

**Irish Federation of University Teachers**

**PROCEEDINGS**

**OF**

**ANNUAL DELEGATE**

**CONFERENCE**

**2014**

**Cónaidhm Éireannach na Múinteoirí Ollscoile**

# **PROCEEDINGS OF 2014 ADC**

## **1 OPENING**

The President Dr Rose Malone, NUIM, opened the 48<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Irish Federation of University Teachers at 11:00am on Saturday 10 May 2014 in Buswells Hotel, Molesworth Street, Dublin 2. Speaking in Irish and English Dr Malone welcomed all delegates, observers and guests.

The General Secretary then welcomed our Fraternal Delegates: Mr Gerard Craughwell, President, Teachers' Union of Ireland; Ms Annette Dolan, Deputy General Secretary, Teachers' Union of Ireland; Mr Brendan O'Sullivan, Outgoing President, Irish National Teachers' Organisation; Ms Julie Orr, Vice President, Ulster Teachers' Union. He also said he was delighted that Ms Sally Maguire, President and Mr Pat King, General Secretary of Association of Secondary Teachers Ireland would join us later.

The General Secretary then conveyed to the meeting the messages of goodwill and solidarity which had been received from: Mr Martin Romer, European Director, European Trade Union Committee for Education (ETUCE); Ms Sharn Riggs, National Secretary, National Tertiary Education Union, New Zealand; Mr David Begg, General Secretary, Irish Congress of Trade Unions; and Ms Sally Hunt, General Secretary, University & College Union, UK.

The President congratulated Mr Michael Delargey, UCC on his election as Incoming President of the union.

## **2 STANDING ORDERS REPORT**

The report of the Standing Orders Committee was presented to the conference. Its adoption was proposed by Michael Delargey, UCC - Incoming President and Anthony Harvey, Royal Irish Academy – Central Branch and agreed unanimously.

## **3 ELECTION OF TELLERS**

Russell Higgs, UCD; Tony O'Farrell, NUIM and Angela Flynn, UCC were nominated and agreed.

## **4 PROCEEDINGS OF 2013 ADC**

The proceedings of the previous Annual Delegate Conference were tabled for approval and were unanimously agreed by the meeting.

## **5 ANNUAL REPORT 2013/2014**

The President then invited the General Secretary, Mike Jennings and the Deputy General Secretary, Joan Donegan to present the Annual Report for 2013/2014. The text of the General Secretary's Speech introducing the Report is attached at Appendix II.

The General Secretary, Mike Jennings then presented the Annual Report for 2013/2014. The text of his speech introducing the Report is at Appendix III.

The President congratulated the General Secretary and Deputy General Secretary and the Secretary/Office Manager, Ms Phyllis Russell on an incredibly busy and effective year on behalf of the members of the union.

The President reminded all present that all members of IFUT have the right to speak at the ADC. The conference is very open. All sessions are open to the Public with the exception of Financial Affairs.

The Adoption of the Annual Report was then put to the ADC and was unanimously agreed.

## **6 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS**

The Presidential Address was delivered by Dr Rose Malone of NUIM (see Appendix II). At the conclusion of the Speech there was sustained applause from the conference.

The General Secretary then introduced the first Guest Speaker, Dr David Robinson Executive Director Elect of the Canadian Association of University Teachers. The General Secretary said that he was honoured to introduce David not only as a distinguished guest but also as a very good friend both personally and a friend of IFUT. In that regard he was particularly pleased to note that David had just recently been elected to the position as Executive Director of the CAUT. David Robinson's Speech is attached as Appendix IV.

**The conference then adjourned for lunch.**

## **7 FINANCIAL REPORT**

The Financial Report was debated in Private Session. The report was presented by Mr Michael Delargey, Vice President-Finance.

Following a number of comments and questions from the floor which were dealt with by the General Secretary and the Vice President-Finance the Financial Report was put to the conference and agreed.

## **8 APPOINTMENT OF AUDITORS**

The General Secretary advised the ADC that the Trustees had decided to reappoint MAZARS as our Auditors for the coming year. The General Secretary thanked the outgoing Trustees Gerard Jennings, NUIG; Donal Fitzsimons, UCD and Colum Ó Cléirigh, SPD.

## **9 ELECTION OF TRUSTEES**

The General Secretary announced that Gerard Jennings, NUIG was eligible for re-nomination as a Trustee but that Colum Ó Cléirigh, SPD and Donal Fitzsimons, UCD would not be going forward. The following Trustees were then proposed and agreed: Gerard Jennings, NUIG; Gerard Enright, MICL and Maureen Killeavy, UCD.

## **10 MOTIONS ON POLICY**

### **1 Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership TTIP**

*This ADC notes that high-level discussions are proceeding between the European Union and the United States of America with a view to concluding a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. While we support economic co-operation at international level we wish to declare our deep concern that education might, inadvertently or otherwise, be classified as a commodity and be subject to the terms of a Free Trade Agreement.*

*We therefore call upon the Irish Government (the Minister for Education and Science, the Tánaiste and Minister for Trade and the Minister for Jobs, Enterprise and Employment) to ensure that no clauses are inserted into any TTIP which would have the effect of limiting public access to education at all levels and/or nor inhibit the State from conducting an education policy for the benefit of all of its citizens and other residents.*

*Proposer: Executive*

The motion was proposed by Peter Murray, NUIM. Peter said that most of what he had to say with regard to TTIP had already been expressed very eloquently by David Robinson of CAUT. He stated that Education International had expressed its concerns in the strongest possible terms and it was incumbent upon us as a national union to join in this condemnation.

The resolution was seconded by Brendan Bartley, NUIM and agreed unanimously.

## 2 Equality

*This ADC notes with satisfaction the huge enhancement of IFUT's work in the whole area of Equality including Gender Equality. We congratulate the national Equality Committee for the work done in this regard and commit ourselves to further action on this important agenda.*

*Proposer: Executive*

The motion was proposed by the Deputy General Secretary, Ms Joan Donegan. In the course of her address the DGS said the following:

"I believe everyone would agree with me if I said that;

We are lucky.

We don't live in the world of our mothers or grandmothers where career choices for women were so limited.

Most of us have grown up in a world with basic civil rights and amazingly we still live in a world where some women don't have them.

All that aside, we still have a problem and it's a real problem and the problem is this.

Women are not making it to the top of any profession anywhere in the world.

The numbers tell the story quite clearly.

190 Heads of States 16 are women

Just one in seven board members, (13.7%) at Europe's top companies is a woman.

In the University sector – a world where we might think is lead by more women

- women at the top (on average) only represent 19%

We also have another problem in that women face harder choices

- Professional success and personal fulfillment.

And as a consequence - Women are dropping out of the workplace.

The question is

- How are we going to fix this?
- How do we change these numbers at the top?
- How do we make this different?
  - Before I came to work in IFUT I worked in the largest T.U. in Ireland.
  - Amazing experience - career path was difficult.
  - Expected - Male dominated organisation.
    - Conflict resolution
    - Accepted Style – usually Adversarial
    - Unconscious Bias
  - Consequences;
    - Never get a job elsewhere
    - Unconscious bias anticipates you will be a
      - Troublemaker
- Came to IFUT 3 yrs. ago.
- Sense of University life for women would be very different
- *“.. tempting to regard universities as hospitable places for women – places where academic excellence and the merit of an argument are the overriding values, places where there is a detached and impartial consideration of issues” (Davies & Holloway, 1995: 11).*
- Rude Awakening
- Shocked.
- Although statistics show Irish females are better educated than Irish males.

- On average - 19% Professor. (Female Academics)

Only 1 in 5 women have the opportunity to make it to the top.

It would appear that much of our work should be about -

Keeping women in the workforce

I really think that this is the answer.

The problem being that women keep dropping out!

And what I would like to focus on today is - what do we do as individuals?

What is the message we tell ourselves?

What is the message we tell the people we work for and with?

What message do we tell our daughters?

My thoughts comes with no judgments

I don't have the right answer

I don't even have that for myself.

And I'm not saying that staying in the workforce is the right thing for everyone.

My thoughts today reflect rather what are the messages - if you do want to stay in the workforce.

My experience as a Union official tells me that sometimes women can underestimate their own abilities. This fact has also been born out in the “Through the Glass Ceiling Project in UCC.”

The deep irony is that the actions that women are unconsciously taking with the objective of staying in the workforce - sometimes lead them to eventually leave.

When considering future family needs some women no longer raise their hand but rather begin to lean back much earlier than is necessary.

So;

Don't leave before your leave.

Don't lift your foot off the pedal. Don't unconsciously prepare to leave ahead of time - unless and until you have to – as your job better be really good to go back to - as it is really hard to leave the little one at home!

This problem is also reflected in the number of cases that come to our attention in IFUT.

- Number of cases regarding career progression coming to my desk at the moment is negligible.
- Reality – This issue does not exist on the industrial relations landscape
- Does not exist on the political stage

Serious lack of discussion of this issue in Higher Education in Ireland.

There is no proper monitoring of statistics

No public debate

No public policy



There is a requirement now to place the equality agenda back into the realm of collective bargaining, and on the agenda of university bodies, supported and lobbied by the Trade Union Movement face to face with members of parliaments and governments.

Given the painfully slow extent of change achieved in Ireland in 25 years it would appear that gender (in)equality in 2014 is off the agenda and has been relegated to a less legitimate issue now than in the 1980s.

There is a requirement now more than ever to explore why women are not pursuing these concerns in a collective manner and supporting one another to affect structural change within the framework of the University and society generally. Perhaps in Ireland we need to reformulate a language to capture the memory of the 1960's, 1970's and 1980s?

Our Motion asks that;

This ADC notes with satisfaction the huge enhancement of IFUT's work in the whole area of Equality including Gender Equality.

This issue has been a focus of attention at a number of universities, including UCC, where the *Through the Glass Ceiling* project was recently completed, involving 219 female academics and researchers in the college, from postdoctoral to professorial level between 2010 and 2012.

UCC is also one of seven European universities undertaking the GENOVATE project which seeks to ensure equal opportunities for women and men by encouraging a more gender-competent management in research, innovation and scientific decision-making bodies.

Trinity College, Dublin is currently involved in INTEGER programme which will continue until 2016. (2011 – 2016).

Recently, Trinity College Dublin's Physics Department has been awarded Juno Practitioner status by the Institute of Physics (IOP) for taking action to address gender inequities across its student and staff body.

National University of Ireland Maynooth has recently advertised for an Equality Officer and invited staff members to communicate their views on gender equality issues to an NUIM Academic Council sub-committee that was established in January 2013.

IFUT wants to see this important work replicated across all of our Universities and Colleges in Ireland.

And we intend to work hard with our members to achieve this goal.

At the recent EI Conference in Dublin in April this year this event provided an opportunity for IFUT's presence and voice to be reported by the media and to be heard by Education International. Education International is an organization, which advances the interests of higher education and research staff by working closely with UNESCO, the ILO and other UN bodies, and by lobbying international agencies such as the OECD, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization. Due to IFUT's input at the Higher Education Workshop, the EI Conference outcomes and recommendations include an amendment to the Education International Gender Equality Action Plan to include women and gender issues in higher education and research into the text of this document.

### **Conclusion**

Our Motion also asks that;

We congratulate the national Equality Committee for the work done in this regard and commit ourselves to further action on this important agenda.

We have a wonderful team working with us in IFUT on the Equality Committee and I am especially pleased to have two male colleagues Eddie McCann from TCD and John Dunnion UCD working in our midst.

The gender equality issue is not just a women's issue.

All of Us – men and women need to take responsibility to tackle this injustice.

What father wants to see his daughter have just a one in five chance of progressing in her career in academia?

What husband wants to see his wife face such obstacles in her career?

I am sure you will agree with me that this is important work and that IFUT needs to keep its foot on the pedal to bring about speedy change to this worthwhile cause.

Thank You.”

The motion was seconded by Michael Delargey, UCC and unanimously adopted.

### **3 Gender Equality:**

*‘That IFUT will continue to pursue issues of gender inequalities within the higher education sector, and that it welcomes and endorses the recent decision of the World Women’s Conference of Education International to include an amendment relating to women and gender issues in higher education and research into their Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP)’.*

*Proposer: Angela Flynn, UCC*

*Secunder: Caitriona Ni Laoire, UCC*

In proposing the motion Angela Flynn of UCC stated that the intention of the motion was to affirm the continuing need for constant hard work on this issue. In 2013 only 19% of Professors were women and only 26% of Associate Professors. She was very concerned about the lack of transparency and the lack of hard information on this vitally important topic.

The motion was formally seconded from the floor by Michael Delargey, UCC and unanimously adopted.

### **4 Redundancy Payments**

*This ADC notes that a Labour Court Recommendation of 24<sup>th</sup> February 2014 overturned the long-standing interpretation held by NUI Galway that ‘existing exit mechanisms’ covered not only the fact of the redundancy but also the amount of money to be paid on redundancy. NUI Galway had long argued that their existing practice was to pay the statutory redundancy pay only, and that they were therefore not bound by norms agreed in the Public Sector Agreement. This argument was rejected by the Labour Court, who recommended that in future the Education Sector norm of three weeks’ pay per year of service in addition to the statutory redundancy amount should apply.*

*This ADC commends those former employees of NUI Galway who have persevered in bringing claims, in the face of numerous delaying tactics by NUI Galway. It notes that other former employees of NUI Galway are still seeking to assert these rights, in the face of the same delaying tactics. It therefore mandates the General Secretary to write to the HR Department in NUI Galway, seeking that future claims be conceded without delay*

*Proposer: NUIG Branch.*

The motion was proposed on behalf of the NUIG Branch by Alastair McKinstry. He said that, as pointed out in the Annual Report it had been a momentous year in NUIG. We have had our victories but it doesn't always feel like that. We have suffered continuing delaying tactics from our Management and we needed to commit ourselves to persevering until all issues are resolved.

The motion was seconded by Catherine Emerson, NUIG. The General Secretary said that it was well recognised that one sign of madness was to continue to do the same thing and expect a different result. This behaviour seemed to characterise the behaviour of NUIG with regard to redundancy. However, he was hopeful that our position would prevail in the coming months. The motion was unanimously adopted by the conference.

## **11 GUEST SPEAKER**

At this stage the President Dr Rose Malone interrupted proceedings to provide for the speech from Jens Vraa Jensen of DM in Denmark and Chair of the European Higher Education and Research Standing Committee (HERSC). As Jens had been unable to get to the Annual Delegate Conference in time his speech was read on his behalf by Peter Murray of NUIM.

## **12 MOTIONS ON RULES**

The President said at this stage she would, as previously indicated, move to a debate on the Rules of IFUT. The motion was being tabled at this time to ensure that it got maximum time for debate.

**Insert after Rule 12 (f) to become Rule 12 (g)**

**CO-OPTIONS:** *The Executive may co-opt up to four members of the Federation to be members of the Executive. Co-opted members shall serve from the date of their co-option to the end of the following Annual Delegate Conference and shall have full voting rights. No*

*member may be co-opted to the Executive for more than four consecutive years. No more than two members so co-opted may be members of the same Branch.*

*Proposers: Joe Brady and John Dunnion, UCD*

Joe Brady, UCD spoke in favour of the motion. He said that we do not change our Rules very often and this is for good reason. Some years ago we had made dramatic changes to the Rules especially regarding the Executive. One thing we had not done was to allow for co-options. At that stage I was worried that the Executive would be too large. However, the time has now come. The Executive works very well but has no capacity to add people who have particular expertise. What is being proposed is a facilitatory Rule Change. In other words it is not mandatory on the Executive that it has to co-opt anyone.

John Dunnion, UCD seconded the motion. He said that he had supported the previous Rule Changes but that this one now provided for more agility and more egalitarianism on the Executive. He saw it as a fine tuning exercise to allow us to bring in experience, expertise and continuity. The amendment is not intended to dilute in any way the existing structure of the organisation.

The President then opened the debate to the floor.

Paddy O'Flynn, UCD said that he had agreed with the changes brought in some years previously and felt that IFUT had worked well since then. Looking at the dark side the implications of the current amendment could be that a narrow majority on the Executive could reinforce its majority. Perhaps we should examine mechanisms as to how this would actually pan out in practice. Jacqueline Fallon, CICE said that the CICE Branch had discussed the motion and was opposed to it. It would compromise our democratic structures. It carries the risk of political interference on the Executive and might actually create an elite. Michael Delargey, Incoming President/UCC speaking on behalf of the Executive said we needed to consider all of the implications of the motion and it was the Executive proposal that the issue be referred back for further discussion at Council. A discussion then ensued as to whether the co-option could be by unanimous vote or by "an enhanced majority".

Joe Brady, UCD said that there was no provision for a referral back to Council, motions could only be referred back to the Executive. In view of this Michael Delargey, Incoming President/UCC said he would amend his proposal to request that the motion be referred to the Executive. This referral was put to a vote and was unanimously agreed.

### **13 RESUMED DEBATE ON POLICY**

#### **5 Researchers I**

*This ADC notes with satisfaction the agreement of Higher Education Unions across the Continent of Europe on a policy with regard to the rights, entitlements and treatment of*

*Researchers. We also note that IFUT had considerable input into the drafting of this policy paper.*

*We call upon all of those involved in the area of higher education and research to recognise the particular problems besetting early-stage Researchers and to co-operate with unions such as IFUT to assist in the resolution of these difficulties. In particular, we ask that there be a complete end to practices of exploitation such as requesting Researchers and PhD candidates to carry out academic work on an unpaid basis.*

*Proposer: Executive*

The motion was proposed on behalf of the Executive by Aidan Seery, TCD. He stated that with the establishment of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) numerous lofty and well-meaning declarations are being made with regard to full-time Academic Researchers. Fourteen years on and still there was no proper career path for Researchers in Europe. In fact Researchers are amongst the most vulnerable and precarious of employees in higher education. He noted with approval the agreement on a Memorandum of Understanding between IFUT and the Irish Research Staff Association.

The motion was seconded by Michael Delargey, Incoming President/UCC and agreed unanimously.

## **6 Researchers II**

*That IFUT will continue its campaign to promote and normalise the pay and conditions of Researchers across the University Sector.*

*Proposer: UCC Branch*

The motion was proposed by Michael Delargey, Incoming President/UCC. He recalled having proposed a motion at last year's ADC with regard to the Tyndall Institute. The purpose of proposing this motion was to keep the issue very much on our agenda and to remind the Department of Education and the HEA of the importance of Researchers.

The motion was seconded by Angela Flynn, UCC. Kate O'Malley, RIA stated that in RIA one can remain as an early stage Researcher forever. David Landy, TCD stated that he was a proud member of Third-Level Workplace Watch which campaigns on this issue and he wished to thank IFUT for all of the work it had done in drawing attention to the plight of precarious workers. We all have a responsibility to tackle this issue. The motion was unanimously agreed.

## **7 Defend the Irish University**

*This ADC calls upon all IFUT members and all members of the academic community in Ireland and abroad to register their support for the Defend the Irish University Charter for action. (Details of this Charter are available on [www.defendtheuniversity.ie](http://www.defendtheuniversity.ie))*

*Proposer: Executive*

The President, Dr Rose Malone departed from the Chair to propose this motion. She said she had already spoken at length on the topic and also Jens Vraa Jensen's speech had also covered much of what needed to be said. She urged all members of IFUT to sign the Defend the Irish University petition.

The motion was seconded by Anthony Harvey, Central Branch RIA and agreed unanimously.

## **8 Associate Professors, NUIG**

*This ADC notes that a Labour Court Recommendation of 19<sup>th</sup> June 2013 found that NUI Galway had not been justified in withdrawing an adjustment to the salary of Associate Professors and in seeking reimbursement of supposed overpayment of salary amounting to up to €15,000 per employee on that grade. The Labour Court recommended that the salary be restored to its previous level, with effect from the date of the recommendation. This ADC notes that this restoration has not taken place.*

*NUI Galway argues that the restoration must be approved by the Department of Education. We note that the matter was raised in October 2013 by the IFUT Executive, when they met with the Minister for Education, and that the Minister undertook to investigate the situation. This ADC would like to thank the Executive for raising this issue.*

*We mandate the General Secretary to make renewed contact with the Minister on this matter and to point out that nearly a year has passed since this recommendation was made. We would like him to underline that the patience of members affected cannot be relied upon indefinitely.*

*Proposer: NUIG Branch*

The motion was proposed by Breandán Ó Cochláin, NUIG. He explained the background to the motion. In the 1980's the Professorial scale had eight increments. Associate Professors had a fixed point on the incremental scale for life. In the late 1980's one academic had fought the issue because the Associate Professors' pay scale was blurred with the Lecturer scale. He won his case, known as the Wilkins' Judgement and this led to Associate Professors being on 91% of the Professors' pay scale. Fast forward seventeen years when the O'Brien Report recommended a reduction in the number of increments. The 91% was to

be maintained. In 2012 the Department of Education issued an edict to NUIG to change the scale. This was fought by IFUT and SIPTU and the case was won in the Labour Court but the Department of Education has refused to implement it despite the fact that IFUT met directly with the Ministers for Education on the issue.

The motion was seconded by Alastair McKinstry, NUIG. Anthony Harvey, Central Branch RIA spoke to say that he fully supported the motion but wished to widen-out the matter of Labour Court Recommendations being ignored by the State. In the RIA a Labour Court Recommendation had been ignored for almost 5 years. The union needs to keep campaigning actively on these issues. The motion was unanimously agreed.

***The President said that we would take Motions No. 9 to 14 together and vote on them at the end of the debate.***

## **9 Initial Teacher Education Report**

*This ADC reiterates its commitment to ensure that no changes are forced upon IFUT members working in the area of Initial Teacher Education; we demand full negotiation and agreement with this union acting on their behalf.*

*Proposer: Executive*

The General Secretary spoke in favour of this motion and also said that he wished to lend his support to all of the motions in this section. This issue is a fundamental one for IFUT he said "It sticks in my craw that there is so little regard being had for the disruption which is being caused to those affected by these proposed changes. We have asked what was the problem that this change is designed to fix and have never got a satisfactory response". He had no hesitation in stating that IFUT is 100% committed to the defence of our members' interests in this area. He also paid tribute to members in UCD and TCD who had actively operated so well to prevent a very damaging merger of these two Schools of Education with the Marino Institute. He also noted that the merger for MICL and UL appeared to be stalled.

## **10 Incorporation Process Involving CICE, SPD and MDIE**

*Conference demands that the HEA/DES fund this incorporation process so that equal status can be achieved between the four institutions involved and that smaller institutions may achieve the 'equality in partnership' promised at the outset of the process.*

*Proposer: CICE Branch*



This was proposed by Áine O'Neill, CICE. She said we had been told that CICE staff would be equal partners. However, we were shocked by the presentation made by the President of DCU. This appears to be a takeover by DCU and there appears to be total exclusion of the rights of the CICE staff. CICE and MDIE are completely under-represented and sometimes fully excluded from the Working Groups set up to bring forward the Incorporation. The Department of Education appears fully committed to this change but does not appear to support the rights of the staff in the matter.

The motion was seconded by Maurice O'Reilly, SPD.

## **11 Incorporation Process Involving CICE, SPD and MDIE**

*Conference is concerned at the speed with which the incorporation process involving CICE, SPD, MDI and DCU is progressing and demands the following: That management bodies*

- a. Engage with IFUT to agree positions relating to the items on agenda presented to each management body by local IFUT branches at the outset of this process.*
- b. Engage in the collective bargaining process to support the proposals put forward by IFUT.*

*Proposer: CICE Branch*

The motion was proposed by David McKeon, CICE. He said that it was surprising that we even had to table such a motion. The Branch had sought a meeting to discuss the issue in April 2013 and the meeting did not take place until January 2014 and then only when we withdrew from the Working Group. We were to have a follow-up meeting but 3 months later just before this Management cancelled it because IFUT had convened a meeting of our members in the three Branches. We are trying to resolve the issues with our employers but they have made it very difficult.

The motion was seconded by Orla Kelly, CICE.

## **12 Incorporation Process involving CICE, SPD, MDIE**

*Conference is concerned at the speed with which the incorporation process involving CICE, SPD, MDI and DCU is progressing. Conference is equally concerned at the lack of real consultation with IFUT members in the process. Conference affirms the right of IFUT members in CICE, SPD and MDI to withdraw cooperation from this process as they deem appropriate and instructs the Executive to support Branches in their actions.*

*Proposer: CICE Branch*

The motion was proposed by Jacqueline Fallon, CICE. She said the Joint Steering Group (JSG) had been set up. A lot of money had been thrown at Price Waterhouse Coopers to take these structures forward. They devised a process by which the Incorporation would be implemented. The unions were not consulted. The structures are not workable because no one consulted us. Things may have slowed down somewhat but it would be naive to believe that nothing is about to happen.

The motion was seconded by Aidan Seery, TCD.

### **13 Proposed Merger with DCU/Negotiating any Changes in Terms and Conditions of Employment for IFUT Members in SPD, CICE, MDIE**

*This ADC demands agreed structures for negotiating any changes in terms and conditions of employment for IFUT Members in SPD, CICE and MDIE in light of a proposed merger with DCU.*

*Proposer: CICE and SPD Branches*

This motion was proposed by Michael O’Keeffe, SPD. He said he wished to reiterate all that had been said already. In SPD the members had not been consulted either. The merger cannot take place other than by consultation and agreement. The Minister appears to be unaware of the lack of such engagement.

The motion was seconded by Jacqueline Fallon, CICE.

### **14 Proposed Merger with DCU/Effectiveness of the Collaborative Action taken by the IFUT Branches in CICE, MDIE and SPD**

*This ADC notes the effectiveness of the collaborative action taken by the branches in CICE, MDI and St. Pat’s to provide time and opportunity for meaningful collective bargaining to take place between IFUT and the management of the three institutions. Conference endorses and mandates the continuation of a collaborative process between the three branches until a resolution is reached to their mutual satisfaction.*

*Proposer: CICE Branch*

The motion was proposed by Orla Kelly, CICE. She stated that the three Branches had demonstrated their power by collaborating and working together and this co-operation must continue. A very successful Plenary Meeting of the three Branches had occurred on 9 April 2014.

The motion was seconded by Maurice O’Reilly, SPD. He said that firstly he wished to express the gratitude of all members to the General Secretary, the Deputy General

Secretary and to Head Office for all the support that had been given. We must emphasise and continue the great co-operation and collaboration between the three Branches. There is a charade of consultation represented by the JSG. This is nothing more than a disgraceful masquerade. Orla Nic Aodha, SPD said that she wished to express her support for all of the motions in this section. We had witnessed a total shutdown by local Management. All decisions were being handed over to DCU and this had been very stressful for all staff.

Motions No. 9 to 14 inclusive were then put to the conference and all were unanimously adopted.

### **15 Competitive Retention**

*This ADC states that the practice of “Competitive Retention” is one which has the potential to undermine the integrity of promotion systems in all of our universities. Therefore, we call upon all Branches to investigate what procedures are in place in their Colleges with regard to “Competitive Retention” and to ensure that these procedures are not used to undermine the entitlements of IFUT members and academics generally to fair promotion procedures.*

*Proposer: Executive*

The motion was proposed by Dr Marie Clarke, UCD. She said retention is about more than just competition. It is about transparency. It is not acceptable to us that retention process should be in place while a promotions system is simultaneously in operation.

The motion was proposed by Michael Delargey, Incoming President/UCC and unanimously agreed.

### **16 Appointment to All Senior Positions in Third-Level Institutions**

*That appointments to all senior positions in third-level institutions should be conducted with transparency and probity. These positions should be advertised publicly. Further, selection of candidates, interview procedures and appointments made should conform to best practice at all times.*

*Proposer: Marie Clarke, UCD*

*Seconder: Maureen Killeavy, UCD*

The motion was proposed by Maureen Killeavy, UCD. She said she had looked back at motions proposed at previous ADC's just before this conference. It seems absolutely ludicrous that a motion such as this is still required. Some promotions involve considerable financial reward, yet they are put through in secrecy. Thus the practice is at times quite underhand.

The motion was seconded by Tony O'Farrell, NUIM. Joe Brady, UCD said he applauded the motion but wondered why it was confined only to senior positions. He suggested an amendment to delete the "senior". This was accepted by the proposer. Tony O'Farrell, NUIM said that people can say to institutions "I will come if you also give employment to my partner". The President can make appointments by fiat. This is a mis-spending of public funds. Cormac Ó Cuilleaináin, TCD said there were other jobs being given out, for example, Dean.

The motion as amended was carried by a majority vote.

## **17 Maternity Leave**

*This ADC demands that substitute cover for maternity leave is made statutory for the Irish University Sector.*

*Proposer: SPD Branch*

The motion formally proposed by Michael O'Keeffe, SPD and seconded by Orla Nic Aodha, SPD.

The motion was unanimously agreed/

## **18 Substitute Cover for Sick Leave**

*This ADC demands that substitute cover for sick leave is made statutory for the Irish University Sector.*

*Proposer: SPD Branch*

Once again the motion was formally proposed by Michael O'Keeffe, SPD and seconded by Orla Nic Aodha, SPD, and was agreed.

## **19 Parental Leave**

*This ADC demands that parental leave is made statutory for the Irish University Sector*

*Proposer: SPD Branch*

As above the motion was proposed by Michael O'Keeffe, SPD and seconded by Orla Nic Aodha, and unanimously agreed.

## **20 Pension Levy**

*'That IFUT will lobby ICTU to press for the setting of a date for the removal of the pension levy'.*

*Proposer: UCC Branch*

The motion was proposed by David Murphy, UCC. He said that he would like to rephrase the motion slightly. He felt it would be better if the motion read “That IFUT will request of the ICTU that it press for the setting of a date for the removal of the Public Sector Pension Levy”. He formally proposed the motion and it was unanimously agreed.

## **21 Privatisation & Casualisation**

*‘That IFUT will continue to campaign and fight against the increasing privatisation of the university sector and the associated increasing casualisation of academic and research work’.*

*Proposer: UCC Branch*

The motion was formally proposed by Angela Flynn, UCC and formally seconded by Michael Delargey, Incoming President/UCC. The motion was agreed unanimously.

## **22 Contracts of Indefinite Duration**

*‘That IFUT will continue its campaign for the protection of precarious members and those on CIDs’.*

*Proposer: UCC Branch*

The motion was formally proposed by Michael Delargey, Incoming President/UCC and formally seconded by Angela Flynn, UCC. The motion was agreed unanimously.

## **23 Temporary Staff, NUIG**

*This ADC is concerned by the way that HR departments handle the contracts of temporary staff members, to the detriment of their careers and ability to make long term plans. It recognizes the efforts that branches have made in recruiting and supporting members in this situation and urges them to continue to support those members whose position is the most vulnerable.*

*Proposer: NUIG Branch*

The motion was proposed by Catherine Emerson, NUIG. Catherine said that the motion had relevance right across the Branches and we should therefore delete the word “NUIG” in the title of the motion in order to reflect this.

The motion was seconded by Alastair McKinstry, NUIG and unanimously agreed.

## **24 Higher Education rights in Palestine**

*Palestinian academics and students have the right to participate in and benefit from higher education on an equal footing with all other citizens and people in their area.*

*This ADC therefore commits the Executive to work with other international unions, such as the Canadian Association of University Teachers, to provide practical support for trade unions representing Palestinian academics in vindicating that right.*

*Proposer: Executive*

The motion was proposed by the General Secretary who also said that the Executive would be requesting the referral back of Motion No. 25. He said that the motion arose because we had listened very carefully to how the debate had proceeded at the inquorate meeting of Council in February. The Executive is very conscious of just how passionate opinions are on either side of the discussion with regard to Israel and Palestine. Therefore, the Executive wished to be more positive and rather than condemning any side. We should work to assist those who need us most. There was a need to recognise the plight of the Palestinian people without causing division in our own ranks. He gave the example of the recent upheaval in Ukraine whereby he had stated at European level that the role of unions outside of Ukraine was to provide support to forces within the country which were trying to bring about peace and practical alleviation of civilian suffering.

The motion was put to the floor and agreed with 5 abstentions.

## **25 Opposition to the Involvement of the Federation in any form of Academic Boycott**

*That in line with the first object of IFUT, namely the advancement of higher education and research, this Annual Delegate Conference affirms its rooted opposition to the involvement of the Federation in any form of academic boycott.*

*Proposer: Tony O'Farrell, NUIM*

*Seconder: Stephen Buckley, NUIM*

The motion was proposed by Tony O'Farrell, NUIM. He noted that the motion does not refer to Palestine. He stated that the organisation cannot go beyond its own declared objects as set out in the rules. A boycott is about cutting people off from each other. As such it is incompatible with our aims and objectives.

The motion was seconded by Maureen Killeavy, UCD. David Landy, TCD stated that the organisation of which he was a member which supported an academic boycott had not proposed any such to the IFUT ADC because they felt the issue needed more debate. This motion would have the effect of closing down that debate. Paddy O'Flynn, UCD said there

were two occasions in the past when IFUT took very strong positions on major international issues. These were Bloody Sunday in Northern Ireland and Apartheid in South Africa. Therefore, he saw the motion as being historically incorrect. On a vote it was agreed by majority that the motion be referred back to the Executive.

### **13 CLOSING OF CONFERENCE**

The President said that she wished to bring the proceedings to a close and thanked all of those for their attention and for the quality of the debate. She also noted that we had managed to get through a very full agenda in a very tight timeframe. The General Secretary also spoke and expressed his appreciation of the wonderful chairing of the meeting by the President. He also thanked all delegates present. A presentation was made to Phyllis Russell, Secretary/Office Manager for all of her work. The ADC then formally closed.

**Appendix I**  
**DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS AT**  
**2014 ADC**

(As recorded at Conference)

**DELEGATES**

**TCD**

Dónall MacDónaill	<i>Ceimicí</i>
Hugh Gibbons	<i>Computer Science</i>
Mary Sharpe	<i>Computer Science</i>
Aidan Seery	<i>Education</i>
Pat Wall	<i>Education</i>
Liam Dowling	<i>Electron&amp;Elect. Eng.</i>
Cormac Ó Cullleanáin	<i>Italian</i>
Edward McCann	<i>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</i>
Eliz. Culleton-Quinn	<i>Physiotherapy</i>

**UCD**

John Dunnion	<i>Computer Science</i>
Gordon Cooke	<i>Conway Institute</i>
Marie Clarke ( <i>Outgoing Pres</i> )	<i>Education</i>
Maureen Killeavy	<i>Education</i>
Joe Brady	<i>Geography</i>
Kelly Fitzgerald	<i>Irish, Celtic Studies</i>
Russell Higgs	<i>Mathematical Science</i>
Thomas Unger	<i>Mathematical Science</i>
Rita Collins	<i>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</i>
Regina Joye	<i>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</i>
Emma Sokell	<i>Physics</i>
Paddy O'Flynn	<i>Student Consultative Forum</i>

**UCC**

David Murphy	<i>Computer Science</i>
Michael Delargey ( <i>Incoming Pres</i> )	<i>Education</i>
Angela Flynn	<i>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</i>

**NUIG**

Catherine Emerson	<i>French</i>
Alastair McKinstry	<i>ICHEC</i>
Antony Wheatley	<i>Physiology/Medicine</i>
Breandán Ó Cochláin	<i>Physical Chemistry</i>

**NUIM**

Rose Malone ( <i>Pres</i> )	<i>Education</i>
Maeve Martin	<i>Education</i>
Liam MacAmhlaigh	<i>Froebel</i>
Brendan Bartley	<i>Geography</i>
David Malone	<i>Hamilton Institute</i>
Saranne Magennis	<i>HE Policy Unit</i>
Andrew Sliney	<i>Library</i>
Tony O'Farrell	<i>Mathematics</i>
Jeneen Naji	<i>Media Studies</i>

Dermot Barnes-Holmes	<i>Psychology</i>
Peter Murray	<i>Sociology</i>

**MICL**

Gerard Enright	<i>Maths&amp;Computer St.</i>
Patrick Connolly	<i>Theology &amp; Relig. St.</i>

**SPD**

Cora Cregan	<i>Careers</i>
Orla Nic Aodha	<i>Library</i>
Maurice O'Reilly	<i>Mathematics</i>
Michael O'Keeffe	<i>Special Education</i>
Joe Travers	<i>Special Education</i>

**CICE**

Orla Kelly	<i>B Ed Dept.</i>
Jacqueline Fallon	<i>Early Education</i>
David McKeon	<i>Education</i>
Áine O'Neill	<i>Special Education</i>

**CB**

Anthony Harvey	<i>DMLCS, RIA</i>
Kate O'Malley	<i>Foreign Policy, RIA</i>
Joan Byrne	<i>Microbiology, HRB</i>

**APOLOGIES**

**TCD**

Seán Hughes	<i>Library</i>
Anne-Marie Malone	<i>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</i>

**UCC**

Virginia Conrick	<i>Library</i>
Tom Andrews	<i>Nursing &amp; Midwifery</i>
Eoin Sheehan	<i>Tyndall Institute</i>

**SPD**

Colum Ó Cléirigh	<i>Music</i>
------------------	--------------

**CB**

Mícheál Collins	<i>Nevin Economic Research Institute</i>
-----------------	--

**OBSERVERS**

Jean Berry	<i>All Hallows</i>
John Kelly	<i>UCD</i>
David Landy	<i>TCD</i>





## Appendix II

10 May 2014

### IFUT PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Dr Rose Malone

Colleagues,

The General Secretary and Deputy General Secretary have reported on what has been an exceptionally busy, demanding and, ultimately, successful year. In this address I want to look at the activities of this union through a particular lens, that of defending the Irish university. We are employed by universities but we don't relate to them simply as employees. The university we wish to defend is a collegial structure of which we are members. This address will interrogate the role of an education trade union in defending ' in a critical way, the universities and the very idea of a university.

I believe that this is appropriate, given that, under Rule 2, the first object of the Federation is stated thus: The advancement of higher education and research. IFUT, together with SIPTU, was delighted to launch a campaign last November to defend and promote this principle. The Charter to Defend the Irish University is the basis an online campaign and lists 10 statements which has been developed by academics in SIPTU and IFUT and now has more than a thousand signatories in support of its aims. In this address I want to analyse the features of the Irish University that we want to defend, the features that, as a union, we want to oppose and the threats to the university which we perceive and against which we have worked strenuously over the past year and will continue to work in the future.

#### Section 1 Defend the University

##### A Public Good

The Charter consists of 10 statements, which I will consider here, some of them in more depth. The first of these is that the **Irish University is a public good**, not a private profit-making institution. In an online comment on the Charter, a respondent examines in a technical way the meaning of the term "public good" from the point of view of economics. He asserts that a public good is not diminished by the number of people availing of it and concludes that universities meet this criterion. Another way of looking at the term "public good" is one that is funded and supported by the State as part of the public service. According to the National Strategy for Higher Education, 85% of the funding of Irish Higher Education is from State sources. This compares with an EU average of 81%, but is well below Norway's figure of 97%. On both these criteria then, Higher Education in Ireland can be considered a public good.

Irish Higher Education has undergone a transformation that is nothing short of revolutionary. From a participation rate of just 5% in the 1960 we have arrived at one of 65% in 2011.

There has been a 26% increase in participation between 2007 and 2011 and that encompasses an 85% increase in the number of PhD candidates. These figures are taken from HEA statistics and from a report on the financial health of the universities carried out by the consultancy firm Grant Thornton – hardly radical left-wing commentators. The Grant Thornton report also notes that there has been a 7% decrease in core staff since the introduction of the Employment Control Framework in 2009. They note that the operating surplus of the universities has been reduced by more than half. The funding of the universities is fundamental to their ability to be a public good in any real sense.

It is a matter of great concern, colleagues, that at a time of funding crisis in the universities, government spokespersons, including the Minister for Education, should repeatedly speak in support of a private, profit-making institution in the Higher Education area and allow it to operate in an uncontrolled fashion in direct competition with publically-funded institutions which are subject to controls and limitations.

### Academic Freedom

The second object of IFUT listed under Rule 2 is “the promotion and protection of **academic freedom**”. Academic freedom is specifically mentioned in the Universities Act, 1997 which states

A member of the academic staff of a university shall have the freedom, within the law, in his or her teaching, research and any other activities either in or outside the university, to question and test received wisdom, to put forward new ideas and to state controversial or unpopular opinions and shall not be disadvantaged, or subject to less favourable treatment by the university, for the exercise of that freedom.

The Charter (paragraph 10) notes the necessity of stressing the importance of academic freedom over a “fear-driven consensus”. The greatest enemy of academic freedom is, I believe, casualisation. The exercise of academic freedom can require courage from even the most secure and eminent academics. For casualised academics, their right to “question received wisdom” or express “controversial or unpopular opinions” is undermined by the precarious and circumscribed nature of their status and their Union’s ability to vindicate their rights is undermined by the use of other pretexts to justify non-renewal.

### Knowledge and Research

The set of principles enunciated in the Charter includes three that refer specifically to knowledge. Paragraph 2 asserts that: The strategy of a university should reflect **all dimensions of human endeavor**. It is perhaps ironic that it is those disciplines that were most valued in the (fairly recent) past that are now under threat. We were proud to support the successful campaign to defend the Classics Department in UCC. An article in last Tuesday’s Irish Times criticizes the growing practice of teaching only those aspects of subjects required in the short term by the employment market and ignoring the underlying principles which give them meaning and notes that such strategies are counter-productive, even in the medium term. In the context of the re-configuration of Initial Teacher Education we were concerned that in some instances, the amalgamation of university education departments into institutes might have the effect of separating applied fields from their foundation disciplines and are pleased to note that such proposals appear to be in abeyance. I will return to the ITE reforms later.

Paragraph 4 states that the **aim of research is to produce new knowledge**. It is noteworthy that a significant part of the research that is carried out in Ireland is done by students and staff on short term contracts. In supporting the importance of research we also want to support the importance of research workers and to draw attention to the exploitative conditions in which they often have to work.

Paragraph 3 states that: The main aim of teaching is the **dissemination of knowledge and the fostering of creativity**. A balance must be struck between students' legitimate desire for regulation of courses and clarity of expectations and excessive bureaucracy, over-assessment and surveillance in the design and specification of courses. We are required to do "research-led" teaching and this implies that academics should have the opportunity to engage in research, to publish and to collaborate with colleagues.

#### A Collegial community

The university is not just about abstract ideas. It is about people, about staff and students. Paragraph 6 of the Charter states that "**Students are the lifeblood of the University**". IFUT believes that students are active participants in education, rather than passive consumers, and is opposed to the creation of an adversarial culture in universities. Our support for traditional and foundational disciplines does not imply opposition to, or scorn for applied and newer forms of knowledge. We recognize the importance of equipping students for employment while rejecting reductive approaches which see this as our sole function. The Campaign to Defend the University has the support of USI.

Students and staff are entitled to a safe, dignified and collegial environment. One of the few positive outcomes of the current and recent economic crises has been increased cooperation among the various unions on university campuses. Many of our Branches (or ASAs) have been pro-active in developing structures for inter-union groupings on campus in order to make common cause against common threats.

A collegial work environment for academic staff should provide for a coherent and equitable career path, with negotiated and clearly defined mechanisms for progress. Too often, young researchers tread a precarious and poorly defined path from post-doctoral research to hourly paid work to short term contract. This scenario does not serve students well, nor does it make for good research.

#### Civic Engagement

Engagement with communities is the third arm of the universities' mission. As the Charter states, this must mean more than linking with local business enterprise. Most IFUT branches send delegates to their local Trades Councils and play a real and tangible role in linking the campus to its communities

#### ICT

Paragraph 8 of the Charter states that: Information and communications technologies are a great tool for teaching and research but should not be used to impoverish the quality of education or reduce staff-student contact time. Nor, I suggest, can they substitute for staff contact time nor be used to justify increased class sizes. ICT is both a resource and a threat

and presents both challenges and opportunities. It is perhaps an area where we could work with students (and learn from students), especially in the area of the responsible and creative use of social media.

### Managerialism

It is the Charter's opposition to managerialism that has come in for criticism, not least from the President of one of our universities. We strongly support the prudent management of resources and the humane and collegial organization of people. We believe that good management is essential to support the universities' mission of teaching, research and civic engagement. We number some senior members of management among our members. What we do find problematic is when management "efficiency" becomes the mission of a university. We have a problem with the idea that the process of management is more important than that which is to be managed. This is what we mean by managerialism. Managerialism has also become the source of new and pernicious form of discourse where familiar words take on new and specific meanings, which are grounded in ideas of efficiency as based in cost-saving and where false consensus is assumed without going through the processes of consultation and negotiation.

### Section 2 What we don't defend

Colleagues, many of the features listed in the Charter to Defend the Irish University refer to aspects of the university which have been valued in the past or are under threat at present. But our defence of the university is not an exercise in nostalgia or a wish to return to some mythical "golden age". There are some features of the traditional university that we do not defend. These include:

#### Elitism

If Higher Education is a public good, it should benefit all sections of Irish society

The National Strategy for Higher Education demonstrates the inequalities hidden with the impressive figures for entry to Higher Education in Ireland. Within the 65% entry rate are stark socio-economic differences. The group with lowest participation rate (non-manual, lower middle income) and the second-lowest (semi-and unskilled manual) have rates of 27% and 33% respectively – less than half the national average. These represent significant and welcome improvements – in 1980, the average national rate of entry was just 20%. However, this expansion has happened in parallel with cuts in funding and staffing. Unless we can offer the same level of quality to all entrants, expanding participation will just create a different kind of elitism, resulting from comparisons within and between institutions.

#### Inequalities

The Deputy General Secretary has given us a clear picture of the levels of gender inequality still prevalent in our universities. The glass ceiling is still there, made of toughened glass with great insulating properties. Defending the university does not mean defending the norms and practices that give rise to inequalities and injustices. Teaching and research deal with abstract concepts and complex ideas but they are done by real people with real human lives which frequently include children, partners and parents. We do not defend a university that ignores this basic fact.

## Excessive workloads

There is a strong university of open-ended work practices whereby academics are trusted to engage in work-related activities without the need for ongoing surveillance or rigid timetabling. This is a tradition that we would defend and uphold against the increasing demands of 'management' that every waking moment be documented and located on a workload model. It is a tradition that has served research and teaching very well because most academics work far in excess of the number of hours in a normal working week. The requirement, however, that more and more of this work be undertaken on campus under surveillance is not one that we support nor do we believe that it is positive for the work of scholarship. At the same time our presence in the virtual workplace, while the earth spins on its axis and completes a circuit of the sun means that there can be an assumption of constant availability to students. This we would argue is not reasonable nor in the longer term beneficial to students.

## Section 3 what are the threats against which we need to defend the university

I have set out a case here in support of defending the Irish university but this is a purely theoretical unless I can identify what I am proposing to defend it against. Colleagues, I believe that the answer is not far to seek. I will deal with some of the major ones.

## Underfunding

I am not going to reiterate the statistical evidence that Irish universities are underfunded but it is an incontrovertible fact and I have attempted to demonstrate how the mission of the universities is undermined and distorted by this fact. It is simply not possible for the universities to be a public good, serving society as well as the economy if they are not adequately funded. Seeking alternative sources of funding distorts the mission of the universities.

## Casualisation

The disease of casualisation eats away the concept of academic freedom and without academic freedom there can be no scholarship. This is perhaps the single biggest issue with which we have to deal. I could also add that it is a simple and fundamental issue of social justice and must be at the core of any union's activities – the fight against casualisation is central.

## Consumerism

The use of league tables, indices of satisfaction and other consumer-type measures can lead to a serious slippage of language where students are cast as customers and consumers rather pro-active and creative users of knowledge.

## Undermining of conditions

Moratoria on promotions and further limiting of already limited promotion opportunities do not serve the universities well in addition to their effect on academics and on recruitment.

## Denigration of the public service

Our identity as public servants is an important part of our defence of the university as a public good.

Economic recession in Ireland seems, inevitably, to be accompanied by attacks on the very idea of public service and a culture of blame of public service workers. It is important that we do not internalize that blame and recognize that the cuts to pay and pensions imposed on us were disgraceful. The threat of the draconian measure of the latest FEMPI Act represents a serious and invidious change in industrial relations. Together with seeking restoration of pay and pensions we must demand the repeal of this measure.

In conclusion

The landscape of Irish Higher Education has undergone significant change recently but further and perhaps more far-reaching change is planned. The universities have a crucial role to play in that landscape. We will seek to defend the positive aspects of the Irish university in whatever new configurations may emerge. Industrial relations processes will be an essential part in any re-organizations, amalgamation or collaborations. IFUT will continue to play a significant part in defending the university and its members within it.

## **Appendix III**

**Speech by Mike Jennings, General Secretary, IFUT.**

### **ANNUAL DELEGATE CONFERENCE**

**10 May 2014**

Colleagues, Delegates and Friends,

I am very pleased to formally propose and introduce our Annual Report for the 2013/2014 session. My colleague, the Deputy General Secretary, Joan Donegan, will join me in this task.

I have said in the General Introduction to the Report that the past year has been the busiest and most demanding of any year in our history. I believe that to be a fact. What, you may ask, is the reason for this? Why are we so busy and required to put in so much work on behalf of our members?

And when I say “we” in this context I am not simply referring to the Head Office staff. I am including all of our “frontline” representatives who, unlike those of us privileged to be employees of this union, do all of the work that they do so well on behalf of their work colleagues on a totally voluntary basis without payment or time off in compensation.

Modern e-mails tell you one thing that an old fashioned letter never revealed unless the writer chose to divulge it. An e-mail tells you what time it was sent at. I am frequently amazed at the number of letters arriving in Head Office from our representatives which were despatched at 1:00am, 2:00am, 3:00am or even later. Clearly, an ability to cope without normal levels of sleep and rest is a recurrent characteristic of IFUT representatives.

So what is it that generates all this work that we do on behalf of members? Is it lodging pay claims? Are we getting more time off? Negotiating bonuses? Defending errant employees from justified disciplinary action? No, the answer is not to be found in any of the options above.

The simple, stark, depressing and dispiriting reality is that the people who see themselves as charged with controlling and directing us simply do not respect us.



The Department of Education does not respect Academics or Researchers. The HEA, which used to see its role as being a bridge between the civil servants of Marlborough Street and those working in academia has “gone native” and now sees its job as an enforcer of increasingly remotely conceived “solutions”. These “solutions” – such as the Initial Teacher Education Review Body Report – are frequently promulgated and enforced without anyone bothering to identify what the problem requiring a solution was in the first place!

Where, one may ask, is the evidence for this lack of respect for Academics and Researchers? Well, it is everywhere.

When was the last time you heard the Minister or the HEA express concern that the staff-student ratio in our colleges has gone from

1:18.7 in 2008/2009 to

1:20.9 in 2009/2010

1:24 in 2010/2011

And it has got even worse since then.

Such is the total cluelessness of those who make all the major decisions about our colleges that it appears that they actually believe that it is as easy to give a lecture to 50 students as to 100 or 150, and so, what’s the problem? It can only be wilful and self-serving blindness that makes them not see that you cannot do 150 assessments in the same time or with the staff numbers as you did 50. You cannot do the same proportion of tutorials or small group teaching sessions. You cannot assist 150% more students experiencing educational and/or social or emotional difficulties. You cannot look out for the atypical student, the ones from abroad, of atypical age, or those from disadvantaged areas whose backgrounds give them no cultural familiarity with higher education.

And do they care – these people of such little insight? Sadly, the answer has to be “no, they don’t”.

Because, if they did, they would come to the likes of IFUT and ask us and consult us from time to time. They would even listen to us, perhaps.

If they knew – and they should know because the scientific evidence has been there for years – that senior academics work an average of 50 hours per week and junior academics work an average of 47 hours per week – would they (as in Haddington Road) ask us to work

78 hours more per year while at the same time proclaiming that no one who works 39 hours or more per week is expected to put in more time?

If they knew how much of our time is taken away from teaching students and doing research by the demands of senseless and mind-numbing form-filling, would they demand that every year we do more administration and more mindless and mind-bending paperwork?

If they knew what really goes on between a Lecturer and a Student when the spark of learning and scholarship is ignited would they really try to crudely measure the process with stopwatches and clipboards?

And then there is research!

Over and over and over again we hear Ministers, Junior Ministers and other worthies talking about our national priority – “the enhancement of research”.

Let me be frank. Let me use plain language. All this talk is pure bunkum.

It is worse, it is hypocritical bunkum. It is pure hypocrisy when you say you value research and you refuse to lift a finger when the staff in one of our finest Research Institutes are paid up to 30% less than their equivalent colleagues in UCC. It is hypocrisy when you say you value research when NUIG tells the Labour Court that not one single Researcher in Higher Education is entitled to the job security clause of the Haddington Road Agreement.

And it is bunkum when another university actually boasts that there is not one single fulltime Researcher on a permanent contract there.

Colleagues, in recent times we have seen speculation and rivalry about who should be first in the queue when restitution is made for the cuts imposed since our economy was destroyed by greedy people, not one of whom has heard the sound of cell door closing behind them (except of course for wilful contempt of Court).

Such a scramble may be regarded as a tad premature.

We in IFUT are no slouches in negotiations. When and if there are improvements on offer we will demand our fair share. But we are not holding our breath.

But let me say this. Respect costs nothing. Listening and hearing costs nothing.

IFUT members in our universities and colleges are telling us they are sick and tired of being controlled and directed by those who understand nothing about what they do and how they do it and yet believe they have the right to foist “solutions” upon us which make things worse not better.

It is time to shout “stop”.

I commend this report.

## **Appendix IV**

### **Address to IFUT ADC**

***David Robinson***

***Executive Director Elect***

### ***Canadian Association of University Teachers/Association canadienne des professeures et professeurs d'université***

Dear Delegates and Guests,

Let me begin by bringing you greetings on behalf of the president of the Canadian Association of University Teachers, Robin Vose, our executive committee and our 68,000 members for a successful annual delegates' conference.

It is an absolute privilege and an honour to be invited to address you today. IFUT and CAUT have a long history of close collaboration and friendship that is a source of pride for all of us.

Let me add also a word of gratitude for the enormous contribution that IFUT plays on the international stage, and in particular the stellar work and leadership that your General Secretary, Mike Jennings, provides at the European and international level. It is true that in terms of numbers IFUT is a small union compared to many counterparts, but it is one that punches well above its weight. You should be very proud.

Today, I want to talk about some of the key challenges facing the academic labour movement globally. There is of course a long list of challenges that one might compile. I have only a few moments today; so I will have to draw a selective list. I must also warn you I am an economist by training. In that light, it might be appropriate while I'm on Irish soil to recall George Bernard Shaw's shrewd observation that if you took all the economists in the world and lay them head to foot, they would go on and on and on...but never reach a conclusion. I admit that I may not reach a conclusion today, but I will promise not to go on too long.

Let me begin by describing what I see as a paradox – or an apparent paradox – in discussions about higher education globally today. The paradox is this: It is virtually impossible not to find a politician no matter what political stripe they might wear, a business leader, a community leader, a government and perhaps even an economist who doesn't preach the importance of higher education. There is a consensus that high education is more important than ever, that increasing access and providing opportunity is absolutely vital. And yet, at the same moment, the academic workforce – the very heart of universities and colleges – are under unprecedented pressures.

These pressures will not sound foreign to you. The first is what I call the shift from “tenure to taxicab”. Around the world the number of fixed-term positions in higher education is rising. In Latin America, outside of Brazil, 80% of the professoriate is employed on limited-term, precarious contracts. They are called “taxicab” profs because many of them shuttle from one university to another in taxis in order to pick up enough work to barely make ends meet.

In China, large parts of Eastern Europe, and in Sub-Saharan Africa, almost all academic appointments are fixed-term or casual, with faculty expected to supplement their income with outside contracts and tutoring.

This isn't just a problem in the Global South. In the United States today, 75% of those who teach in universities and colleges are employed on non-tenured, non-tenure track positions. That's compared to just 25% a generation ago.

The second trend I see is the steady erosion in the status of higher education teachers and researchers. The growth in precarious, low-paid work has been a key factor in this, but even for full-time academics the past few years have been marked by either stagnating or declining salaries and conditions of employment. It used to be that being a university or college professor was a career on par to that of a lawyer or doctor. No more. In many countries today, faculty don't earn much more than the average industrial salary and certainly less than comparable professions.

Finally, there has been general trend from autonomy to accountability. Just within the past decade we've seen the dramatic erosion of collegial governance in places such as Denmark, Israel, Japan, France and Quebec. In all cases, the voices of faculty in shaping academic decisions have been muted if not silenced.

But we also see this in the way that faculty control over teaching and research is giving way to accountability, assessment and managerialism – faculty are seen less and less as autonomous professionals, and more and more as employees who need to be managed. It's this kind of thinking that has led to the emergence of ever changing, simplistic, reductionist but time-consuming assessments of “academic productivity” -- our administrative bean counters are on steroids!

So, what does this mean? Why is there this consensus that higher education is important, and yet everywhere our institutions and the people who work in them are under attack?

The first reason, I believe, is because you matter. This is an important point: academics are under attack not because you are weak, but because you are strong. You have power – if you didn't, nobody would care. You stand in the way of something that others want.

Now, before I make you too narcissistic, I'll add that the second reason why the university is under attack is because it is about more than you. What's at stake is beyond just us. It's about certain values that, though located in the university, transcend the university. Public service values, in fact the very notion of the public, is under attack.

Being here in Ireland, I must add that it's of course absolutely true that the current economic and fiscal climate of austerity is a factor in the stress we see on the profession and on the sector. But I think it's important to recognize that all the trends affecting academic labour – precarious work, de-professionalisation, all the things I raised previously -- pre-date the “crisis”. And of course, our political foes will never let a good crisis go to waste if it will further their agenda. But there is a broader political and economic context that needs to be addressed.

I believe the attacks we see today are symptoms of a deeper and more profound transformation of higher education. It is a transformation characterized by the marketization,

privatization, and commercialization of education and other public services locally, nationally and internationally

Let's consider marketization for a moment and how it is affecting higher education. A generation ago, we didn't talk much about privatization of higher education on a global scale. Today, virtually every international conference and gathering on higher education features discussion and debate on the explosive growth in the private, for-profit sector. Internationally, this is seen in the growth of branch campuses, franchising arrangements, joint-ventures and public-private partnerships, cross border e-learning – including the hopelessly over-hyped Massive Open On-Line Courses or MOOCs – and of course the obsession with international student recruitment as a key revenue generator.

This international marketplace until recently has been largely un-regulated, a kind of Wild West of higher education. But increasingly, we are seeing attempts to create and codify rules largely through the so-called “trade” in education services. This reflects the belief of some that, like widgets or wheat, education is something that can be and should be traded globally. As one of the more exuberant proponents of this has declared: “Any other commodity that has become globally traded has improved in quality and decreased in price. Higher education has to figure out how to cut costs.”

This “logic” -- if I can call it that -- is reflected most recently in the proposal to negotiate the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Project – or TTIP.

The TTIP is an ambitious and comprehensive trade, investment and regulatory cooperation agreement between the EU and United States. It is extraordinarily broad in scope. It used to be that trade talks were largely quantitative exercises. One country would agree to cut its tariffs by 10%, while another would counter with 8%. No more. Trade deals like the TTIP extend far beyond tariffs and quotas, to cover any legislation, measure, rule, regulation, or requirement that potentially affect trade. It's not just about numbers, it's about public policy.

Education remains one of the least-covered sectors in trade agreements because of long held, legitimate concerns that legally-binding trade rules would restrict the ability of governments and designated authorities to ensure access to quality education. In the context of the rise of cross-border education, marketisation and commercialisation, however, some players are looking to open new markets and set binding rules that would lock-in private provision.

For instance, the UK government indicated in its international education strategy policy released last year that “[i]n order to ensure the UK is best placed to take advantage of global opportunities in the education services sector, the Government will look actively at how significant trade negotiations, both ongoing and future, could address the market access barriers which our education services suppliers face in some third country markets.”

Note the reference to market access barriers. What barriers, you might ask? There are no tariffs on trade in education of which I'm aware. Rather, what is meant are regulatory barriers – things such as accreditation procedures, quality assurance, local hiring requirements and procurement policies. In other words, all the things we do to ensure quality, equity, and other policy goals.

Will education be covered in this new deal? So far, the EU has said that there's nothing to worry about, that education will be protected because there will be a general exemption for public services in the TTIP based on existing language in the GATS – the World Trade Organisation's General Agreement on Trade in Services.

GATS provides a basic exemption for public services, but these are defined narrowly as those services that are “supplied neither on a commercial basis, nor in competition with one or more service suppliers.” This is hotly contested language that is open to conflicting interpretations. In the education sector, for instance, it is quite common for educational institutions, particularly at the post-school level, to operate on a commercial basis insofar as they charge private fees even if they receive public grants. As well, there is in most European countries competition in the education sector insofar as public and private institutions coexist. In short, the exemption is extremely narrow and ambiguous with respect to what protection if any it offers the education sector. It's not language I'd want to hang a legal argument on.

There are other reasons for us in the education sector to be concerned about the TTIP. The agreement is adopting a so-called negative list approach. Basically, this means that all services are included in the scope of the agreement unless countries specify what sectors or sub-sectors and all non-conforming measures they want to exclude. This contrasts with GATS which has a positive list approach – you list only the things you want to liberalise. The intention with a negative list approach of course is to dramatically broaden the scope of coverage. It's a “list it or lose it” approach. The negative list also creates a target for future rounds of liberalisation.

In addition, the TTIP will likely include a standstill and ratchet clause as was negotiated under the recent Canada-EU deal. Standstill requires parties to lock-in existing levels of liberalisation in all service sectors unless a specific exception has been taken. The ratchet clause goes further and requires parties to bind all autonomous liberalisation. The problem with the ratchet clause is this: Imagine a government of a certain political persuasion in Europe decides to open up its education market to offshore providers. If education was not properly protected, this action would automatically bind and lock-in that liberalisation for all future governments. The problem is that a future government, even if had a mandate to undo the policy of liberalisation, would be restricted by the TTIP from doing so. It wouldn't be impossible, but it would be very difficult and potentially costly to undo the damage. This, in my view, has serious implications for democratic decision-making.

Finally, there is a proposal to include a so-called investor-state-dispute settlement mechanism in the TTIP. Most trade agreements, like those of the WTO, involve state-to-state dispute resolutions. If a country feels that another signatory country is in violation of an agreement, it can launch a legal process adjudicated by the WTO.

Investor-state is different because it grants private companies special rights to bypass domestic court systems. Cases are heard by arbitration panels that can order governments to compensate investors allegedly harmed by public policies or regulations. In effect, investor-state rules establish a private justice system exclusively for foreign investors, including the world's largest and most powerful multinational corporations.

It gives investors a powerful tool to challenge public policies. There are numerous examples of the dangers of this. For instance, at the end of 2012, Dutch insurer Achmea (formerly Eureko) was awarded €22 million in compensation from Slovakia under the investor rights provisions of a bilateral investment treaty signed with the Netherlands. Achmea challenged a 2006 Slovak government decision reversing the health privatisation policies of the previous administration and requiring health insurers to operate on a not-for-profit basis.

It's not hard to imagine a similar case where, if education services are covered by the scope of the TTIP, offshore private education providers could argue that accreditation rules or quality assurance procedures are in fact trade barriers.

In the worst case scenario, then, the TTIP could facilitate a flood of private, for-profit colleges into Europe and leave governments with limited policy space to regulate them. And regulation of the private sector is needed. In 2012, the US Congress launched an investigation into the activities of the for-profit colleges and found there was a 64% drop out rate and high graduate unemployment rates. As well, for-profits spent over 22% of all their revenues on marketing, took just under 20% in profits, but devoted just 17% of their revenues to instruction. The Congressional report concluded that for-profits were characterised by "substandard academic offerings, high tuition and executive compensation, low student retention rates and the issuance of credentials of questionable value."

The TTIP is just one symptom of this darker shadow being cast over the university today. Even if we defeat the TTIP, we will not vanquish the enemy that is the marketisation and privatisation of all things public.

At stake are the values of the university that serve the public interest. We are now in danger of sacrificing academic quality for managerial expediency; research integrity for corporate marketing; and academic freedom for administrative obsession over messaging, branding and public relations.

The academic labour movement hasn't sat idly by in the face of this challenge. In country after country there has been renewed activism. We've seen the rise of new coalitions and campaigns such as the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education in the United States, the Council for the Defense of British Universities, and of course your own Defend the Irish University – and might I just say kudos to IFUT for taking the lead on this important initiative.

But as I said at the beginning, I'm here not just to flatter you but also to make the case that while defending the university is about us, it is also about more than us. It is about a broader struggle against the forces that would seek to reduce public space, to constrain democratic participation, and to extend markets into public sites like the university with the effect of subjecting them to a cold, economic logic.

What do we need to do? I will be the first to admit that I don't have all the answers. However, I would propose in what is a tradition in Ireland of thinking in threes, of three things we as academic unions need to think about.

I would propose, following the lead of the American higher education scholar Gary Rhoades, the following three "Rs": regenerate, reach out and reach beyond



**Regenerate.** We need to regenerate our leadership. In many parts of the world, but particularly in the OECD countries, demographics require us to rebuild our leadership at the local and national level. This is not as simple a task as it may seem. In many cases, younger academics have become disengaged from their unions. We need to find out why and look for solutions.

**Reach out.** We also need to find new ways to engage and grow our membership. Academic work has changed dramatically. The growth in precarious and fixed-term employment poses new challenges for us and the entire labour movement. It requires us to think about new ways of organizing. And organizing isn't just about signing up members and sending them a newsletter once in a while. It's about engaging them and listening to them.

**Reach beyond.** Finally, if the attacks on the university and on academic labour are about more than us as I've suggested, then we need to make common cause with others – with students, the broader labour movement, civil society partners, and our communities.

Once again, thank you for the invitation to speak to delegates here today. I am absolutely honoured to have had this opportunity and look forward to our continued work together.

Go raibh maith agat.