

Chapter 8

My Campus Administration, Faculty Association, Senate, and Me: A Case Study in Academic Mobbing

Peter Wylie

University of British Columbia – Okanagan, Canada

ABSTRACT

This chapter recounts recent experiences of the author with the University of British Columbia (UBC), its Faculty Association (FA), this association's relationship with the author's campus administration at UBC Okanagan campus (UBCO), and the relationship of the campus administration with the senate of the campus. The chapter is a case study of academic mobbing. The author's targeting, exclusion, and ostracism is fully documented in the chapter and fully explained by the concepts of academic bullying, harassment, and mobbing. It is a case study of where an elected union representative of faculty members and an elected senator was targeted, excluded, and ostracized by the powers that be in the union and university administration, working in collusion and complicity.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-9485-7.ch008

INTRODUCTION

This chapter recounts recent experiences of the author, a tenured associate professor close to normal retirement age, with the University of British Columbia (UBC), its Faculty Association (UBCFA, or simply, FA), this association's relationship with the author's campus administration at UBC Okanagan campus (UBCO), and the relationship of the campus administration with the senate of the campus. The chapter is a specific and personal case study of academic mobbing, defined as "an insidious, non-violent and sophisticated kind of psychological bullying that predominantly takes place in college and university campuses" (Khoo, 2010, p. 61). The chapter is one of a series of works the author has written and published in recent years on the institutional analysis of UBC, especially UBCO and the FA (Wylie, 2017, 2018a, 2018b, 2018c, in press). A comprehensive account of some early in time aspects of this case study is published elsewhere (Wylie, 2018c) and hence is not repeated in this chapter.

The inquiry draws on narrative and self-study methodology requiring a close, critical process of inquiry and reflection (Clarke & Erickson, 2003). Self-study is paired with narrative (Hendry, 2010, p. 73). Care however was taken to anonymize as much as possible, other than the actual institution. The chapter explores how administrative managers at the campus, who *de facto* control the senate, deny and explain away inconvenient information, and how the FA supports them do it. The article demonstrates a turn on 'don't shoot the messenger' wisdom, as sweetheart unionism, defined as "collusion between management and labour" in terms "beneficial to management and detrimental to union workers" (Dictionary.com, 2018) and an all-administrative academic governance (Ginsberg, 2011), goes out of its way to muzzle and sideline critics and whistle blowers. The analysis is partially grounded on a particular theory of human reception of *inconvenient data*:

We habitually avoid or ignore evidence that contradicts long-held views and tend to believe only the things reported to us by people we like. We reject inconvenient data as lies and propaganda. We are massively susceptible to peer pressure. We also fiercely resist admitting error. (Behr, 2010)

The objective of the chapter is to generate conversation, dialogue, feedback, input and future inquiry into the issue of academic mobbing, in the spirit of critical engagement as well as insight into new courses of action.

BACKGROUND: ACADEMIC MOBBIING

Although the case study of this chapter is primarily a personal account of events, it is of course useful to locate it within the professional literature on academic mobbing. Estimates put mobbing at 15-20 per cent of all participants in the workplace in the United States (Davenport, Schwartz and Elliot, 2011; Hoel and Salin, 2003). Of the 100 or so academic mobbing cases known in Canada and the United States to one expert in the field, around two dozen were from Canadian institutions (Westhues, 2005). Others characterize such phenomena as “low incidence, high severity” (Gunsalus, 2006, pp. 124-25). Yet others argue that the phenomenon is pervasive (MacDonald, Stockton and Landrum, 2018). One commentator cites that an estimated 12 per cent of mobbed professors end up committing suicide (Seguin, 2016, para. 14). One infamous example is that of Justine Sargent, a McGill University neurologist, who committed suicide with her husband in 1994 (Cran, 2018).

The academic mobbing “process begins when a small group of instigators decide to cast someone out on the pretext that he or she is threatening their interests” and “negative communication frames the target as someone who is impossible to work with and who threatens the organization.” The target is characterized as a “troublemaker,” as someone who “doesn’t listen to advice,” who is “detrimental to the organization,” even who “is mentally ill.” Mobbing includes a range of oppressive tactics; “depriving the target of the right to have a voice, excluding them from committees and positions of responsibility, not responding to [their] emails, etc... the targets end up becoming completely ostracized – their reputation, credibility, authority, influence and contributions to the organization are nullified. As in a totalitarian situation, any attempts to defend themselves are perceived as additional proof of their “deviance.” The target becomes a “non-person.” Also is the fact that “university administrations and human resource departments are involved in most mobbing campaigns” (Khoo, 2010, pp. 61-63; Seguin, 2016).

Tenured professors engaging in academic freedom, particularly when it calls attention to or challenges administrators’ mismanagement, is argued to be the most common reason for academic mobbing: “The most common trait of mobbing is that targets [are] blowing the whistle or having knowledge about a serious breach of ethics or wrongdoing by a powerful person in the workplace...people who speak out against unethical behaviour and are intolerant of hypocrisy are often targets” (Khoo, 2010, p. 63). It is argued that academic mobbing is largely practiced by “unprincipled” or “corporate-minded” administrators particularly to intimidate and dissuade faculty from publicly questioning their actions or decisions (MacDonald et al., 2018, para. 11).

McDonald et al. (2018) argue that almost all scholars who study academic mobbing agree in several key respects:

First, academic mobbing tends to be initiated by unprincipled administrators whose malfeasance was questioned or revealed through the expression of academic free speech. Second, the victims of academic mobbing tend to be productive, likable, principled tenured professors who publicly speak out about administrative wrongdoing. Third, academic mobbing involves manipulation of the language or misrepresentation of the facts regarding the victim's motivations, speech, or behavior. Fourth, the victim's colleagues are either poisoned against him or her, or choose not to support the victim due to fear of sharing his or her fate, indifference, or a lack of conviction... Finally, the victim is left personally and professionally injured, while the perpetrator(s) goes unpunished and therefore perhaps empowered to pursue a new target (MacDonald, et al., 2018, para. 12).

These characterizations fit perfectly the author's personal treatment at the hands of the UBCFA and UBCO senior administration since assuming an executive officer position with the FA and an elected senator role, both in July 2017. The author's targeting, exclusion, and ostracism by university and union administrators is fully documented in this chapter and fully explained by the concepts of academic bullying, harassment and mobbing of a principled tenured professor.

Despite a history of research and case studies, and a burgeoning professional literature, it must be noted at the outset that the FA and UBC managers do not acknowledge the existence of academic mobbing as a phenomenon. Nor can one find references to academic mobbing among the extensive official resources at UBC given to "bullying and harassment." Indeed, there is a double denial: once in denying that administrators, association officers, or faculty and staff members stoop to mobbing, and twice in denying that the phenomenon even exists.

THE START OF THE AFFAIR

The author began their FA role as 1st vice-chair of the Okanagan Faculty Committee (OFC), an executive officer position on this standing committee of the FA, in July 2017, and was also elected as a faculty representative of the joint Faculties to the campus senate in July 2017, for an additional 3-year term (having also served 2014-17). The academic mobbing campaign against the author by both the FA and the

UBCO campus administration, in collusion and conspiracy, was first triggered by an email the author sent on August 2, 2017. This was to the UBCO acting provost, copied to the FA, and a day later to the campus principal, as a result of discussions the author had, in their official role as executive officer of the FA, with a faculty member. This member who had approached the author had four graduate students, two PhD and two MA, approved by them for their graduate program admission for 2016-18, one in 2016-17 and three in 2017-18, all of whom they had agreed to supervise, rejected for admission, apparently by their director and associate dean. This was over their head, as the faculty member was neither consulted on nor informed of their rejection by either the director or associate dean. The author, in his FA executive role, queried this to the administration. In the meantime, the author was also helping this same member on their workload and other matters, because they were getting no help from the professional staff of the FA.

After six weeks of no response from the administration, on September 12, 2017 the author received a formal letter from their provost. The letter was not copied to others. In this letter, the provost (of all people) stated, amongst other things, that the author, as an elected executive officer of the FA, must “*cease and desist from any further involvement in the workplace affairs of faculty members*” as they “*do not have the authority to act on behalf of the FA*” and their statement that they were the elected 1st vice-chair of the OFC executive representative of UBCO faculty members was a “*willful misrepresentation of [their] status*” and that they had no authority to be “*involved in labour relations matters concerning members of the FA*” and the author was “*inappropriately engaging with FA members.*” The provost also suggested that it might be a good idea if the author was to avail themselves of the psychological testing resources of the University. A good example of the collusion and complicity between FA and UBCO senior administration, and the author’s academic mobbing where a “small group of instigators decide to cast someone out on the pretext that he or she is threatening their interests” (Khoo, 2010). But what were these interests? Was it just to protect the sweetheart unionism deal?

On October 10, 2017 the author received a further formal and threatening letter, this time from their UBCO campus principal and deputy vice-chancellor (DVC) of UBC, that stated, in part: “*I am restating the provost’s clear direction that you are to cease communicating with University administration on matters related to labour relations and interfering in these matters, Sincerely.*” The UBCO campus senior administration and the FA in complicity and collusion were turning up the heat on the author’s academic mobbing, bringing in the principal of the campus this time. The FA and the administration appeared to be making a mountain out of a molehill, so what was the hidden agenda? Had the author turned over a rock and the administrators and the FA did not want to let the can of worms exposed beneath, out?

A week after receiving the threatening letter from the principal, the author received a formal letter on October 17, 2017 from the vice-president of the FA stating to them that they were: “*inappropriately engaging with FA members*” saying “*you do not have the authority to become involved with labour relations matters concerning members of the bargaining unit*”. Also that “*if you are approached by any members seeking assistance, you must refrain from providing advice.*” Finally, in a letter to the author under the signature of both the FA vice-president and the chair of the OFC, dated February 1, 2018, the author was told: “*You are not to deal with members’ concerns should they come to you, or you go to them...you do not have the authority...to deal with the University administration on any matters affecting the Faculty Association or any of its Membership...we consider this matter closed.*”

The discussion in this chapter of this portion of the case study is necessarily brief as it is comprehensively covered in another of the author’s recent papers to which to reader is hereby referred (Wylie, 2018c).

CONTINUATION OF THE AFFAIR IN SENATE

Concurrently, given the reception the author had received trying to act in their official role as elected executive officer of the FA, the author tried instead to raise the issue as an elected senator of the member’s graduate students being turned away without consulting nor informing them, first at the September 28, 2017 senate meeting. At this meeting, the principal of the campus stated that the matter was one of labour relations that could not be commented on in senate as it was currently under discussion with the FA. Later however, and more revealingly, in mid-January 2018, the author, as an elected faculty officer of the FA elected to investigate the concerns of Okanagan campus faculty members, was asked by another faculty member, to bring another matter to the attention of the FA. The matter was this member’s removal from their position of graduate program coordinator in their Faculty on September 8, 2016. This was, they felt, due to their principled opposition to “the improper suspension of admissions into the faculty graduate program in October 2015.” This was, coincidentally, the same program, the Interdisciplinary Graduate Studies (IGS) program of the Faculty of Management (FoM), that the other faculty member had their students turned away from in July 2017, by their Faculty director and associate dean. This, in mid-January 2018, was the first the author had heard of this alleged suspension of admissions, dated from October 2015, apparently made without having the suspension approved by senate, without informing faculty or

students, and without posting the suspension on any University website. Adjudication of admissions to the FoM graduate program had also been removed at this time from the authority of the senate-constituted committee of the Faculty, formerly chaired by this member, and placed in the hand of the director and associate dean of the FoM. The member was also concerned that their removal might affect his tenure denial reconsideration, another matter the author was helping the member with, as their elected faculty executive officer representative of the FA.

No administrator of UBCO, if they were aware of a suspension of admissions as of October 2015 and on senate, such as the dean of the FoM in question, who would have been the person to have made such a decision to suspend admissions, if any such decision was made (and from the administrative email evidence provided to the author, it appears it was made), and presumably the then dean of the College of Graduate Studies (CoGS), nor the provost or principal and DVC, informed senate of any suspension of admissions at the September 28, 2017 meeting, even though that would have been a sufficient explanation as to why the faculty member's students had been turned away. In fact, rather, both the UBCO provost and the FA president had already told the author, as had the UBCO principal and DVC, and as the vice-president of the FA, and chair of the OFC of the FA, were soon to tell the author, all in formal letters, to take their nose out of where, in their collective view, it did not belong, and to butt out. What was going on here, why were they all protesting so (too) much?

After discussion with their fellow executive officers of the FA, it was decided by the author that the alleged suspension of admissions was a matter for senate, the academic governance body of the University, and its admissions committee, rather than the FA. By the end of February, the author had determined to bring the matter to senate. Hence, as the faculty member's elected senator, elected to represent the UBCO joint Faculties, the author first offered the associate dean of CoGS and the director of the FoM the opportunity to meet with them to discuss the matter. However, neither demonstrated any interest in that, and the associate dean of CoGS denied the fact that there was a suspension of admissions, even though they had been in fact intimately involved in arranging it in October 2015 -- the member in question who had contacted the author about the matter had provided the conclusive documentary administrative email evidence proving that there had been such a suspension in October 2015, for a, so far, uncertain period. The director of the FoM did not reply to the author's enquiries, as an elected senator, suggesting a meeting to discuss.

The author requested that the matter be added to the agenda of the March 29, 2018 senate meeting. On March 21, 2018 the senate agenda committee refused to allow the matter to be added to the agenda. The committee suggested that the author

take the matter up with CoGS and the FoM, which they of course had already done, and the senate secretariat knew that, and so presumably, did the agenda committee, as it was advised by the secretariat. Moreover, as an elected senator, the author was bringing the matter to senate -- are senators instead supposed to bring matters to the attention of other bodies on the campus, rather than to senate? The committee told the author that they could give notice of motion regarding the matter at the March 29, 2018 meeting, for addition to the agenda of the April 26, 2018 meeting. Therefore, the academic mobbing was extending itself to those senior administrators controlling the agenda of the campus senate, in charge of academic governance on the campus.

At the March 29, 2018 senate meeting, the author attempted to give this notice of motion for the April meeting, regarding the illegal suspension of admissions and the overriding of senate-approved procedures for adjudication of student applications in the FoM IGS program. The notice of motion was merely to the effect that student application fees collected by UBC while the secret suspension of admissions was in place be returned to the students. The notice of motion was disallowed by the chair of senate (the president of UBC) and secretary of senate, on the basis that the author did not provide an "exact wording of the motion." This was in violation of Robert's Rules under which the senate operates. Senate has no such special rule for the making of notices of motion. However, after the meeting was abruptly adjourned by the chair, cutting off the author's attempts to make the notice of motion, another member of senate was allowed, ex-post to the meeting, to give a notice of motion on the matter. Also at this March 29, 2018 meeting, the dean of CoGS denied loudly, by abruptly standing up and screaming at the top of their voice, on the author requesting the notice of motion, and hence interrupting the author without leave to do so, that there was no suspension of admissions into the IGS program in the FoM.

On April 19, 2018 the senate agenda committee refused to allow the author's background evidence, material to the other member's motion, to be added to the senate materials, for senate consideration. It told them if they wanted the material documentary evidence proving the suspension to be considered by senate, they would have to give a notice of motion at the April 26, 2018 senate meeting for consideration for the May 2018 meeting. On April 19, the author asked why this was, and the excuse given this time was that the agenda committee thought that the matter of any alleged suspension of admissions into the IGS in the FoM was a matter for the FA, not senate. This was of course preposterous, as senate has an admissions committee, and the FA has nothing to do with student admissions, but here we went round the academic mobbing merry-go-round. The UBC administration was making a concerted

effort to suppress the information the author had asked as an elected senator to be discussed, trying all it could to stop it from being made public, not allowing the author's motions at senate, not allowing them to file the material evidence in senate, and their senior administrators not answering the author's requests for information as an elected senator, and refusing to engage in discussion of the matter.

Therefore, on April 23, 2018, the author made the material documentary evidence public themselves, by circulated the background evidence material (a 2-pager) to all members of senate for which they had email addresses, by email. There is of course nothing in the senate rules forbidding that. However, one senate member, an associate dean, and hence member of the senior administration, complained on the floor of senate at its meeting on April 26, 2018 that the author had illegitimately sent an email to senate members, that the material should be disregarded, and that the motion should be put to a vote without senate discussion. This was in clear violation and attempted infringement, censorship and suppression of the author's academic freedom, by a member of the senior administration, and an affront to academic freedom and the principle of senate debate. The dean of CoGS at the meeting referred to the author's circulated documentary material evidence as "vexatious." This was also in direct attack on the principle of the free expression of ideas, opinions and facts at UBC. The denials of the administration were getting louder and more vociferous, as the academic mobbing of the author intensified and widened.

Also at the April 26 Senate meeting the dean of CoGS informed senate that there was no suspension of admissions because they testified that there were offers made in the FoM IGS to students for entry in the three academic years 2015-16 to 2017-18, but that none of these offers resulted in any admissions, as all of the offers were declined by the students. Senate accepted this explanation, based on no official data, but just on the unsubstantiated word of the dean, and hence voted down by large majority, the motion and any further action on the issue. With the motion to return the student applications fees so defeated, the author then made a notice of motion for a future senate meeting worded: "*That senate conduct a full investigation, by whatever means deemed most suitable, into the management of the IGS program in the FoM, 2010-18.*" Soon after the meeting a freedom of information (FOI) request was put in to UBC to reveal the offer letters and refusal letters of the students, 2013-18. It was later decided by the senate secretariat, on the author's suggestion, that the further motion be postponed for senate discussion until after the FOI request had been dealt with.

RESPECTFUL ENVIRONMENT AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMPLAINTS

The acting dean of the author's Faculty contacted them on July 31, 2018 to say:

I am writing to inform you that four complaints have been received by the Dean's Office alleging that your conduct breached UBC's Statement on Respectful Environment for Students, Faculty, and Staff in your April 23, 2018 communications to Senate and others. In accordance with UBC Respectful Environment Statement (RES), I am the responsible Administrative Head of Unit and request two meetings with you: The first is to provide you with copies of the written complaints and explain the investigation process and protocol. The second is to afford you the opportunity to respond to the complaints. As this is a formal process, you are entitled to representation and I encourage you to invite a FA representative to accompany you at the investigation meeting. A member of the Human Resources (HR) team also will be present during the meeting.

Dates for the meetings were suggested for August, the month of the author's scheduled vacation. The author finally obtained the complaints on August 14, and found that they were made by three deans and a director, three complaints on April 26, the day of the Senate meeting, and one on May 1. This certainly appeared to have been an organized effort on the part of the four UBCO senior administrators, and unexplained was the more than 3-month delay between HR at UBCO receiving these complaints, April 26-May 1, 2018, and the author being informed of them, on July 31, 2018, and being given them finally to read, on August 14, 2018. On August 12, before the author had received the complaints, they wrote to the president of UBC to say:

In April 2018 I raised at senate a significant issue of academic governance on the UBC Okanagan campus [and] on Jul 31, 2018 I received an email from my acting dean regarding this. I am concerned that the RES of UBC appears to be being used in an attempt stifle academic debate on campus, even in senate it appears, in a hope to silence criticism of the administration, and the raising of important issues of academic governance. In my view, senators, as do all members of the UBC community of scholars, need to be free to raise significant issues of academic governance as they see them, especially in senate, the academic governance body of the university, and need to be free to criticize the administration.

The four complaints were from the associate dean of the FoM, the director of the FoM, the associate dean of CoGS, and the dean of CoGS. The first complaint, from the associate dean of CoGS, in charge of the IGS program on campus, dated April 26, 2016, 12.29 PM (3 hours prior to the senate meeting of that day) claimed that the author's material documentary evidence emailed April 23, 2018 constituted a form of "*harassment against [them]*", and that the author's material evidence should be "*severed*" from being presented to senate. This was in stark violation of this associate dean's duty as a senior administrator of UBC to protect and promote academic freedom at UBC. The author had sent this administrator one highly respectful email on this matter on March 7, 2018, to which they had curtly, disrespectfully and dishonestly replied to on March 8, in a one-line blanket denial.

The second complaint, dated April 26, 2016, 1.44 PM (2 hours prior to the Senate meeting of that day) was from the director of the FoM, who argued that the author's material evidence sent to senators on April 23, 2018 was "*harassing, exclusionary or defamatory*" of them and that the author was involved with "*secretive work with others*" -- the professor who had their students turned away and the professor removed as IGS coordinator -- to "*defame, exclude and harass [them]*" making "*false claims*" about their "*actions and character.*" The author had sent this director one highly respectful email March 7, 2018 on the matter, to which the director did not bother to reply, even though they knew the facts the author was referring to. They now claimed that the author was making it "*impossible*" for them to carry out their "*work as director, their own research, and to enjoy their family life.*"

The third complaint dated April 26, 2016, 1.52 PM (1.5 hours prior to the senate meeting of that day) was from the associate dean of the FoM who spoke of the author's alleged "*repeated breaches*" of the RES now involving an "*abusive, vexatious attempt [by the author] to diminish this associate dean's standing within UBC and the wider public*" and that "*the responsible authority [CoGS] has answered in plain terms that no such suspension has occurred.*" But the author had the factual and irrefutable documentary evidence that it had occurred. This associate dean asked for "*anticipated and immediate administrative action*" against the author "*by the University administration*" and characterized the author's inquires on the matter as an "*apparently endless and evidently groundless vendetta against administrators.*" In the author's view this complaint was an affront to academic freedom at UBC, and a violation of this UBC senior administrator's duty to protect and promote academic freedom at UBC.

The fourth and last complaint was dated May 1, 2018, from the dean of CoGS. It also spoke of "*continuous breaches*" of the RES claiming the author's "*abusive, distressful campaign to diminish [their] reputation*" on the part of the author and

that the author was “bullying and harassing” them.” The dean stated: “[the associate dean of CoGS] has stated there was no suspension of IGS in FOM and I clearly stated such at March senate.” But unfortunately both of these statements, providing no evidence, were lies, as confirmed by the material evidence. This dean also asked for “action” to be taken against the author by the University. So, all hell appeared to have broken loose, with a line-up of senior administrators ganging up to have the author presumably at least disciplined, perhaps suspended, or even fired. Quite, in the author’s view, an attempted cover-up and suppression of information and material evidence, violation of academic freedom, and academic mobbing.

In early September 2018 the author filed formal complaints to UBC, and asked the FA to bring a grievance, over the attempted suppression of the author’s academic freedom by UBC, as revealed by the RES complaints. The author also brought a counter-complaint under the RES against named individuals for their disrespectful treatment of the author in the affair. In late October, after much toing-and-froing, the author was informed by UBC that they had hired an “external investigator” to investigate the various complaints and counter-complaints.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION DATA RELEASED

Official applications, offers, and admissions data for the IGS 2013-18 were finally provided to the author in early October 2018, along with redacted letters of all admission offers and all student letters declining offers, as a result of the FOI inquiry. Remarkably, these data were apparently fully available in March 2018 when the author first made enquires for them, because in an email to the provost and others dated March 16, 2018, from the director of the FoM, an email the author was only inadvertently copied on in mid-November 2018, it was stated: “... [the dean of FoM] has the admissions data and decisions on every applicant over this period, if needed.” So the director of the FoM had, in March 2018, direct access to these data, and was willing to provide them to the provost, but not to the author, the elected senator enquiring into the matter. This associate dean chose not to reply to the author’s email to them of March 7, 2018, enquiring of these data. The author was only inadvertently copied on the email from the director of the FoM to the provost of March 16, noting that the data on admissions were fully available at that time, but apparently, not to the author.

Therefore, the author only received these data six months later via long and torturous FOI requests. Once provided to the author in October 2018, the official data showed that there were no offers of admission into the FOM IGS made in the

3 academic years 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18. The former dean of CoGS had told the April senate meeting that there were offers made in these three academic years, all rejected by the students. Not so as it turned out, according to the actual factual evidence. The last two offers made were made in the 2014-15 academic year, in July 2014 and March 2015, both declined by the students, and both well before admissions were suspended in October 2015. Other confirmed facts from the material evidence that the author already had was that there was a suspension of admissions to the FOM IGS from October 2015 until at some date in 2018, as confirmed by the former FoM IGS coordinator, who had been removed, because, as they thought, of their principled opposition to the suspension, and the administrative email evidence of October, 2015. This was without Faculty Council or senate approval, without informing students and faculty, and without posting the suspension on any UBC website. Also as confirmed by the factual email evidence and the former FoM IGS coordinator, there was a violation of senate-approved procedures in the FoM that took approval of IGS admissions away from the senate-constituted IGS coordinator and committee of Faculty Council they chair and into the hands of the director and associate dean. All applications October 2015-February 2018 were hence ultimately rejected by the director and associate dean.

The suspension of admissions decision appears to have been made by the dean of the FoM, and no students were admitted to the program after April 2015, until at some point in early 2018. Again, the former dean of CoGS at the April 2018 senate meeting said there were offers made and rejected during the last three academic years (2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18). The two offers made and rejected for 2015-16 were both made in the 2014-15 academic year, well before admissions were suspended in October 2015 (one in July 2014 and the other in March 2015). There were no new admissions offers made after March 2015.

As a result of receiving this confirmation of the facts in early October, the author asked that their further motion be now added to the agenda of the October 25, 2018 senate meeting: *“That senate conduct a full investigation, by whatever means deemed most suitable, into the management of the IGS program in the FoM, 2010-18.”* The senate agenda committee this time agreed to allow the motion and (finally!) agreed to allow the author’s material documentary evidence to be included in the senate materials, for senate discussion. Perhaps it was realized that the administration could no longer to deny and suppress everything. At the October 25 senate meeting, the author reiterated their belief that this matter was in their view a serious issue of academic governance and institutional integrity, and asked: Did this matter constitute fraud and misrepresentation, the offering of something to prospective students under

false pretences? The author also asked: What explains the denials of UBCO senior administrators since the author's first inquiries in early August 2017, to date? The author reiterated their belief that UBC needed a fact-finding investigation into how and why this had been allowed to occur in violation of both academic governance and institutional integrity at UBC.

The author's motion was defeated at the October 25, 2018 senate meeting by a vote of 15-16. All of the elected student senators voted for the motion, all of the unelected, ex officio administrators on senate against, with elected faculty members split, some of course, as in any faculty member cohort, like-minded with respect to the administrators. The dean of the FoM of course voted against and this was the deciding vote on whether there should be an investigation into their actions or not. Debate went on for over an hour, the other business of senate was done in the first 20 minutes. Actually, as it had turned out, there was no need for an investigation, as all of the facts were already transparent. How long could the senior administration continue to ignore the facts to protect the dean of the FoM?

The author filed their written response to the four complaints of the deans and director in October, 2018. They stated that no amount of bluster and bombast from these deans and director could change the indisputable fact of the secret suspension of admissions. With the facts confirmed by the former IGS Coordinator of the FoM, who was in best the position to know, by the actual documentary email evidence, and by the official offers and admissions data, were these deans and director living in some alternate reality, preferring to peddle alternative facts? Quite an attempted campus-wide senior administrative cover-up and suppression of information, material evidence, academic freedom, and the facts, right up to the provost and principal, and the FA. Also, of course, an academic mobbing of the author for uncovering and prosecuting the facts, and then all and sundry ganging up to have the author presumably disciplined, suspended or even fired. The author was as mindful as ever, of course, of a core value of UBC, as written in its most recent strategic plan, of: "Academic freedom: A unique value of the academy: a scholar's freedom to express ideas through respectful discourse and the pursuit of open discussion, without risk of censure" (University of British Columbia, 2016, p. 9).

UNIVERSITY INVESTIGATION

There remained the matter of the investigation into these matters as a result of the RES complaints against the author by the four deans and director, the author's RES counter-complaints, and the author's complaints regarding administrative

infringement of their academic freedom and academic freedom generally at UBC. The University had hired a lawyer as the “external and independent investigator” in October who had worked for many years for the FA’s legal counsel firm, so the author suspected it was hardly going to be an independent investigation. The author was denied a copy of the terms of reference of the investigation, and had no say in them. The author met for a full-day meeting with the investigator on November 7, 2018. At this meeting the author supplied the investigator with their list of important witnesses, the two most important being one, the professor who had their graduate students turned away in July 2017, and two, the professor who was removed as graduate program coordinator because of what they felt was their principled opposition to the secret suspension of admissions. The author also provided the investigator with all of the, now extensive, documentary material evidence and admissions and offers data.

The report of the investigator was received by UBC on December 13, 2018, and the author was provided with a copy on January 31, 2019. The investigator completely ignored all of the documentary material evidence provided to them by the author at their meeting of November 7, evidence which conclusively and fully substantiated the author’s case. The investigator completely ignored the evidence that demonstrated conclusively that the FoM had all of the admissions data and admissions offer letters that conclusively and fully substantiated the author’s case in March 2018, and offered them then to the provost, but not to the author, the elected senator asking for them. The investigator completely ignored the offers and admissions data finally provided to the author in October, the data that completely and conclusively substantiated the author’s case, saying these data were outside of the investigation’s terms of reference. The investigator completely ignored the evidence of the October 25, 2018 Senate meeting debate that also conclusively and fully substantiated the author’s case, saying the meeting occurred after they were hired and hence outside of the terms of reference given to them by UBC. The investigator failed to interview three of the four dean and director complainants, and only interviewed the fourth briefly via Skype. They failed to interview any of the people on the important witness list the author provided to them at their November all-day meeting. The investigator’s failure to interview the professor who had their students turned away, and the professor who was removed as graduate program coordinator, the two central figures in the entire matter, was of course both outstandingly egregious and totally irresponsible.

The investigation, reporting to UBC administration, was hence a massive failure of total bias, irresponsibility, and brazen indifference to the actual evidence, facts, and truth. The investigator also refused to acknowledge that the dean of CoGS had deceived (lied to) senate at the April 26, 2018 senate meeting, as the subsequent

evidence, facts, truth, admissions offers data and letters of offer to students, 2015-18, conclusively showed. They also failed to acknowledge that the senate secretary and chair of senate (the president of UBC) had failed to adhere to Robert's Rules in senate in denying the author's request for a notice of motion at the March 29, 2018 senate meeting, as Robert's Rules provided to them, conclusively showed. The investigator ignored this clear and conclusive evidence and fact, and made up their own alternative fact and truth in stating: "*It did not occur.*"

The investigator somehow managed to conclude, entirely unsubstantiated by any evidence whatsoever, that the author had acted with malice and was vexatious. The author was deemed by the investigator to have been malicious and vexatious because they "*had a desire to show [they] were right, and the administration was wrong.*" Of course, the investigator's baseless pronouncement was just what the University administration had ordered. It appears we cannot have faculty members and elected senators being right, and the administrators being wrong. The truth was that the author was engaged in an honest pursuit of the truth, as an elected senator, doing their job, truth that was eventually fully revealed in the release to the author of the admissions offers, data and letters in early October. Both the professor who had their students turned away and the one removed as IGS coordinator had to take sick leave for stress and anxiety over the matter. The investigator makes light of these facts by calling the author's enquiries malicious and vexatious. The FA had told both of these professors, after their returns from sick leave in February 2018, that there was no suspension of admissions, merely a "restriction" that faculty members had been fully informed of. Both of these statements were patently false, alternative facts, but were repeated verbatim by the investigator in their doublespeak and doublethink "findings of fact".

Thus the investigation initiated by the University turned out to be a sham, a kangaroo court Star Chamber, without due process, ignoring the clear material evidence, a continued attempted administrative cover-up of the actual facts and truth, an unsuccessful complete whitewashing of UBC administration, a massive personal and professional defamation of the author, an elected senator, and an totalitarian exercise in misinformation and denial of the truth. The author asked the FA to file a grievance on their behalf under the Collective Agreement statement on Academic Freedom. The FA of course denied this request, as per its sweetheart unionism deal with the University. The investigator's report was merely then the continuation of the pack of lies, disregard of conclusive material evidence, obfuscation, and academic mobbing the author had received from the University administration and the FA since their first enquiries into these matters in early August 2017.

The UBCO administration (deans, directors, provost and principal) and the FA could now continue to get away with their longstanding and concerted campaigns of fear, bullying, harassment and intimidation of regular UBCO faculty members, elected senators, and elected executive officers of the FA, such as the author, by being fully supported by an entirely biased, ridiculous, baseless and defamatory “independent investigation”. The author had the facts, evidence and truth on their side, the administration and the FA, unfortunately, only falsehoods, lies and deceit, in an effort to keep everyone ignorant of what is really going on behind the scenes. IS UBC thus the Ministry of Truth, where power is the only truth and those with the power can make the truth into whatever they chose, with the actual truth rewritten in kangaroo courts of University-controlled “external investigation?”

One of the rationales for dismissing the author’s claims given by the investigator was that the converse finding “*would show that Dr. Wylie was right and UBCO administration was wrong*”. Notwithstanding the fact that this would confirm the facts and the truth. But UBC and the FA did not want that, as the facts and the truth were detrimental to UBC and the FA. The investigator found fault with the author that they “*preferred to believe the hearsay evidence of two faculty members rather than the deans and director.*” How about the factual evidence of the emails by the deans and director in October 2015 suspending admission, provided to the author by one of these two professors? The investigator even more remarkably stated: “*[The author] has no evidence of a suspension of admission.*” Now we were really into alternative facts territory. To the investigator there were no facts or falsehoods, right or wrong, truth or lies, just as they stated “*matters of opinion and opposing views.*” The one and only complainant interviewed by the investigator (and not in person), the dean of CoGS, remarkably stated: “*[The author] did not set out to gather and consider all available, relevant evidence.*” Of course, this is exactly what the author did do, as an elected senator, for over a year. They also stated: “*[The author, an elected senator] undermined my role as dean.*” Obviously a no-no in UBC’s version of shared governance. Therefore, the “investigation” failed to acknowledge the conclusive material evidence, failed to interview any of the author’s witnesses, failed to interview the complainants, and made entirely unsubstantiated accusations of malice against the author. Just what the University had ordered.

The executive director of the FA in March 2019 wrote to the author to say:

“[T]here are potentially very serious consequences to you that may arise out of the investigation and that if there is an underlying medical condition that could possibly be a contributing factor to the conduct which is the subject of concern, it would certainly help mitigate any potential consequences.”

The author replied that personally they failed to understand how an elected senator exposing and seeking minimal redress for students for a minor bit of fraud and misrepresentation in a fairly minor program in a fairly minor corner of the campus can result in very serious consequences to that elected senator, as the author was merely asking that the student application fees October 2015-February 2018, when admissions to the program were secretly suspended, be returned to the students. About 10 students were involved, with the application fee of \$100 per student.

The author in February 2019 received this further advice in the matter from the executive director of the FA:

The facts that UBC will act on are contained in the findings of the reports. What you are being asked to provide, if you wish, is any mitigating information that you would like the Dean to consider before [they make] a decision on the matter. Mitigating information is information which could excuse or explain the conduct in question, or information which could be relied upon to reduce any possible discipline that may be contemplated by the University. Mitigating information could include an apology, a medical reason for the conduct, an explanation that the conduct was an aberration which arose out of a misunderstanding and is unlikely to happen again in the future, that sort of thing. You are not being provided with an opportunity to redo the investigation and challenge the findings of fact that was arrived as a result of the investigation process. The one matter that our counsel found unusual was that [the investigator] did not interview any of the complainants or respondents except [the author] but instead relied on the notes that were provided to [them] from the interviews that [the Dean and HR] conducted. [Counsel] indicated that this action was somewhat unusual and unexplained for a person tasked with conducting an investigation. The investigator's consideration of the material facts before them was appropriate and their application of the applicable law was sound. Legal counsel did not find any substantive grounds upon which we might challenge the investigation process or its outcome. We will therefore not be filling a grievance on this matter.

Therefore, the above is further confirmation of the author's hypothesis that UBC and the FA are in cahoots and collusion in their Kafkaesque and Orwellian world. The FA in the author's view does not, in good faith, as a union with monopoly representational rights, fairly represent its members vis-as-via the employer and pays only lip service to but does not defend the principles of collegial shared governance and academic freedom at UBC. Also, of course, the author finds it strange that if someone has a commitment to seeking the truth and the facts at UBC, such as themselves, and with all due diligence carries out responsibly their role as a faculty member and elected senator, their only defence and excuse for such behaviour can be an abnormal mental condition. Very 1984 and Communist China.

THE GROWING MOB

The spread of the author's academic mobbing then continued apace. On March 31, 2019 the author's former dean sent the following email to the author, copying it at the same time to over 300 faculty members at UBCO, over 50 percent of the voting FA members:

Evidently, Peter, you were seeking validation of your efforts as chief agitator and primary critic of the [University]. Perhaps it is time for some self-reflection, given your state of perpetual unhappiness. Why not resign your tenured faculty position (with its wonderful salary, great benefits, and permanency) and move on to something else more rewarding? Who at UBCO is keeping you chained to your misery?

This author takes such an unprovoked, personal and malicious ad hominin attack as indicative perhaps of the depths of administrator-ex-administrator disrespect for regular tenured faculty members. This former dean's venom is perhaps good evidence of what is said about the author behind the scenes as the academic mobbing campaign against them intensifies. The same day, March 31, 2019, a member of the author's own academic department filed another RES complaint against the author, to the HR department. In it they state:

Wylie...show[s] a significant degree of bias toward a negative assessment. Wylie is of course entitled to his views and opinions...He is not however, in my opinion, entitled to publicly berate the administration by questioning their abilities, their legitimacy or their aptitudes in performing their appointed duties...some means [should be] be investigated which will curtail Wylie's ability to [send] unsolicited, biased and negative messages about the inadequacies of the Faculty and administration... Perhaps IT could investigate ways to shut down his capacity for these email[s].

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The in-coming president of UBC stated in an email to faculty at UBC in July 2016:

We will become a stronger and better university if our most outstanding faculty take ownership of our academic standards and academic governance...You are the real experts on UBC. You have ideas about how the university can be improved...I will

work with the Board of Governors, Senates, central administration, deans, heads and director and faculty members at large to continuously improve UBC's governance, guided by principles of transparency, openness and accountability. It is critical that the faculty have reason to trust, respect and view as competent the people in leadership roles at the university. Together, we can improve UBC one step at a time (University of British Columbia, 2016).

And as the Universities Canada Statement on Academic Freedom states: "Evidence and truth are the guiding principles for universities... faculty must be... free to examine data, and therefore be guided by evidence" (Universities Canada, 2011). Except, it appears, if faculty are examining the administration of the University itself, where, if so, the first casualty is the evidence, facts and truth. The administration instead then chooses to rely on deceit, lies and the covering up of the evidence, facts and truth, and academically mobs the whistle blower. There is no doubt in the author's mind, after a fairly cursory perusal of the professional literature, that the academic mobbing issue is pervasive in universities across the world as universities take on an increasingly corporate and vertically hierarchical organizational model rather than the collegial, shared governance, horizontal organizational model (MacDonald et al., 2018, Ginsberg, 2011). The author is quite sure that their experience is not an isolated incident. The larger picture of the mobbing and bullying of regular faculty members by their administrative and union officials needs to be recognized, as the lack of respect for faculty and shared governance has become pervasive, and as faculty unions and administrations increasingly collude and conspire against individual faculty members in sweetheart unionism deals. This case study in this chapter is not an isolated squabble but just one instance of a large, pervasive problem, that is getting larger in the author's view. Future research and comparative study is needed to explore just how pervasive this problem is becoming.

CONCLUSION

This in the author's view is a clear case of academic mobbing. The case fits perfectly with what is argued that almost all scholars who study academic mobbing agree is its primary characteristics; it is initiated by administrators whose malfeasance was questioned or revealed through the expression of academic free speech; the target tend to be tenured professors who publicly speak out about administrative wrongdoing; it involves manipulation or misrepresentation of the facts regarding the victim's

motivations or behavior; the target's colleagues are either poisoned against him or her, or choose not to support the victim due indifference, or a lack of conviction, and the target is left personally and professionally injured, while the perpetrator(s) goes unpunished (MacDonald et al., 2018, para. 12). To this the author would add that the kangaroo court investigation procedures of the university are merely an extension of the academic mobbing process.

Perhaps has UBC and the UBCFA adopted the advice given to Forrest Gump by his mother that if you can't say anything nice, don't say anything at all? UBC claims to set its 'respectful environment' policies on not the Golden Rule Maxim, but its own new Platinum Rule: "Treat others in the way they would want to be treated". This is perhaps as characterized elsewhere as "The New Critiquette"; are we not allowed to engage in vigorous debate and conflicting views, must we be nice and agreeable at all times, like Stepford faculty, staff, and students? Is there no place for "reasonable hostility"; does the way one says something now count for more than what one has to say (Petrina, 2012, p. 41-42)?

Should an elected FA executive representative of faculty members and an elected senator be allowed to be targeted, excluded and ostracized by the powers that be in the union and university administration, working in collusion and complicity? Regarding senate, if faculty members, especially elected senators in senate, cannot express opinions or raise concerns and questions over issues of academic governance without administrators taking these as personal, how can substantive debate and discussion materialize or academic governance proceed? If administrators personalize issues by singling out faculty members and senators for retribution, with the FA idle and negligent, what faculty members and senators will want to bother participating? If faculty members, especially elected senators, cannot speak up and ask questions or make critical comments without fear of reprisal or retaliation from university administrators, what value is academic freedom? Senior university administrators such as directors, deans, provosts and principals are supposed to work for their faculty members and students, and their members of senate, not the other way around. The faculty and students, and their elected senators, are the university, not the senior administrators. The author is an elected senator, a representative of those who voted for and elected them, and of those who didn't. Administrators are supposed to respond to elected senator's requests for information, discussions, meetings, and inquiries. The university is its faculty and students, and its elected representatives, not its administrators. The administrators are hired by the university (its faculty, staff and students) to manage the university; they are supposed to work for us, not us for them.

REFERENCES

- Behr, R. (2010, September 21). Almost everything you know is wrong: Review of Being wrong: Adventures in the margin of error. *The Observer*.
- Clarke, A., & Erickson, G. (2003). Teacher inquiry: A defining feature of professional practice. In A. Clarke & G. Erickson (Eds.), *Teacher inquiry: Living the research in everyday practice* (pp. 1–6). London, UK: Routledge Palmer. doi:10.4324/9780203417669
- Cran, B. (2018, March 2). The academic mob and its fatal toll. *Quillette*.
- Davenport, N., Schwarz, R. D., & Elliot, G. P. (2003). *Mobbing and Emotional Abuse in the American Workplace*. Civil Society Publishers.
- Dictionary.com. (2018). *Sweetheart contract*. Retrieved from <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/sweetheart-contract>
- Ginsberg, B. (2011). *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gunsalus, C. K. (2006). *The College Administrator's Survival Guide*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hendry, P. M. (2010). Narrative as inquiry. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 103(2), 72–80. doi:10.1080/00220670903323354
- Hoel, H., & Salin, D. (2003). Organisational antecedents of workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*. Taylor & Francis.
- Khoo, S. B. (2010). Academic mobbing: Hidden health hazard in the workplace. *Malaysian Family Physician*, 5, 61–67. PMID:25606190
- McDonald, T. W., Stockton, J. D., & Landrum, R. E. (2018). Civility and Academic Freedom: Who defines the former (and how) may imperil rights to the latter. *The College Quarterly*, 21, 1.
- Petrina, S. (2012). The new critiquette and old scholactivism: A petit critique of academic manners, managers, matters, and freedom. *Workplace*, 20, 17–63.
- Seguin, E. (2016). Academic Mobbing, or how to become campus tormentors. *University Affairs*.

My Campus Administration, Faculty Association, Senate, and Me

Universities Canada. (2011, October 25). *Research Statement on Academic Freedom*. Retrieved from <https://www.univcan.ca/media-room/media-releases/statement-on-academic-freedom/>

University of British Columbia. (2016, July 12). *Invitation to engage from Professor Santa Ono* [email]. Author.

University of British Columbia. (2018). *Shaping UBC's Next Century: Strategic Plan 2018-2028*. Vancouver, BC: Author.

Westhues, K. (2005). *Workplace mobbing in academe: Reports from twenty universities*. London: Mellen Press.

Wylie, P. (2017). Memorandum of misunderstanding? Public accountability and the University of British Columbia, Okanagan Campus, 2004-17. *BC Studies*, 195, 65–96.

Wylie, P. (2018a). The all-administrative campus: University of British Columbia, Okanagan. *Workplace*, 31, 10–21.

Wylie, P. (2018b). Exclusionary and extractive campus management: The University of British Columbia, Okanagan. *Workplace*, 31, 22–30.

Wylie, P. (2018c). My campus administration, Faculty Association and me: Academic mobbing and sweetheart unionism. *Workplace*, 31, 31–41.

Wylie, P. (in press). The University of British Columbia's International Student Initiative: Implications for provincial public higher education. *Critical Education*.

ADDITIONAL READING

Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The Knowledge Factory*. Boston, Mass: Beacon Press.

Cebekhulu, E., & Mantzaris, E. (2006). Labour pains and university mergers: The case of UKZN. *Alternation (Durban)*, 13(1), 182–202.

Faria, J. R., Mixon, F. G. Jr, & Salter, S. P. (2012). An economic model of workplace mobbing in academe. *Economics of Education Review*, 31(5), 720–726. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2012.04.004

Gravios, J. (2006, April 14). Mob Rule. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Harper, J. (2013). *Mobbed! What to do when they really are out to get you*. Backdoor Press.

ICES. (2014). Academic bullying and mobbing: Introduction to the special issue. *Workplace*, 24, 56–57.

Sachs, B. (2010). Enabling employee choice: A structural approach to the rules of union organizing. *Harvard Law Review*, 123(3), 655–728.

The Walrus. (2018, September 17). L’Affaire Galloway.

Thorne, A. (2013, September 23). *Can civility and academic freedom coexist?* Retrieved from <http://www.thefire.org/can-civility-and-academic-freedom-coexist>

Westhues, K. (2006). The unkindly art of mobbing. *Academic Matters: The Journal of Higher Education*. OCUFA, August, p. 18-19

Yale Law Journal. (1966). Union authorization cards. *Yale Law Journal*, 75(5), 805-844.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Academic Freedom: The freedom of faculty members to honestly speak their mind and opinions, including the freedom to criticize their university and union.

Academic Mobbing: The concerted attempt by university managements and faculty unions to ostracize a faculty member seen to be threatening their interests.

All-Administrative University: A university that is governed by its managerial cadre rather than its elected senate or other representative bodies.

Collusion: University management and faculty union working together in unison rather than in opposition.

Complicity: University management and faculty union united in turning blind eyes to violations of faculty member rights.

Faculty Association: A union of faculty members purportedly representing their collective interests vis-a-vis the university employer.

Investigation: An internal university procedure operating on the legal principles of a Star Chamber or kangaroo court.

Respectful Environment Policies: Attempts by university management to suppress academic freedom in the name of fostering a harmonious environment.

Senate: The elected academic governance body of a university in law but typically not in practice.