willis and students Miguel Aguayo, Ellen Hibbard, Mala Naraine, and Margot Whitfield. The EIC thank them for their hard work and support in making the event a success.



Report from the Chair, Equity...

In the Winter 2012 semester, EIC collaborated with the Social Justice Committee in the School of Social Work, the Sam Gindin Chair in Social Justice & Democracy, Dean, Faculty of Community Services, and the Ryerson Students' Union in organizing a seminar titled: *No Safe Space: The Myth of Queer and Trans Safety*. The event was held on March 27, 2012 at Thomas Lounge, Oakham House. Over 100 students, community members, faculty and staff attended the event. This event was important because the EIC learned from some RFA members that the classroom can be a hostile place when one is a member of the Queer and Trans community. The RFA is committed to equity and inclusion of historically marginalized groups, including persons who identify as lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, two-spirited, trans-identified, intersexed and queer. The goal of equity is to achieve inclusiveness and social and economic justice through recognition, respect, numerical representation, accountability, responsibility and the development of balanced, healthy and harmonious working environments.

As Chair of the EIC, I have also been working closely with representatives of the various unions on campus including the RSU, CESAR, CUPE, OPSEU on a Community Coalition against the budget cuts and tuition fee increases. The work of this coalition led to the first community forum on March 20, 2012 with other events planned for April 2012.

Currently, the EIC is working on an event around ageism in the neo-liberal academy. This forum is being planned for Fall 2012. We continue to solicit your ideas and topics that are of interest to you, so please continue to share your equity concerns and suggestions with us.

Committee Members: *Yunxiang Gao, Farid Shirazi, Anne-Marie Singh and Aparna Sundar*

Report from the Chair, Negotiating - Peter Danziger

As I'm sure you all know, we ratified our new Collective Agreement in December 2011, with the Board of Governors ratifying in January 2012, and so we now have a new Collective Agreement. As per the RFA by-laws, ratification sees the dissolution of the bargaining committee. I would like to take this final opportunity to express my thanks to the hard work and dedication of the committee in seeing this process to a successful conclusion. Together with our Executive Director, André Foucault, I am in the process of proofreading the language and hope to have a final version ready before too much longer.

The new agreement contains many new procedures and practices, so the next steps are to see to their successful implementation. Everyone should have received their backdated pay increases in mid-March; we are working on getting the anomalies process up and running, but it may take some time to get the updated data. The implementation of the new Sabbatical provisions seems to be proceeding well and we each should be receiving a statement of how many sabbatical credits we have.

Probably the most complex piece is the implementation of the new hiring, tenure and promotion language. In this context, the most immediate concern is the creation of the new committees for hiring, tenure and promotion to full professor. Though these committees will not start their work until September 1, elections to these committees should be completed by May 15.

The Departmental Hiring Committee (DHC) will normally consist of the Chair, or his/her designate, two elected and one appointed member. These four will then, between them, choose a fifth member. As is the current practice, the committee may vary from 3 to 7, but normally, any department with more than 10 tenure-stream faculty would have a 5 person DHC and any department with more than 25 tenure stream members would normally have a 7 person committee. There may be up to one probationary member on the committee, but only when elected, and only probationers with at least one year of service may serve.



Report from the Chair, Negotiating...

The Departmental Evaluation Committee (DEC) shall normally consist of the Chair, or his/her designate, three members elected by and from the Department/School, and one member appointed by the Chair. As is the current practice the committee may vary from 3 to 7, but normally, any Department/School with 8 tenured faculty members would have a 5 member committee and a department with more than 20 tenured members would have a 7 person DEC. In the case of a 3 member DEC, it will consist of the Chair/Director, one elected and one appointed member. Seven member DEC's will consist of the Chair/Director, one appointed member, and 5 elected members.

The Chair/Director, in making his or her appointment to these committees, and the first four members, in making their selection of an additional member, shall take into account the University's equity, diversity and inclusion obligations, and/or shall attempt to expand the fields of expertise of the committee. In a written report to the Dean and the Department/ School, the Chair/Director shall explain how the appointments to the committee will serve these goals.

The new Faculty Tenure Committee (FTC) and Faculty Promotion Committee (FPC) consist of six elected members each, one from each department, except in the case of the new Faculty of Science which will have one member for each department. The departments with representation are selected from a Faculty ordering list, which will be made available shortly. In the initial elections, half of the posts (announced in advance) will be for only one year, the rest will be for two years. The purpose is to create overlapping terms going forward. These elections should also be held by May 15.

As regards to actual changes in the tenure and promotion process, I would draw your attention to the following excerpts from our new agreement:

In this round of bargaining the tenure criteria have been reworded. The criteria for tenure have been simplified to fit the practice as it has developed over time and this is not intended as a material change to this practice. Tenure criteria before and after this change remain comparable...

The parties have agreed to a process by which promotion will be granted with tenure. It is understood that the criteria to be applied for tenure review and assessments are those for tenure and not those previously in place for promotion to Associate Professor.

In other words, the fact that promotion is now automatic upon the granting of tenure should not be a consideration in tenure decisions, nor should it affect the level of expectation for tenure.

We should all be receiving our provisional teaching loads for next year by May 15, and remember that we have a commitment that the level of support from Academic Assistants, (TA/GAs) will, as a minimum, continue in accordance with current departmental and Faculty practices or as indicated in the departmental teaching standard. The new overload payment rate of \$6,300 per course is also applicable from this term onwards.

For those departments that are considering putting forward a teaching standard, the criteria for developing the standard have changed slightly. Amongst other things, the provisions for research and service expectations have been removed. Those who have already submitted a proposal need not modify their proposals, though they may if they wish. The new process also allows for greater RFA involvement. This includes having an RFA representative present in the negotiations between the member and the Dean, should a department so wishes. Those departments that would like to consult us should contact the RFA to arrange for representation.

Finally, I am happy to have been of service to our Association and I would like to thank you all for your support throughout this process. It has been invaluable.

Committee Members: *Diane Granfield, Diane Pirner, Krishnan Venkatakrishnan, Charles Zamaria*



Report from the Health and Safety Officer - Fernando Pardo

We spend much of lives on Campus and we are exposed to many elements. These elements will have an impact on our work, *and* quality of life.

As the elected Health & Safety Officer (H & S), since September 2011, my focus has been:

Open Communication- Understanding Legislation- Proper Training

Open communication with all RFA members; the goal is to have members feel comfortable in speaking and sharing their concerns with the Health & Safety Officer, or with any member of the RFA Executive. The RFA President, Anver Saloojee, although occupied with many other concerns for our University, has established Health & Safety as a priority of concern for our Executive. The entire executive has quickly brought forth communications from faculty to me, whenever identified to be in the realm of Health and Safety.

Understanding Legislation is important for all of us. I have been working diligently to obtain an understanding of the rules and standards that are already in place. In doing so, I have been seeking the choicest route of action for all involved, in order to alleviate present concerns and/or hazards.

Proper training is prevention; we can prevent many accidents, loss of work, and loss of quality of life. The Executive and I have initiated steps, for the individual faculty member to understand safeguards that have been, or still need to be put in place. In attending the RFA Rep's council meetings, for example, I have been sharing and distributing healthy parcels of information that could be of benefit to you, and those whom you supervise.

In addition to the bi-weekly meetings the RFA Executive holds, I sit on the Ryerson Joint Health Occupational Committee (JHOC), a committee that represents the Employees and Ryerson management. We meet on a monthly basis to discuss legislation, review incidents/accidents or outstanding issues, and to bring other H & S concerns to the table. The regular frequency with which these committees meet allows concerns and queries of individual faculty members, and departments, to be heard and addressed in a timely manner.

Concerns such as consistent climate control issues (no heat), air quality testing, new construction issues, proper lighting, safety of washrooms in Kerr Hall, safety of elevators on campus, H & S training to new Chairs & Directors, proper cleaning of faculty offices, and transportation of chemicals have been submitted to the JHOC, and have been resolved.

Health & Safety is not just about steel toe boots at the work place! How do you know if the members of your department are trained in H & S procedures? As a faculty member do you have Health & Safety responsibilities for your research assistant and/or teaching assistants whom you hire each semester? To whom do you talk about inadequate lighting in your office? How do you know if you might be exposing yourself to harmful chemicals or toxic fumes in your department? Should you be concerned with Bill 168? Do you have any legal responsibilities for your office/work space that only you use?

As your elected Health & Safety Officer, I can assist in helping you acquire the proper training and/or find the answers to the questions that might have an impact on your work and personal health.

My goal as the Health & Safety Officer, is to bring "Quality". If you have Health & Safety questions or concerns, or perhaps not sure of something, please contact me (at fpardo@ryerson.ca), or any member of your RFA executive, and we will seek out the answers.



Report from the Health and Safety Officer...

Health & Safety Suggestions:

- * Faculty members: Have you completed your 2012 Health & Safety Office Inspection Checklist? Need one?
Email: fpardo@ryerson.ca
- * Remove clutter from your office space. FIPPA requires you to keep students grades and documents for one-year. Anything older than one-year can be destroyed. Contact your Departmental Assistant for instructions.

Health & Safety Topic:

Air Quality

Do you have quality of air in your work space? The quality of air has short and long term effects on your personal health and the quality of work you do. IAQ (Indoor Air Quality) is responsible for illness known by these names: Sick Building Syndrome (SBS), Tight Building Syndrome (TBS), Building-Related Illness (BRI) and Multiple Chemical Sensitivities (MCS). They are caused by contaminants brought in from the outside through poorly designed or maintained HVAC systems, or from the interaction between building materials, furniture, activity, climate and occupants.

If you are experiencing any of the symptoms below in a consistent manner during your work hours and feeling better when you get home, please contact our RFA Health & Safety Officer, Fernando Pardo: fpardo@ryerson.ca

Symptoms:

- * Dryness and irritation of the eyes, nose, throat and skin
- * Headache, fatigue
- * Shortness of breath
- * Hypersensitivity and allergies
- * Sinus congestion
- * Coughing and sneezing
- * Dizziness and/or nausea

Sources:

- * Insufficient outdoor air intake
- * Inadequate temperature, humidity, lighting, excessive noise
- * Chemical, dusts, moulds or fungi, bacteria, gases, vapours, odours

Toxins:

- * Carbon dioxide, tobacco smoke, perfume, body odours
- * Dust, fiberglass, asbestos, gases
- * Toxic vapours and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from cleaners, glues
- * Gases, vapours, and odours from off-gas emissions from new furniture, new carpets installed, and paint
- * Microbial contaminants, fungi, moulds, and bacteria from damp areas, stagnant water and condensate pans
- * Ozone from your department photocopier, electric motors, electrostatic air cleaners

References

1. ASHRAE. ANSI/ASHRAE Standard-55-2004: Thermal environmental conditions for human occupancy, American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Atlanta, 2004.
2. National Research Council of Canada, Institute for Research in Construction. COPE Project Research Reports (<http://www.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/eng/projects/irc/cope/reports.html>), Ottawa, 2003.
3. Arens, E., Xu, T., Miura, K., Hui, Z., Fountain, M., and Bauman, F.S. [A study of occupant cooling by personally controlled air movement](#). Energy and Buildings, 27, 45-59, 1998.
4. ASHRAE. ANSI/ASHRAE Standard-62.1-2004: Ventilation for acceptable indoor air quality, American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Atlanta, 2004.
5. Seppanen, O.A., Fisk, W.J., and Mendell, M.J. [Association of ventilation rates and carbon dioxide concentrations with health and other responses in commercial and institutional buildings](#). Indoor Air, 9(4), 226-252, 1999.
6. Shaw, C.Y. Maintaining acceptable air quality in office buildings through ventilation, [Construction Technology Update No. 3](#), National Research Council of Canada, Institute for Research in Construction, 1997, 4 p.
7. ASHRAE. ASHRAE Fundamentals: Chapter 32. Space Air Distribution, American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Atlanta, 2001.
8. Won, D.Y., Magee, R.J., Luszyk, E., Nong, G., Zhu, J., Zhang, J.S., Reardon, J.T., and Shaw, C.Y. [A comprehensive VOC emission database for commonly-used building materials](#). In Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Healthy Buildings, Singapore (Vol. 1, p.253-258), 2003

**New Faculty Members**

The RFA extends a warm welcome to our new colleagues effective January 1, 2012:

- Costin Antonescu, *Chemistry & Biology*
- Jeffrey Boase, *Professional Communication*
- Reem El Asaleh, *Graphic Communication Management*

Retirees 2011/12

At press time, we are bidding farewell to the following RFA members and also extend our best wishes:

- ♦ Judy Britnell
Nursing
- ♦ Douglas White
Professional Communication

Promotion to Tenure**Faculty of Business**

Robin Church - *Human Resources*
Sonia Graci - *Hospitality & Tourism*
Philip Walsh - *Entrepreneurship & Strategy*

Faculty of Community Services

Marni Binder - *ECE*
Kiaras Gharabaghi - *Child and Youth Care*
Kathryn Underwood - *ECE*
Mandana Vahabi - *Nursing*

Faculty of Engineering, Architecture and Science

Habiba Bougherara - *Mechanical Eng.*
John Cirka - *Architectural Science*
Martina Hausner - *Chemistry & Biology*
Jinyuan Liu - *Civil Engineering*

Faculty of Communication and Design

Kamal Al-Solaylee - *Journalism*
Gerda Cammaer - *Image Arts*
Joanne DiNova - *Professional Communication*
Gregory Levey - *Professional Communication*
April Lindgren - *Journalism*
Jason Lisi - *GCM*
Grahame Lynch - *Fashion*

Faculty of Arts

Yunxiang Gao - *History*
Alasdair Goodwill - *Psychology*
Amina Jamal - *Sociology*
Julia Spaniol - *Psychology*
Kristin Vickers - *Psychology*

Recipients of Faculty SRC Awards, Sarwan Sahota

ARTS

Martin Antony - Psychology
 Margaret Moulson - Psychology
 Daniel Rubenson - Politics
 Leslie Atkinson - Psychology
 Frank Russo - Psychology
 Graham Hudson - Criminology
 Irene Gammel - English

FEAS

Habiba Bougherara - *Mechanical & Industrial Engineering*
 Daolun Chen - *Mechanical & Industrial Engineering*
 Marcello Papini - *Mechanical & Industrial Engineering*
 Bo Tan - *Aerospace Engineering*
 Karthi Umapathy - *Electrical & Computer Engineering*

FCAD

Marta Braun - Image Arts
 Richard Grunberg - RTA
 Richard Lachman - RTA
 April Lindgren - Journalism
 Sandra Tullio-Pow - Fashion

FCS

Pamela Robinson - *Urban & Regional Planning*
 Kathryn Underwood - *Early Childhood Education*
 Yvonne Yuan - *Nutrition*

TRSM

Ayse Bener - *ITM*
 Guoping Liu - *Business Management*
 Farid Shirazi - *ITM*
 Fei Song - *Business Management*

Congratulations

The RFA congratulates its 2011/12 Scholarship Award winners:

- **Azar Masoumi** and **Liane Salvador** - Full-Time student award (\$2,500.00 each)
- **Linda Parker** and **Réal Carrière** - Aboriginal student award (\$2,500.00 each)
- **Somona Gupta** - Part-time student award (\$1,500.00)

The RFA Executive for 2012/13 is composed of the following members:

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| President | Anver Saloojee |
| Vice President Internal | Jason Lisi |
| Vice President External | Franklyn Prescod |
| Treasurer | Bozena Todorow |
| Secretary | David Naranjit |
| Chair, Grievance | Sophie Quigley |
| Chair, Negotiating | Peter Danziger |
| Chair, Professional Affairs | Kileen Tucker Scott |
| Chair, Equity Issues | Jennifer Clarke |
| Health & Safety Officer | Fernando Pardo |
| Members At Large (2) | Anthony Francescucci |
| | Aparna Sundar |

New Executive Committee Member/s**Aparna Sundar, Member at Large**

Started in Ryerson on 2006 at the Department of Politics and Public Administration. She has been an active member of the RFA Equity Issues Committee for the past five years.

RFA General Meeting

Thursday, May 10, 2012, 12 (noon) - 2:00 p.m.

ILC, International Room

Disclaimer

Statements made and the views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not represent the position of the RFA unless so specified.

THANK YOU

We would like to thank all contributors to this issue. Editors: David Naranjit and Agnes Paje

Produced by: Preciosa del Monte and Agnes Paje