

BUFA VOICE

Message from the President The Search for Brock’s Next President

Linda Rose-Krasnor



What is the process?

President Lightstone’s second term as University President and Vice-Chancellor expires on June 30, 2016. The Board of Trustees, not Senate, will select our President (Faculty Handbook; FHB 3.2.2). In making that decision, the Board will consider the recommendation of an Advisory Committee, comprising seven Board members, three faculty or

professional librarians appointed by Senate, one senior Administrator, one undergraduate student, and one graduate student. Although there are faculty, librarians, staff, and students on the Advisory Committees, they are not representative of the faculty, librarians, students, and staff as a whole. The Board also must consult Senate.

The Advisory Committee members have now been appointed by the Board and are in the process of defining the search process for the next President. We expect that the Committee will use a private “headhunter” as have Advisory Committees in the past.

Continued on next page...

General Membership Meeting

Thursday, February 26, 2015

Pond Inlet

1 - 3pm

**Discussion of Program Review
and Prioritization**



www.BUFA.ca

News and Views

In this issue:

Message from the President

Linda Rose-Krasnor

~

OCUFA Director Report

Larry Savage

~

Message from the Grievance Officer

David Whitehead

~

Letter to Provost and VP Academic

Miriam Richards

~

Welcome New BUFA Members

~

Calendar of Events

~

The BUFA Executive and Contacts

Keep up-to-date on what’s happening with your faculty association through social media.

Twitter: @BUFABrock

Facebook: search "Brock University Faculty Association"

Editor: Nancy Taber

Editorial Assistant: Joy Werner

Message from the President *(continued from cover page)*

This decision is important for all of us.

The abilities, attitudes, vision, and values of the individual who is chosen as our next president will have a significant impact on Brock's future. Recent examples have shown how ill-advised decisions of university presidents can disrupt a university's functioning and well-being. For example, the University of Saskatchewan President dismissed a tenured Dean because he criticized the university's program review and prioritization exercise, as well as "leaking" the President's ban on any public criticism by Deans. His dismissal resulted in a storm of international outrage directed at the University and led to the resignation of both the President and Provost. In the midst of labour negotiations, the University of Windsor President unilaterally imposed draconian contract conditions on faculty and librarians. His actions undermined the collective bargaining process and seriously damaged labour relations at the University for many years to come.

On the other hand, *new Presidents can bring a sense of renewal*, hope for the healthy resolution of differences, and a promise of future productive collaborative problem solving. At the University of Alberta, University of Guelph, and St. Francis of Xavier University, for example, faculty associations recently have expressed some optimism that new Presidents will help them return to the core academic values of their universities, as well as healing the divisiveness and misdirection that had occurred as a result of problematic program review and prioritization processes.

As outlined in FHB 3.1, a primary responsibility of the President is to supervise and direct the implementation of the educational policy and general University administration, the teaching staff, and the students. In addition, the President makes recommendations about academic and senior administrative appointments. In this context, we note that, within President Lightstone's term, almost every Vice President and Dean has been replaced and a number of new Associate Vice-President positions have been created. The President bridges between, and supports the work of, the Senate and the Board, links us to the community, and raises funds. An increasingly important focus for the President is representing us in negotiations with the Province. Thus the President is powerfully positioned to influence our institution. *Let us take every opportunity, therefore, to exert our influence in the process* of his or her selection.

We need a President who comes from the academic world.

The President's job is a complex one, requiring a wide range of skills, an openness to dialogue and joint problem solving, and values that are consistent with Brock culture. There is no question that our next president must understand financial issues, as well as having the political knowledge and instincts to deal with an increasingly interventionist provincial government.

But, beyond all this, our next President must be an academic.



Some Canadian universities have chosen presidents from outside academia (e.g. Nipissing, Laurentian, Ottawa). Given financial difficulties, it is easy to see how Boards of Trustees and others might be tempted to hire a president who has a corporate orientation and will run the university as a commercial enterprise. The business background of many Board members and increasing commercialization of university life are likely to exacerbate this temptation.

However, the University is not like a commercial business, whose primary purpose is to make money, with corresponding priorities of cost-effectiveness and productivity. *Universities have unique characteristics that, on one hand, protect its academic mission but, on the other hand, are incompatible with corporate management models.* In a recent address to the Brock Senate, Dr. Glen Jones (OISE) identified these unique factors as follows: (1) academic freedom and tenure; (2) shared academic decision making, which requires consensus-building and a focus on open processes; (3) a strong "organizational field", reflecting shared conceptions of "right and wrong" and institutional norms across universities; and (4) more limited management powers of university president, largely due to the former three factors.

A President who comes from outside the university sector is unlikely to understand the academic culture fully, be able to effectively manage within it, and champion and protect the priority of the University's academic mission.

Message from the President *(continued from page 2)*

Tell us your name; we'll tell you ours!

Our University President should be chosen through an open search. By this I mean that the short-listed candidates be invited to address the Brock community and meet directly with faculty, librarians, students, staff, and community members. This is similar to the process currently used at Brock for the hiring of Vice-Presidents and other senior administrators.



If this Advisory Committee follows past practice, it will keep the names of short-listed candidates secret. The interview process will be closed. Any campus visits by candidates will be secret. Once the Committee determines a final candidate, it will present that candidate, and only that candidate, to Senate, in an in camera meeting (FHB 3.2.2). The Committee will then submit its recommendation to the Board for a decision. Is there anything in the FHB itself that involves the larger Brock community in the process of selecting our next President? Only in FHB 3.2.2.8 (emphasis added): “**Following** appointment, the successful candidate shall be invited to meet with the University community”.

The primary (and often only) argument made for refusing to hold an open search is that good candidates won't apply because they don't want their Board of Trustees or others to know of their interest in exploring a move to another institution. Indeed, some possible candidates may agree to be considered only under secretive conditions. However, we believe that the benefits of an open search are significantly greater than the potential loss of those candidates, whose need for confidentiality outweighs their interest in becoming our next President.

An open and transparent search reflects a university's commitment to shared academic self-governance and collegial decision-making. We want to have a president who will consult with us when big decisions have to be made. What kind of a decision-making model are we demonstrating for a new president, when the big decision about the next president is made with very limited consultation with the Brock community? *Open searches help build connections between those working and studying at the University and the new President.* This sense of connection would give the new President a “head start” in earning the confidence of the Brock community, rather than starting off surrounded by suspicions that might follow an exclusionary search process.

Additional considerations concern the type of individual who would be deterred by an open search. Do we want a president who won't pursue this leadership opportunity out of fear? Further, should we hire someone who does not want to meet with groups of people with whom he or she will be working? The fewer people meeting the candidates, the more limited are the views expressed, the questions asked, the issues explored, and the ideas considered.

Only with an open search, will members of the Brock community be able to directly assess the qualifications, vision, and suitability of the short-listed candidates. Only with an open search, will interested Brock community members be able to provide informed comments to the Advisory Committee and/or the Board before a hiring decision is made. And only with an open search, could our next president get to know us. In doing so, he or she will get a more authentic and nuanced view of our institution than could possibly be achieved in a set of closed interviews with Committee members and selected others.

The Advisory Committee is charged with giving “careful consideration to the need to communicate with the community” (FHB 3.2). When the Committee asks for your input into the how the search should be conducted, please let them know what you think.

OCUFA's October 2014 Board Meeting: Setting priorities for the year ahead

Larry Savage, BUFA OCUFA Director



On October 25-26, 2014, OCUFA held its 144th Board of Directors meeting. Three times a year, OCUFA's Board – composed of representatives from all 28 of its member faculty associations – come together to discuss emerging issues and the organization's ongoing advocacy work.

One of the key objectives of this meeting was to identify key priorities for OCUFA in the year ahead. After reviewing the political and collective bargaining context in Ontario, the Board identified university pension plans, faculty complement/precarious academic work, and e-learning as priority initiatives for 2014-15.

Pension initiative

OCUFA's work on pension security will focus on the project underway to explore the development of a multi-employer Jointly Sponsored Pension Plan for the university sector. OCUFA is leading this initiative, alongside the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), with financial support from the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities (MTCU). The project aims to present a framework for a new JSPP by September 2015. Faculty associations will have the option to enter the new plan on a voluntary basis. OCUFA will support the project by providing communications support, staff resources, and by liaising with MTCU and the Ministry of Finance. Faculty Associations that decide to remain in single-employer plans will continue to receive support from OCUFA.

Faculty complement/precarious academic work

It is clear that over the last fifteen years hiring of tenure-stream professors has not kept pace with enrolment increases in Ontario. Increasingly, administrators are turning to contract faculty to meet the instructional needs of their universities. These contract faculty often work without job

security, without access to benefits, and for low pay.

OCUFA's Board was unanimous in setting this issue as a key priority for 2014-15. OCUFA staff are now working directly with contract faculty to develop a plan of action and explore potential activities going forward. A more fully developed plan will be presented to the OCUFA Board at the February 2015 meeting.

E-learning

In recent years, the Government of Ontario has signaled its intention to expand online and e-learning options in Ontario. While faculty are supportive of the appropriate use of e-learning, expanded e-learning must be undertaken to improve student success, not cut costs. The OCUFA Board has set e-learning as a priority, and the organization will work to support our members as they advocate for high-quality e-learning options that respect academic freedom, intellectual property, and collective agreements. To that end, OCUFA will host an e-learning workshop on March 20, 2015 as a first step to developing policy recommendations and strategies for collective bargaining around e-learning. The OCUFA Board also mandated the organization to strongly advocate with the Ontario government for faculty representation on the Board of Directors and committees of Ontario Online, a new government initiative designed to increase online course provision in the province. OCUFA staff will provide member associations with a template letter to be sent to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities and the Council of Ontario Universities regarding this issue

During the Board meeting, OCUFA presented its annual teaching awards to outstanding faculty members from across Ontario at a special gala luncheon. Winners from Wilfrid Laurier, U of T, York, McMaster, and Western were recognized. Deputy Premier Deb Matthews also attended and presented welcoming remarks.

The next OCUFA Board meeting will be held on February 7-8, 2015.



www.BUFA.ca



Message from the Grievance Officer

BUFA's Grievance Panel is "Member Owned and Operated"

David Whitehead, BUFA Grievance Officer



For the previous two years, BUFA's Grievance Panel has been "Member Owned and Operated." BUFA members' issues are dealt with by other BUFA members who are trained, experienced members of the BUFA Grievance Panel.

Before this time, the BUFA Executive Director and the BUFA Grievance Officer handled members' issues and consulted members of a BUFA Grievance Committee as required, but in January 2013, the members of the BUFA Grievance Panel, under written Terms of Reference approved by the BUFA Executive, became significantly more active, meeting monthly to discuss issues; receiving regular training in grievance handling processes; receiving appointments to represent members with questions, complaints or grievances; investigating members' issues; presenting members' cases in meetings of the BUFA Grievance Panel and in formal grievance meetings with the Administration; and advising both the BUFA Grievance Officer and the BUFA Executive on grievance related matters. The members of the Grievance Panel and an introduction to grievance handling processes can be found in the [Grievance Corner](#) on the BUFA web site.

This transition to an active grievance handling role for members of the BUFA Grievance Panel has mirrored the transition of BUFA from a Faculty Association in which decisions were made and member services were provided primarily by paid staff in Executive Director positions to a "member owned and operated" Faculty Association where it is BUFA members, supported by three experienced and knowledgeable paid staff providing administrative support in the BUFA Office, who make decisions and provide services to other BUFA members.

BUFA has been on this journey to increase member mobilization, increase member communication, increase transparency and accountability to members, and increase member engagement and commitment for over four years, and the BUFA Grievance Panel is playing a key role in that transition.

Of course, BUFA is not the only Faculty Association in Ontario and Canada that has been transitioning to a "member mobilizing" model, and Faculty Associations elsewhere mobilize their members in many different ways. There are a wide variety of Faculty Association structures and processes that can and do meet the needs of members and, in Ontario and across Canada, there is widespread recognition of, and respect for, for this variety of approaches.

In order to provide excellent service to BUFA members, the members of the BUFA Grievance Panel require and receive excellent administrative support by dedicated staff in the BUFA office; specialized software and hardware for secure communication and document storage; opinions and representation provided by legal counsel on retainer; and legal and professional support, including training and networking, provided by OCUFA and CAUT, the provincial and national associations to which BUFA belongs.

The annual CAUT Workshop for Senior Grievance Officers was held most recently in Ottawa from December 12 to 14, 2014, and is an excellent example of the indispensable training and networking provided by the national and provincial associations to which BUFA belongs. Dave Whitehead, BUFA's Grievance Officer, and Francine McCarthy, BUFA's Assistant Grievance Officer, both attended this workshop, networked with CAUT professional and legal staff including David Robinson, CAUT's recently appointed Executive Director,



and Paula Turtle, CAUT General Counsel, and networked with Grievance Officers from other faculty associations across Canada. In addition, Dave and Francine participated in sessions developed around a theme of "best practices in grievance handling models" organized in order share best practices and inform the development of a Grievance Handling Manual by CAUT. At the workshop, sessions were also held on ways to bring down equity barriers and

diversity barriers to accessing the grievance process, ensuring that confidentiality is maintained in the grievance handling process, and a review of significant recent grievance arbitration awards and labour-related court decisions across Canada.

The final workshop session was facilitated by Paul Jones, CAUT's Policy and Education Officer. In this final session, Chantal Sundaram, who is Assistant Executive Director at CAUT and the CAUT staff-person assigned on a regular basis to assist BUFA at the local level on issues concerning both collective bargaining and grievance handling, and Dave Whitehead, BUFA's Grievance Officer, co-presented on "Policy Formulation: Developing a Manual on Best Practices for Structuring Grievance Handling."



During this session, Paul Jones announced that he expected that this new CAUT Grievance Handling Manual could be available as soon as the spring of 2015.

In summary, both BUFA and the BUFA Grievance Panel are on a journey to become increasingly "member owned and operated." The challenges are many and the path is not straight and narrow, but *the rewards for members of our Faculty Association in terms of increased engagement and commitment, better representation and better service are significant and many.*

For more information about BUFA's Grievance Procedure, visit www.BUFA.ca and look under the Resources tab or contact: Grievance Officer J. David Whitehead | david.whitehead@brocku.ca | extension 3268

Letter to Provost & VP Academic

Miriam Richards

8 January 2015

Dear Dr. McCartney,

The recent cancellation of the Wiley journal subscriptions seems to me to be one more piece of evidence that Brock is becoming a very difficult place to do research. The library cuts are incontrovertible evidence that research and scholarship have become low priorities at Brock University. Several decisions in the last few years have caused my current pessimism that the research enterprise at this university, especially in the Faculty of Mathematics and Science, is actually a priority and that it can really prosper. The Wiley cut is just the last straw in a series of decisions that have been made with little or no consultation and no appreciation for the damage they would do to research activities.

In the last several years, many of our colleagues have lost their NSERC funding. Many of us who have managed to retain our NSERC funding are getting considerably less money than previously. This, is of course, a consequence of federal cutbacks to basic research funding, and is not the fault of anyone at our university. However, several decisions made at Brock have exacerbated the problems caused by cuts to external funding, and suggest that our research success is taken for granted rather than being actively supported.

First, Brock graduate funding to science students has been slashed. A few years ago, there were extra funds for stipends for both MSc and PhD students, but no more. Whereas these funds were formerly provided by both the Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean of Math and Science, one of the first actions of our current Dean was to opt out of this program and not to provide further funding. Then the funding was focussed solely towards MSc students, leaving funding for PhD students to be paid from our (dwindling) grants. Now, while funding still exists for MSc students (and is appreciated), the amount per student and the number of stipends has dropped significantly. I would like to provide an illustration of the effect of these cuts. Whereas several years ago I had five graduate students in my lab (2 PhD and 3 MSc), I now have two (both PhD students). Whereas I previously averaged

one new graduate student per year, the interval between acceptances is now up to three years, because PhD stipends are my responsibility, leaving no financial room for stipends for new graduate students. Not only does this represent a substantial decline in my lab's research productivity, but it represents a considerable decline in graduate enrolment in Biological Sciences program. As a former Graduate Director, I am quite sure that my experience is not unique.

Second, the Brock Experience Works program was cancelled. Experience Works was a program that was extremely valuable to research labs, because it provided considerable funds to pay for research assistants, especially in the summer. For many years (about ten) I applied for and usually received funding to train and pay one or two research assistants who assisted my graduate students and who collected bee specimens for the longest running demographic survey of bee populations in Canada (and probably the longest in the world). This program disappeared without notice or explanation last year. According to what I could learn in Senate last year, the decision to terminate this program was made by the Vice President, Finance and Administration. I doubt if there was any real consideration of the effect that cutting this funding would have on research labs, although in Senate last year, I tried to emphasize the importance of this program as a way of providing both funding to research labs and job experience to science undergraduate. In Senate, I was assured (twice) by the Vice President Research that those aspects of the Experience Works program that had contributed to research would soon be replaced. As far as I can tell, this has not happened. Last year I was not able to hire a research assistant, as my funds are supporting graduate students. This year may be the same. A promising long-term research project that has produced multiple publications, with several more in the works, may have to be shut down.

The most recent blow was the library's decision to cut the Wiley subscription. For me, this was the nail in the coffin. No attempt at all was made to consult those of us most likely to be affected. It was even claimed that cutting the Wiley subscription "had the advantage of not harming one academic discipline disproportionately over another; cutting book spending would disproportionately impact the humanities and social sciences." I strongly dispute the claim that no discipline would be disproportionately harmed – the decision to eliminate journal subscriptions disproportionately influences scientific disciplines that are far more dependent on journals than on books. The list of journals deleted is clearly not evenly spread across disciplines. Of the more than 1300 journals cut, 509 are in disciplines related to Biosciences (life, medical and health, and environmental sciences). Altogether the science, math, and statistics journals comprise 736 of the cancelled titles, well more than half of the subscriptions. Moreover, the science titles, particularly the life science titles, represent journals with average impact factors 2 to 3 times higher than those related to humanities, social sciences, business or education. Thus the impact of the cuts to scientific disciplines is even greater. The evidence is that these cuts disproportionately affect scholarship and teaching in science.

I also am sceptical about the claim that the damage can be mitigated through email delivery of pdf versions of the papers. The Racer version of papers does not deliver complete publications – supplementary information is accessed through electronic links in the online versions of papers. We cannot be certain that access to supplementary files and data will be possible without a subscription, yet these are critical components of the information contained in scientific journals.

The damage to my own disciplines of ecology, evolution, entomology and behaviour will be significant. By subject area, the cuts include 53 journals of direct relevance to my teaching and research. One of the journals is Molecular Ecology, the premier journal in its field, and my course BIOL 3P97 Molecular Ecology is based on this journal. All the labs, which are focussed on experiential learning, are based on student access to the data sets attached to recent articles in this journal. The course is next scheduled to be delivered in fall 2015 - without student access to Molecular Ecology, this will be the last time that I can teach the course. Next year, Adonis Skandalis and I plan to offer a new course on Human Evolution. We think this will be a great course – but as the course focusses on a rapidly changing field that depends on access to journals that have been cut, including the world's premier evolution journal, Evolution, the American Journal of Primatology, Genes, Brain and Behavior, and Evolutionary Anthropology, the first offering of this course may also be the last. Student satisfaction is a high priority at Brock – and one reason for their satisfaction in my courses has been their ability to quickly access recent publications. I am pretty sure that my students will not find that being limited to older work provides a satisfactory experience. In addition to these specific examples, in my research lab and in my classes, my graduate and undergraduate will now have to do without full access to 12 journals in entomology, 15 in behaviour and ecology, 9 in evolution and dozens more including journals that we regularly use and publish in. I don't think my students are getting a loud and clear message that scholarly work and achievement is a high priority at this university. As one of my graduate students remarked, a cut in library access to journals due to financial constraints is understandable, but the complete absence of any plan to redress the consequences and restore the subscriptions, suggests that the problem is not considered to be worth addressing.

While I certainly understand the demands on library staff to meet budget commitments, and I also understand that many academic publishers, including Wiley demand ever-increasing and rapacious journal subscription fees, I hold the senior administration of this university responsible for creating a culture in which a disastrous decision of this magnitude could be made without consultation with those most likely to be affected and without any real consideration of the consequences. Perhaps this was the

inevitable outcome of a Strategic Plan that sets out a list of “values” that does not include the terms “teaching”, “scholarship” or “research”, referring instead to “generation and mobilization of knowledge”. This is the seventh and last item on the list of values, as if teaching, scholarship and research, formerly the *raison d’être* of the university, have become an afterthought. The Wiley subscription cut was announced a month ago, and since then, the only thing that we have heard from the ranks of Deans, Associate Deans, Vice Presidents, and Associate Vice Presidents whose job it is to facilitate the research enterprise and to sustain the morale of researchers working under difficult circumstances, has been silence. The silence suggests that most of the senior administration of this university do not really think it is worth doing anything other than agreeing that this is an unfortunate situation, but shrugging their shoulders and doing nothing about it (which is the reaction I’ve already had in conversation).

As I wrote this letter, I noticed a new post on the Brock News entitled “Are Academic Journals Obsolete?” (posted 7 January, <http://www.brocku.ca/news/28038>). Reading the post, the message is clear – academic journals are very expensive and obsolete and the only reason we still have them is that the professoriate is too traditional to change and to communicate in a more modern way. A colleague at Simon Fraser who read the post on social media commented, “This is freaking unbelievable. How do they expect anyone to take them seriously as a University?”. I think that perfectly summarizes this entire episode.

Yours sincerely,

Miriam Richards
Professor, Biological Sciences

cc:

Linda Rose-Krasnor, BUFA President
Tomas Hudlicky, Chemistry Professor
Susan Sydor, Chair of Senate
Barbara McDonald, University Librarian

Gary Libben, VP Research
Ejaz Ahmed, Dean, Mathematics and Science
Mike Plyley, Dean, Graduate Studies

Welcome to our Newest BUFA Members

Feng Li
Chemistry

Mark Weiler
Liaison Services Studies



OCUFA E-Learning

OCUFA announced an upcoming workshop designed to help faculty members develop high-quality online courses while protecting academic freedom and intellectual property. The Faculty Leadership in E-Learning Workshop will be held on March 20, 2015 at the Westin Harbour Castle in Toronto.

Join OCUFA for a day of discussion, skill-building, and action for faculty members interested in e-learning. This workshop will focus on the opportunities for pedagogical improvement created by online learning and the challenges associated with deploying new learning technologies to improve educational outcomes, not institutional bottom lines. The workshop will be action oriented, gathering information from participants and working towards the development of an action plan for professors, academic librarians, and faculty associations across the province.

Of interest to faculty who are engaged in issues relating to online pedagogy as well as chief negotiators and bargaining team members, this workshop is your chance to reflect, engage, and work for positive change. [Register today!](#)

Calendar of Events at Brock and in the Community (Visit us online for more information)



BUFA
BROCK UNIVERSITY FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Upcoming General Membership Meetings
February 26 and May 20, 2015
1 - 3pm ~ Pond Inlet



www.BUFA.ca

2014-2017 Collective Agreement
Electronic copy now available!

www.BUFA.ca
(Under the resources tab)

DAYS OF
Wine and chocolate



Indulge in this delightfully delicious tasting event at 26 Wineries.
Every weekend in February - 11am to 5pm.

Show your union pride...
BUFA GEAR
Place your order NOW!



Winter Reading Week
February 16-20, 2015

OCUFA STATUS OF WOMEN COMMITTEE WORKSHOP

May 15, 2015

Writing Compelling Commentary
Shari Graydon, Informed Opinions

This highly interactive workshop builds women’s leadership capacity and enhances their credibility and influence by providing participants with the confidence and tools to contribute their expertise to the public discourse through compelling, short-form written commentary for newspaper op ed pages and online sites. The workshop will be of particular interest and use to diversely-positioned women scholars. Attendance is limited so register early.

Registration: www.ocufa.on.ca/events/



The Voice of Ontario’s University Professors and Academic Librarians

OCUFA Service Award

The OCUFA Service Award was established two years ago to honour individuals who have done, or continue to do, exceptional work on behalf of the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations and its Members. Up to six awards may be given each year and are presented during OCUFA’s Annual General Meeting, which will be held this year on May 9, 2015. The deadline for nominations this year is April 3, 2015.

For more information about the award and the nomination form, please visit:
<http://ocufa.on.ca/ocufa-awards/ocufa-serviceaward/>

Day of PINK
Combat Against Bullying and Harassment

Wednesday, February 25, 2015



Sponsored by: OSSTF D 35
Brock University Support Staff





Executive Committee and Staff Contact List

President	Linda Rose-Krasnor Psychology	Extension 3870 linda.rose-krasnor@brocku.ca
Vice President	Michelle Webber Sociology	Extension 4411 mwebber@brocku.ca
Past President	Hans Skott-Myhre Child & Youth Studies	Extension 4323 hans.skott-myhre@brocku.ca
Treasurer	Sandra Felton Accounting	Extension 3452 sfelton@brocku.ca
Grievance Officer	David Whitehead Organizational Behavior, Human Resources, Entrepreneurship, and Ethics	Extension 3449 david.whitehead@brocku.ca
Health and Safety Officer	Lisa Barrow Organizational Behavior, Human Resources, Entrepreneurship, and Ethics	Extension 5401 lbarrow@brocku.ca
Secretary	Coral Mitchell Graduate and Undergraduate Education	Extension 4413 coral.mitchell@brocku.ca
OCUFA Director	Larry Savage Labour Studies	Extension 5007 lsavage@brocku.ca
Communications Officer	Nancy Taber Graduate & Undergraduate Education	Extension 4218 ntaber@brocku.ca
Non-Tenured Faculty Representative	Santo D'Agostino Physics	Extension 5785 sdagostino@brocku.ca
Professional Librarian Representative	Heather Whipple Library Liaison Services	Extension 4880 hwhipple@brocku.ca
Member-at-large	Jennifer Li Accounting	Extension 4238 jennifer.li@brocku.ca
Member-at-large	Bozidar Mitrovic Physics	Extension 3415 mitrovic@brocku.ca
Executive Assistant	Shannon Lever BUFA Office, D402	Extension 4643 slever@brocku.ca
Administrative Coordinator	Joy Werner BUFA Office, D402	Extension 3268 jwerner@brocku.ca
Administrative Assistant	Laurie Jansen BUFA Office, C409	Extension 5378 ljansen@brocku.ca

* BUFA OFFICE FAX NUMBER (905) 688-8256