

INTERESTING TIMES

A Newsletter from AUNBT

founded 1956 • <http://aunbt.caut.ca>

Winter 2010

As this Newsletter appears, UNB's academic unions have been attempting to negotiate:

- since May 2008 for a first collective agreement for AUNBT's unit of part-time academic employees
- since Fall 2008 for a first collective agreement for PSAC's unit of graduate student TAs and RAs
- since June 2009 for a renewed collective agreement for AUNBT's unit of full-time academics.

All three negotiations have encountered extraordinary delays. This reflects an approach to bargaining on the part of the employer that bodes ill for labour peace at UNB. Once our own contracts have been settled, AUNBT will offer extended comments on the administration's shifting approach to relations in the workplace.

Meanwhile, in this newsletter we share information of general interest elicited recently through questions at one or other of the Senates. Members will find this to be valuable material that can be turned up nowhere else. It deals with UNB **degree programs offered abroad, electronic privacy** and the **Maclean's survey**. Concerning university operations off-shore, the salient point is that little of the considerable revenue they earn shows up in the university's central or campus operating budgets. On the issue of electronic privacy, members will note below that there is no mechanism in place to collect statistics on how often employee privacy is violated and no audit of whether ITS complies with its published privacy policy. In a follow-up response it became evident that employees are also not informed when the employer has violated their e-privacy. We understand that now the president intends to appoint a task-force to examine the state of electronic privacy. Finally, the Maclean's question was prompted by general curiosity as to how UNB's student/teacher ratio can rank best among comprehensive universities.

Q What academic programs does UNB offer off-shore?

Campus Program	Country	Status
UNBF BA(Psyc)	Singapore	Expected start 2010/SU
UNBF BBA	Trinidad	Active
UNBF BBA	Egypt	Active
UNBF BBA	Singapore	Active
UNBF BED	Trinidad	Active

UNBF BISys	Singapore	Expected start 2010/WI
UNBF MBA	Ukraine (Kiev)	Active
UNBF MBA	Poland	Closed
UNBF MED	Trinidad	Active
UNBSJ BBA	China (Beijing)	Closed
UNBSJ BISC	United Arab Emirates (Dubai)	Did not proceed
UNBSJ BscCs	China (Beijing)	Closed
UNBSJ MBA	Poland	Closed

In addition, it is our understanding that the MEd previously offered in Bhutan and the Post-RN previously offered in Bermuda are no longer active. While not "offshore", the RPB Team reminds Senate that we also have an active BN program in Ontario.

Q *How much revenue do these programs realize and where does it show up?*

Discussions with staff at UNBSJ's Financial and Administrative Services confirm that there are presently no active programs for which revenue and expenses should be budgeted. At UNBF, the RPB Team confirms that faculties are expected to budget for the revenues and expenses related to offshore programs within their individual budget portfolios. This exercise is undertaken each year during the annual budget process (currently underway).

The RPB Team also confirms that the gross budgeted revenue related to active programs in 2010-11 (as described [above]) totals \$3.4 Million. Of this amount, almost \$2.4 Million (or 70%) are budgeted within the Faculties offering the programs as direct/indirect costs of the programs; an additional \$0.5 Million (or 14%) remains within the Faculties to offset other initiatives; \$0.4 Million (11%) is received centrally and recorded within general operating revenues of the Fredericton Campus and \$0.2 Million (or 5%) is allocated from certain programs to the Harriet Irving Library as an offset to the cost of library e-resources related to the incremental students.

QUESTIONS ON ITS & E-PRIVACY

Q *For how long does UNB retain copies of e-mail generated by academics in their correspondence with students and with other academics?*

UNB backs up the email server daily; the backup files are retained for approximately two months, then deleted—the backup ensures that data that are lost, deleted, or corrupted can be

recovered. If an individual faculty/staff member or student uses IMAP (Internet Message Access Protocol) their email folders and messages are stored on the central system and are thus backed up. If POP (Post Office Protocol) is used, messages are stored locally (either on the user's personal computer or network file share) and thus may or may not be backed up. In either case, when an individual user deletes messages, they are permanently removed from the system and cannot be recovered after the backups are deleted. To be backed up, messages must be on the system at least overnight; if a message is sent but deleted immediately, it will not be backed up, and there will be no record of it.

Q *What are and have been the written policies and safeguards to privacy governing how ITS "routinely monitors systems and maintains logs and records that may contain information about an identifiable individual"?*

ITS monitors all of its systems in the sense that automatic alerts are generated when specific network traffic, hardware, or server software issues require intervention. For example, unusual traffic patterns on the network, such as denial of service attacks, or downloads of very large media files, can be detected and brought to the attention of operators, who analyse the activity to determine if a problem is occurring that requires intervention. In these cases, we can often identify the individual computer involved, and isolate it (i.e. disable the network connection to that machine). Users of desktop computers logged on the network can be identified by their login ID, as recorded in log files (and subject to the same backup process as described above); in the example, we can surmise from the login information who may be responsible for the unwanted activity.

Q *What are and have been the written policies whereby "the appropriate senior University official" authorizes "access to a person's files or personal information"? Who*

is the senior University official authorizing access? On how many occasions did s/he authorize such access during the most recent 12 month period for which statistics can be generated? To what range of individuals is access provided? What meaning is attached to the terms "required" and "by law"?

In ITS, "Senior University Official" is defined as a Vice-President, or the President. Only these individuals may request access to, or copies of, files from the network or email accounts of individuals at UNB. In practice, most cases in which such access is requested fall into one of two categories: suspected illegal or inappropriate comments or behaviour, or an employee has left UNB and their files need to be shared to facilitate continuity. All such cases are confidential, and only individuals with a need to know are informed of the requests. These files are subject to the same backup/retention processes as any other data, and thus the period in which they are available to be accessed is limited. Requests for records by law-enforcement officials are referred to UNB's legal counsel (we have never actually received such a request).

Q *What audit policy is in place whereby UNB assures itself that "access to a person's files or personal information" occurs solely in accordance with the [announced] policies...and not otherwise? What has been the finding of such compliance audits? Are the audits internal or external to UNB? to ITS?*

From the ITS perspective, there is no formal audit process in place to ensure this. In practice, only very serious issues or pressing needs result in access being requested or provided. However, all such requests are logged in our issue tracking system, including the specific request, the authorization, and the action taken.

UNB & THE MACLEAN'S SURVEY

Q *In 2006 the UNB administration announced that it would no longer participate in the MacLean's survey but it seems to be doing so nonetheless.*

In the fall of 2006, the University of New Brunswick announced it would no longer submit data to Maclean's magazine for use in their annual university rankings process. UNB was among the 25 other universities that made a similar decision at that time.

In the fall of 2006, Maclean's magazine announced that it was planning to change its method of data collection and the number of indicators in the following year. In 2007, the Maclean's questionnaire was dramatically revised and shortened compared to previous years. Maclean's decided to obtain the majority of its information from publicly available third party sources, such as Statistics Canada, the Canadian Association of University Business Officers, the Canadian Association of Research Libraries, the three major Federal granting agencies and Common University Data Ontario (CUDO). The Maclean's questionnaire to universities went from over one hundred data requirements in 2006 to 32 in 2007 (16 in 2009). The ranking moved from 23 indicators in 6 categories to 13, or 14 indicators, depending on university grouping, in 6 categories.

As these changes occurred, it became clear that Maclean's would be able to publicly source most information for a large number of universities in order to prepare its annual ranking. UNB then reconsidered whether it would complete the revised Maclean's questionnaire. UNB made the decision to complete the Maclean's questionnaire in 2007 and continued to do so in 2008 and 2009. [2 irrelevant sentences omitted]

Q *With reference to UNB's student-to-faculty ratio in Maclean's: precisely how is student-to-faculty ratio calculated?*

Maclean's calculates the student-faculty ratio by dividing the number of full-time equivalent students (graduate and undergraduate students) by the number of full-time faculty members. To determine full-time equivalency enrolment, Maclean's uses the following formula: FTE = (full-time + (part-time/3.5)).

Maclean's uses the number of all full-time and part-time students, that is undergraduate and undergraduate students at the institutional level, to calculate the student-to-faculty ratio. As mentioned earlier break downs were done to determine weighted full-time equivalency. Presently, Maclean's uses the following weights to determine the weighted full-time equivalent enrolment:

Students in Group A, that is undergraduate arts, humanities, commerce, education, plus "other program" are given a weight of 1;

Students in Group B, that is undergraduate sciences, math, engineering are given a weight of 2;

Students in Group C, that is undergraduate students in health sciences are given a weight of 5;

Master's students are given a weight of 3;

Doctoral students are given a weight of 4;

Other graduate level students are given a weight of 2.5.

SOME SENATE ADDENDA

Senators appreciate the considerable effort that goes into compiling answers to some of these queries but not all questions elicit such useful data. Repeated questioning as to the implications of

community college co-location for library and support services, parking, traffic patterns etc has revealed that, as one surmised, the administration accepted the colleges undeterred by the fact that it had not investigated, let alone entered agreement with the province, as to the practical implications to UNB of co-location.

On the perennial question of what UNB is doing to accomplish the long-stated goal of **separate government grants** to the two main campuses, the administration continues to have nothing to report.

Finally, a fairly abstract Senate question on "**suspension**" of **new enrolment in academic programs** took on practical significance when a dean purported to suspend enrolment of new students in a degree program, thereby sentencing it to death.

The issue is what collegial process - *ie*, faculty council and senate - ought properly to precede, inform and take such decisions. *Creation* of academic programs is a Senate decision. *Termination* is a Senate decision. So how could *suspension* of new student enrolment, leading inevitably to program collapse, fail to be a Senate decision?

The initial response to this question, offered by one of the vice-presidents, was that the appropriate process depends on whether the motivation for suspension is *academic* (province of the Senates) or *financial* (jurisdiction of management). When the Fredericton Senate grew restless over this rationale, which by deeming matters to be financial could deprive it of much of its jurisdiction, the vice president undertook to seek further advice and return to the Senate. There the matter stands.