

U of T Works Because We Do!

Neoliberalism, the Social Economy, and the University of Toronto

By

Justin Holloway

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements

for the degree of Master of Arts

Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

University of Toronto

© Copyright by Justin Holloway 2019

U of T Works Because We Do!

Neoliberalism, the Social Economy, and the University of Toronto

Justin Holloway

Master of Arts

Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education

University of Toronto

2019

Abstract

The University of Toronto is one of the most important social economy organizations in Canada. However, this institution has not lived up to the potential that it has for being a powerhouse leader of the Canadian social economy. Furthermore, it's revealed that this failure is a direct result from the decisions taken by the senior administration of the University of Toronto at the expense of students, faculty, staff, and the broader Canadian public. The research presented here uses a social economy framework as an innovative lens to critically evaluate this public sector non-profit institution and is a contribution to the emerging field of inquiry called critical university studies. In doing so this research has been conducted by utilizing critical discourse analysis in order to examine the statements and information provided by key stakeholders existing in the academy, and specifically, those existing within the University of Toronto community.

Acknowledgements

I'd like to acknowledge the supportiveness provided to me by my instructor and research supervisor, Professor Marcelo Vieta. His teaching and mentoring has introduced me to many intriguing and radical ideas and concepts that have expanded my conception and understanding of the world we all live in. He's also the first person to instill in me the notion that prefiguring a future society isn't silly, but rather, completely necessary.

Much thanks is also due to Professor Peter Sawchuk for being my thesis second reader and for always being positive and encouraging to me personally and throughout this process. As a side note, I will never forget, nor live up to his bestowing on me the honorary title of "OISE's Columbo" for my efforts on our workplace Joint Health and Safety Committee.

I'd also like to acknowledge my colleague Jeananne Robertson for her patience in allowing me to excitedly convey my discoveries to her in our ongoing dialog together about the state of post-secondary education. Her thoughtful comments, insights, and increasingly infrequent counter-arguments to my impassioned outpourings always seem to spark in me a great deal of creative reflection. This has been a great help, and she has been a great friend.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Chapter One: Introduction and Main Argument.....	1
1.1 Thesis Argument.....	2
1.2 Purpose and Rationale.....	4
1.3 Situating Myself	5
1.4 Potential Audience for this Research	7
1.5 Outline of Thesis	9
1.6 Definition of Key Terms.....	11
1.7 Type of Research and Conceptual Framework.....	15
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	17
2.1 Neoliberalism.....	17
2.2 Critical University Studies.....	18
2.3 The Social Economy in Canada.....	20
Chapter Three: The Modern Academy and Neoliberalism.....	23
3.1 History and Background of the Academy.....	23
3.2 Neoliberals Rise, Target and Transform the Academy.....	27

3.3 Critical University Studies.....	34
Chapter Four: The Canadian Social Economy and the Academy.....	39
4.1 Prioritizing Social Benefit over Private Profit.....	42
4.2 The Urgency for Viable Economic Alternatives.....	52
4.3 U of T Breaks with the Canadian Social Economy.....	58
Chapter Five: U of T Divided.....	62
5.1 Deconstructing the U of T Community.....	64
5.2 The Student Debt Crisis.....	70
5.3 Precarious Teaching.....	78
5.4 The U of T Divestment from Fossil Fuels Campaign.....	87
Chapter Six: Overall Conclusions.....	94
6.1 Implications of this Research.....	96
6.2 Limitations of the Study.....	97
6.3 Recommendations for Future Research	98
Appendix.....	100
References.....	101

Chapter 1 – Introduction and Main Argument

Karl Marx introduced his take on the idea of primitive accumulation in the latter part of the first volume of his book *Capital*. Here Marx explained that the economic system of capitalism started from the unfair, forcible, and sometimes violent seizing and enclosure of the commons by a segment of the population who wanted to gain advantage over others and eventually control the means of production in society (Marx, 2013). This theory is one of socio-economic division, stratification, and domination. The core of this theory is still highly relevant today as the process of privatization and profit-seeking continues unfolding on a path of destruction, increasingly raising the likelihood for the extermination of the human species. This thesis is essentially about how these concepts have manifested in universities, and at the University of Toronto specifically. For many, the first time they become aware of and study such concepts will be at a university. However, the people in power at universities are typically spared from critical examination of their own role in furthering the ongoing processes of socio-economic tensions and conflict inherent in the existing neoliberal capitalist system.

The goal of this thesis is to critically study the academy focusing on the Canadian Post-Secondary Education (PSE) system, universities and the University of Toronto in particular. Just as Marx soundly rejected Adam Smith's notion that the original accumulation of capital occurred in a relatively rational and objective manner, the critique given in this thesis does not ascribe to those in power at universities benevolence or goodness, as scholars Williams (2012) and Connell (2019) respectively caution against. In fact, the totality of the research and the arguments given in this paper strongly suggest that, because of this, many serious problems exist and are exacerbated for those inside *and* outside the academy. This is shown by critically

examining how the modern academy in Canada has been captured by neoliberalism, how it has increasingly broken away from the social economy, and finally how the most important member of the academy in Canada, the University of Toronto, has ended up divided between essentially two communities fractured along socio-economic lines.

A social economy lens is applied throughout this research in order to evaluate universities in a bold and innovative new way that reflects the changing economic nature of universities and their relationships to the public, private, and social economy sectors in Canada. This approach is highly warranted considering that “[u]niversities are a prime example of non-profit organizations that have achieved greater autonomy from government, both in their policies and financing, because they are earning a greater part of their revenues from other sources” (Quarter et al., 2018, p. 106). As public sector universities change and grow more autonomous, it is up to all of us to hold those in positions of power within the Canadian academy responsible to their obligations to Canadians and our collective socio-economic interests.

1.1 – Thesis Argument

U of T is not the powerhouse social economy organization (SEO) that it can, should, and must be. All SEO’s must privilege generating social benefits over generating profit in order to fulfill their social mission (Quarter, et al., 2018). However, the managerialiat (non-unionized professional and managerial staff) at U of T has instead shirked and inverted this responsibility in various ways. These decisions follow historical patterns of neoliberalization in PSE. As a result, there has been intense socio-economic conflict and damage done to the core of the

University community: students, faculty, and staff. This core community is increasingly systematically oppressed by the manageriat and forms the precariat at U of T. A third key grouping at U of T is closely connected to the manageriat and directly or tacitly enables their system of oppression against the precariat. This third group consists of extremely wealthy and powerful university donors, benefactors, and influencers which are categorized as the plutocracy. Because U of T holds a leadership role in both the Canadian academy and within the Canadian social economy, the failure by the U of T manageriat to live up to their socio-economic responsibilities directly harms the precariat and indirectly harms Canadian society in general.

Therefore, this research aims to critically address three central questions:

- 1) How is it that U of T has failed to live up to its responsibilities as a powerhouse SEO?
- 2) What are the consequences of this failure?
- 3) What (if anything) should be done about it?

By critically examining the history of neoliberalism in the academy, the social economy in Canada, and the current class-based divisions at the University of Toronto, this research will provide the required contextual information and critical analysis necessary for answering the central questions listed above. Uncovering and understanding how the U of T community has become divided and how the leaders of this institution have failed to live up to their responsibilities is the central goal of this research.

1.2 – Purpose and Rationale

The purpose of this thesis is to provide readers with considerable evidence and critical analysis which encourages the notion that powerful public PSE institutions in Canada such as U of T are not living up to their socio-economic responsibilities specifically as it applies to their statuses as public sector non-profit charitable organizations within the Canadian social economy. This is urgently required for the benefit of everyone in Canada because Canadian PSE institutions do not only affect community stakeholders. Instead, these institutions impact nearly everyone outside of the academy indirectly as well primarily by virtue of the fact that PSE institutions are both massive employers and act as economic engines for cities and the country as a whole.

PSE institutions also help shape the thoughts and opinions of political and economic decision-makers throughout the country. In this context, the U of T may be both the most critically important and most fundamentally flawed institution in the country. Therefore, it is not just the university communities themselves that are affected by the neoliberalization of the academy: It is everyone. Because of the enormity in scope and severity with which these impacts are felt by so many, it is imperative that analyses rooted in critical university studies such as this exist to expose some of the problematic practices carried out by and the underlying contradictory values guiding these critical institutions in neoliberal times.

A deep dive into the recent history at University of Toronto is warranted in particular because U of T is the premier research university in Canada, the leader of the Canadian academy, and one of the top-ranked public PSE institutions in the world (Times Higher Education, 2019). An enormous amount of public investment and resources have been granted

to this school in order to accomplish these achievements, all of which are predicated on the ability of those working within the institution being able to help fulfill U of T's core teaching and research missions. Therefore, this institution should rightfully be put under the highest level of scrutiny and accountability for ensuring that these vital internal missions are met as well as the extra-local responsibilities U of T has to Canadians and the social economy in general.

1.3 – Situating Myself

For nearly two decades I've earned a living by working full-time as a unionized administrative staff member at the University of Toronto. Working at U of T has financially provided me with the means for acquiring and enjoying both the essentials and non-essentials in life. By belonging to both student (Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, University of Toronto Graduate Student Union) and administrative campus unions (United Steelworkers Local 1998) I've benefitted from collectively bargained workplace benefits such as: a staff tuition waiver, prescription drug coverage, dental and eye care, massage therapy, a grievance procedure, and other benefits and rights above and beyond what's required by law (Government of Ontario, 2000). The totality of the actual covered costs associated with taking up these benefits might in comparison represent a significant portion of many other non-unionized worker's total compensation. Therefore, it's not without due consideration that I acknowledge and expose my own personal position of relative privilege. Also worth acknowledging is the fact that my career at the U of T has—at least to some degree—been possible because of my close associations with senior University administrators through my role

as an administrator, union officials through my roles as a union steward and committee chair, and with others in various positions of power within the University of Toronto.

Therefore, it's clear that the research I'm conducting is institutionally captured by my own personal financial, professional, and academic relationships with others at the U of T. Due to these ongoing commitments and relationships I have no way of completely mitigating or avoiding institutional bias that I've developed or absorbed. This could only be done if I were to essentially leave the PSE sector, which I'm not prepared to do... at least not yet. However, my predicament in carrying out critical university studies research while at the same time owing my living directly through my associations with PSE pales in comparison to the recent history of conflict in the academy throughout North America, at the University of Toronto, and even specifically at my home faculty at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. It's been worthwhile to me to triangulate my own personal hopes and fears with an assessment of other people, students, activists, scholars, etc. operating within the academy who've been required to consider their personal ideological standpoint and socio-economic position in order to proceed towards the pursuit of truth and knowledge.

I also feel personally situated within the field of critical university studies because of my deliberate effort to *not* omit my own home institution from critical analysis in my academic pursuits. Rather, I've made this the most essential part of my research. Critical university studies scholars typically ground their assessments and critique of PSE from their own personal lived experiences. Often this experience has been gained through any combination of working, studying, researching, and teaching within a home institution or institutions. This is true for some of the most prominent critical university studies scholars like Christopher Newfield at

UCLA, Benjamin Ginsberg at Johns Hopkins, and Noam Chomsky at MIT. They have all written specifically and in great detail about the PSE institutions in which they're based while also critically analyzing peer institutions and PSE systems as a whole through their personal lenses. My own contributions to the collective body of critical university studies discourse follows this part of its critical framework as I've also centered my research focus in large part around my own lived-experience and knowledge of my home institution, the University of Toronto.

1.4 – Potential Audience for this Research

In conceptualizing the purpose for undertaking this research I asked myself a simple question: Who is this research for and what do I hope they do with it? In considering this question it occurred to me that those who are the most exploited by the current neoliberal system in PSE would be able to identify with many of the topics covered and arguments given in this research paper. By most exploited, I mean the people associated with PSE institutions (including University of Toronto) who comprise a group consisting of people broadly defined as students, teachers, and (typically unionized) non-managerial or non-professional staff. I have adopted British author and professor Guy Standing's term of the "precariat" (Standing, 2017) as a moniker for this group because they are under constant and increasing socio-economic oppression and precariousness.

The precariat is in constant tension and conflict with dominant managerial regimes at most PSE intuitions. These regimes are comprised of managers and professional staff which I call the manageriat. The manageriat are essentially business managers who are directly supported and guided by plutocratic business-sector elites. Plutocrats contribute to the PSE

sector their wealth, power, and influence which increases private-sector influence and control over universities. The plutocracy sometimes uses this influence and their close personal and professional relations with the manageriat in order to secure patronage positions on university governing boards and councils that have been granted to or lobbied for them by the manageriat. Therefore, the precariat have a dual threat posed to them by both the manageriat and the plutocracy who put the interests of profit and pursuit of privatization and commercialization of the PSE sector ahead of creating and distributing social benefits for all Canadians.

Within the precariat are graduate students, many of which hold a unique position at the university by virtue of their status as both graduate students and as paid workers at the university. At University of Toronto graduate students can apply to a range of unionized assistant positions that typically involve teaching, researching, and assisting faculty or other staff. Graduate students commonly pursue attaining employment while studying as a means of increasing their income. This is commonly required in order to meet the extremely high costs of living in the Greater Toronto Area and to pay their high tuition fees and other student debts. Therefore, the socio-economic precariousness facing graduate students is compounded. These are the same people who eventually will be the next generation of university professors and leaders of the academy. More than half of all U of T PhD graduates will go on to teach and work in the academy (University of Toronto School of Graduate Studies, 2016, p. 7). Therefore, graduate students are the prime audience for this research as their learning and working conditions as students have impact on their lives now as students, and most likely will continue to impact them in their professional lives as well.

1.5 – Outline of Thesis

The first chapter of this thesis gives a general introduction to the fundamental elements of this research. Other contextual components are also discussed here in order to set the stage for social justice activist based research that aims to inspire praxis around the exciting and newly emerging research field of critical university studies.

The second chapter is a brief literature review of the core literary sources for the research contained throughout this thesis. An emphasis is given to critical and institutional discourses in PSE, Canadian PSE, and the University of Toronto specifically.

The third chapter of this thesis interrogates the neoliberalization of PSE with a special focus on the academy in Canada and U of T in particular because of its leadership role. This analysis will take a fairly broad historical perspective, but it will centre on providing an overview of the history of neoliberalism in the academy starting from the immediate post-World War II period, then explaining the elite acceptance and implementation of neoliberal ideology in the 1970s leading to the current global state of neoliberal domination of PSE. A critical examination will be given regarding how the academy played a central role in globally promulgating neoliberal doctrine. An argument will also be explored and supported that the neoliberalization of the academy has resulted in a trend of increasing precariousness for students, faculty, and staff. This argument will look at the broader and Canadian PSE sectors, but also focus in a more detailed way on the dynamics of precariousness that have happened or are happening at U of T. This chapter finishes by introducing critical university studies as an exciting and valid scholarly response to the current state of neoliberalism in the academy.

The fourth chapter of this thesis focuses on the social economy in Canada and the relationship this sector of the economy has with the Canadian academy. The latter is increasingly following a commercialized and private sector business model for delivering PSE in Canada. For this chapter Quarter, Mook, and Armstrong's book, *Understanding the Social Economy: A Canadian Perspective* (2018), is heavily relied on as the foremost work on the theme in Canada. This book is a fundamental text for defining and understanding the scale, scope, and importance of the social economy sector in Canada. Other social economy critiques will also be incorporated which essentially argues for SEO's to not just simply place social benefits ahead of profits, but instead, to further create tangible social benefits that make a real difference to the lives of others and our communities (McMurtry, 2010). The latter point underpins the basis for the overall critique of the U of T as not just a SEO but the leader of the Canadian social economy and therefore responsible for not just meeting its basic obligations, but instead, being a SE powerhouse. An account of the need for this kind of prioritization is also given. The chapter concludes by identifying and examining the specific point of departure when the U of T began to clearly break from pursuing social benefit above all.

The fifth chapter specifically analyzes the tensions and contradictions that have happened or are ongoing at the University of Toronto. An argument is made that the U of T manageriat has shown a pattern of choosing to serve plutocratic interests rather than those of the precariat because their discourses and actions are aligned more closely to those of private interests rather than those of the precariat or the Canadian public. I'll also show how this has caused socio-economic harm to the University community and to Canadians. I'll do this by using the following three key examples to back-up my claims that the U of T manageriat is failing to

put social benefit ahead of profit and therefore directly or indirectly serving private rather than public interests:

- 1) Exacerbating the student debt crisis by blatantly contributing to the root causes of student poverty and precariousness for financial gain.
- 2) Creating an environment built on precarious teaching which is part of an overall strategy to undermine and dismantle the tenure system for financial gain.
- 3) Rejecting fossil fuel divestment. This is the smoking gun which shows that the managerat places profit ahead of social benefit even when this will knowingly cause social harm.

The sixth and final chapter of this thesis offers concluding remarks, as well as the implications this thesis uncovers, and the limitations that were met in pursuing these conclusions. Finally, recommendations for future research will be given.

1.6 – Definition of Key Terms

Several terms recur throughout this thesis. Returned to them often throughout the following pages, I briefly define them here.

Neoliberalism – Neoliberalism is a project to reconstruct and solidify the power and privilege of an economically elite class. This plan was devised by a cabal of right-wing economists associated predominantly with the University of Chicago School of Economics (Harvey, 2005). The neoliberal project has spanned several decades but gained significant traction with elites and policy-makers in the early to mid-1970s. It was a direct response by this group to the democratic social and economic reforms generated in the previous decade through activism and the political organization and mobilization of oppressed minorities particularly in wealthy nations. By the 1980s and 90s neoliberal economic ideology which advocated for market-based solutions as direct replacements for government regulations had firmly become the global standard amongst the business and political sectors. This culminated in a shift from industrial production as the main economic engine to a market system driven primarily by money manipulation known as financialization.

Fragmentation of Academic Work – The way in which those performing teaching and research at universities have become stratified based on their: prestige of rank (tenured, tenure-track, sessional, etc.), appointment status (full-time, part-time), funding and revenue generating ability (from government and private sectors), and other factors (Shanahan et al., 2013).

Coercive Isomorphism – A term given to describe how institutions and organizations who are dependent upon government, other organizations, or influential elements of society, will tend to, over time, align their institutional or organizational mission to resemble and/or fit with the

aims and objectives of these other entities whom a financial, political, or other type of dependency exists (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Precariat – The precariat is a rapidly expanding class of workers millions of whom work an increasing amount of long hours, sometimes holding several different jobs, with low pay and little to no real job security. Therefore, members of the precariat live extremely precariously every day under the threat of job loss, declining mental and physical health, financial and familial turmoil, and other socio-economic stressors (Standing, 2017). In regards to this thesis, the definition and analysis of the precariat is slightly modified and expanded from Standing's conception. It instead includes salaried workers and is limited (for focus) to only the precariat at U of T which includes: students, faculty, and non-professional/managerial staff.

Manageriat – The manageriat referred to by the author Rob Watts and featured in this research refers to a surging class of non-unionized professional and managerial staff specifically at educational institutions (Watts, 2017). The manageriat as a class is rooted in a strong belief in managerialism which has long been seen as the default organizational lens of the business world since its modern inception in the early twentieth century. It was during this period of time manager-led bureaucracies began being touted as the most economically efficient organizational configuration for most organizations and workplaces.

Plutocracy – This is a term dating back to ancient Greece which means a society ruled by the wealthy. Many famous politicians, economists, scholars, and activists have used this term in

various ways. However, for the purposes of focusing this research the plutocracy is examined narrowly in scope and only through the context of post-secondary educational institutions. As such, the plutocracy specifically refers to the wealthy and influential donors and benefactors to the University of Toronto in particular.

Social Economy – The social economy has strong linkages with the cooperative movement dating back to Robert Owen in Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. However, the term social economy is used today in conjunction with various alternative economic systems and activities. Authors Quarter, Mook, and Armstrong posit that the sole defining characteristic of any social economy actor or organization is the privileging of fostering social benefits over generating profit (Quarter et al., 2018). The social economy is relevant to this research because publicly funded post-secondary educational institutions such as U of T are commonly seen as charitable non-profits operating within the social economy and under social economy principles.

Social Benefit – Social Benefit as referred to in this research comprises the monetary and especially the non-monetary benefits generated to both individuals within university communities and external to them. Author Christopher Newfield's analysis of social benefit in this regard is most aligned with the context of this study as he specifically examines the non-monetary improvements to individuals and communities generated through attainment of higher education such as: improved overall health, reductions in crime and therefore safer

communities, improvements in happiness, better environments for raising children, and many other positive social benefits (Newfield, 2016).

1.7 – Type of Research and Conceptual Framework

The research involved with this study has been done in an effort to contribute to the emerging critical university studies field of research and conceptual framework. This contribution is given with an openly declared social justice activist researcher bias. Such a bias is in keeping with other critical university studies scholars who utilize a conceptual framework wherein a core tenant of critical university studies calls for the researcher to presuppose that those in power at universities (the manageriat) are not directly or indirectly benevolent actors (Williams, 2012). The critical university studies conceptual framework also asks scholars to essentially conceptualize how the modern academy has been critically damaged by those in power and to describe or prefigure what has been or can be done in order to stop and prevent this from further happening (Newfield, 2016). The goal of this is ultimately to help bring about the liberation of PSE from the forces of privatization and neoliberalism.

Throughout this critical university studies themed thesis a critical discourse analysis methodology has been utilized. This has been accomplished by uncovering and analyzing various written sources of expert and stakeholder opinion and commentary related to the research topics. Also, a specific discourse-historical approach (Reisigl, 2017, p. 51) has been taken in an effort to show historical context and to semi-structure the organization of the analysis. This is shown by the roughly sequential historical order in which the research material is presented, starting from the early beginnings of the modern academy in the seventeenth

century and continuing up until relatively recently with an assessment of U of T over the last few decades. In addition to this, there is socio-diagnostic critique specifically focused on aspects of duties and responsibilities (Reisigl, 2017, p. 51). This is shown in this research by the emphasis on linking the U of T with the CSE in terms of the failure by the managerialiat exerting control over the former to honour the duties and responsibilities required of them as leaders of the CSE.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

2.1 – Neoliberalism

The body of literature regarding neoliberalism and the neoliberalization of the academy is substantial and represents an ongoing discourse established over several decades. As the neoliberal project has unfolded, now encompassing virtually the entire global economic and political spheres, so too has the specific study of neoliberalism within the academy. However, because of its scale and impact, much of the key literature regarding neoliberalism is broad in scope and deals with the macro global economic consequences of financializing the world economy. Author David Harvey gives a definitive general accounting and distilling of the neoliberal critical discourse in his 2005 book *“A Brief History of Neoliberalism,”* where he assesses the works of previous authors and summarizes the entire history of neoliberalism. This summation argues that neoliberalism should be viewed essentially as an effort started by wealthy elites in America to regain their heightened and privileged pre-war status in the post-war era of the early 1950s and 60s. This goal was accomplished relatively quickly in just a few decades, but continued evolving from the 1970s on leading to the “financialization of everything” (Harvey, 2005, p. 33).

The subject of precarity for workers is another common thread that unites much of the critical discourse around neoliberalization (Harvey, 2005; Standing, 2012; Chomsky, 2017). Much of this literature suggests that the process of precarization happening to the working-class in most industrialized nations is being achieved in-part by the rise in offshoring and globalization (Harvey, 2005; Standing, 2012; Chomsky, 2017). The broader industrial workforce in Canada and the United States among other nations have been particularly susceptible to

these effects as their manufacturing sectors have been dismantled from the inside out. This has been carried out by the business sector in these countries in an effort to shift manufacturing and production to regions that have the lowest labour costs. This has created results that have been devastating for large segments of the population (Chomsky, 2017, p. 37). This development has also caused the middle class in the United States, Canada, and other wealthy countries to virtually collapse relative to the position of relative equality that existed just a generation or two previous to today (Harvey, 2005; Standing, 2012; Chomsky, 2017). Scholar Guy Standing further argues that a new social class has been created by neoliberalism and has called it “the Precariat” (Standing, 2012). The precariat replaces the middle class and is differentiated from the latter and defined by the erosion of the socio-economic security previously closely tied to dignified employment which was a defining characteristic of the now defunct middle-class.

2.2 – Critical University Studies

Critical university studies is a new and emerging field of study that builds on the wealth of literature previously written about the neoliberalization and privatization of universities and PSE. It does so by focusing on the most critical aspects of the established literature and by critiquing these topics while also going further by using the core principles established by this scholarship as a starting point for further critique rather than a summation of the current status of the academy. Critical university studies are differentiated by existing research on neoliberalism because it is not simply about how or why neoliberalism and neoliberalization of the academy exists. Rather, it takes these matters as already established facts no longer

requiring further debate or analysis and instead aims to expand on these concepts to promote radical praxis from within the academy itself and by those most effected by the current neoliberal capture of the academy. An example of this is the literature and debates around the process and to what extent in which neoliberalization and privatization occurs in PSE. Critical university studies scholars accept as a fact and a starting point to their research that public universities are now by default neoliberalized universities. Instead of looking for ways to prove this point further critical university studies scholars instead aim at theorizing and advocating for ways of dismantling the existing elements of neoliberalism PSE from within. Because of this standpoint, critical university studies scholars are typically active members of university communities holding teaching and/or administrative roles.

Some of the key themes of critical university studies research and scholarship has been focused on the reliance of senior university administrators on maintaining the current exploitive system of precarious work done in support of universities, and especially precarious academic work. Critical university studies researchers have specifically identified how academic work in universities is continually being transformed into an ever more stratified area of employment causing increasingly varied levels of remuneration, benefits, status, and security to be attached to almost all academic work in the neoliberal academy (Giroux, 2007; Ginsberg, 2011; Newfield, 2016; Collini, 2017). Critical university studies literature has uncovered that much of this variation is separate from the actual work being performed and that the differences between teaching and research duties performed by contract, sessional, and temporary employees is often not substantially different from those duties carried out by tenured or tenure-track full professors. These management practices within the academy

establish and maintain a system of inequality imposed by university managers onto academic workers. Critical university studies scholarship argues that this imposition is maintained by the acceptance and internalization of neoliberal thinking and values by senior university administrators (Ginsberg, 2011; Newfield, 2016). Much of this acceptance is reflected in the university manageriat constantly privileging the pursuit of financial advantage through the precarizing of academic work to the detriment of the core educational and social missions of public universities.

2.3 – The Social Economy in Canada

Quarter, Mook, and Armstrong's book *Understanding the Social Economy: A Canadian Perspective* (2018) is a fundamental text for defining and understanding the scale, scope, and importance of the Canadian social economy (CSE). This book examines the CSE by defining and categorizing the relevant social economy organizations (SEO's) operating within it. Appropriate classifications are given to SEO's primarily based on the degree to which they receive public versus private funding and support in order to pursue their "social objectives" (Quarter et al., 2018, p. 4). These objectives are aimed at producing social benefits, and this is the driving force behind all legitimate SEO's operating within the CSE. The social benefits targeted typically stem from social needs in society (usually targeting the disadvantaged) that aren't currently being supported adequately by either the public or private sectors. The CSE attempts to bridge this gap in various ways to cover social needs that are not fully the responsibility nor the interest of public or private sector actors. This social mission is the basis for the establishment and continued existence of SEO's and the CSE. Many SEO's could be essentially indistinguishable

from government organizations or private enterprises because of the degree in which they are organizationally or outwardly aligned with the public or private sectors. However, the single most important factor which defines and unifies all SEO's operating in the CSE is their privileging the attainment of social benefits for the public over the creation of private profit (Quarter et al., 2018).

Much of the recent literature on the social economy in Canada speaks to the general lack of understanding of the CSE and why it matters that this sector of the economy should garner more attention than it currently does. CSE scholar J.J. McMurtry raises this point numerous times and specifically in regards to the academy's role in ignoring the CSE and the latter's potential and need for further development (McMurtry, 2010). Beyond highlighting the notion that the CSE is often overlooked and misunderstood, McMurtry also posits that the very existence of the CSE spurs on greater questions about the prefiguration of better future societies and the economies that will exist within them (McMurtry, 2010, p. 16). This notion of contributing to the forward-thinking progress and improvement of social, economic, and environmental goals runs throughout much of social economy literature.

A wealth of the CSE discourse deals with democratizing workplaces, organizations, and institutions. Vieta, Quarter, Spear, and Moskovskaya (2016) define and illustrate the key differences between organizations that are run on a profit-based private business model versus worker-run and multi-stakeholder cooperatives which are setup democratically for the shared benefit of their participants (Vieta et al., 2016, p. 437, 443). These cooperative models have been successfully applied to countless SEO's within the CSE and therefore provides an existing

framework for growing the further expansion of organizations that embrace social economy principles such as: economic democracy, sustainability, and the creation of social benefits.

Chapter 3: The Modern Academy and Neoliberalism

This chapter broadly covers the history of the modern academy and the rise of neoliberalism and its effects on the academy and PSE in Canada specifically. The analysis in this chapter focuses on providing a contextual overview of: the history of the academy, the rise of mass education in the immediate post-war period of the twentieth century, the subsequent co-optation of it by neoliberals, and the advent of critical university studies as a current response to these events. By critically examining this history and these topics it'll be possible to show how the academy and its leaders such as U of T have played a central role in helping to globally promulgate neoliberal economic doctrine as the status quo. This process of institutional capture and subservience of the academy to the forces of neoliberalism has ultimately resulted in a sharp increase in precariousness for students, faculty, and staff at universities including the U of T which will be discussed in closer detail in the fifth chapter of this thesis.

3.1 – History and Background of the Modern Academy

The history of the modern academy begins with the rise of state bureaucracy in Prussia. The Prussian government during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries identified a need to train citizens and not just an elite in order to greatly expand the academy to a much broader segment of the population. The rationale for this was to sufficiently educate enough citizens to fill the deluge of positions being created in their rapidly expanding state and local bureaucracies. As other governments in other nation states throughout Europe also began to expand a similar need by officials was encountered. Expanded access and capacity for advanced education became a priority for most governments at this time for this reason. As such, the

academy in Prussia and then throughout Europe was expanded and also started to admit a range of people, although still mostly from wealthy families, but for the first time in history not entirely comprised of those with elite, noble, or ecclesiastical backgrounds.

Along with the new emphasis given toward expanding higher education within European society sprung the Humboldtian University of Berlin which taught the Humboldtian model of higher education. The founder, Wilhelm von Humboldt argued that the aim of individuals in seeking to attain higher education shouldn't be simply for satisfying the needs of coercive forces such as governments responsive to the interests of the rising bourgeois throughout Europe (Humboldt, 2014). Instead, he opined, education for education's sake was enough justification to rightfully supersede the needs of the state or any other coercive sector of society. For Humboldt higher education was for nurturing the positive development of free individuals and their innate creative needs. Humboldt likened the difference between people being coerced into pursuing education versus doing so voluntarily to a scenario wherein "[i]f a person produces an object on command," Humboldt wrote, "we may admire what he did but despise what he is, not a true human being who acts on his own impulses and desires" (Chomsky, 2004, p. 42). The Humboldtian model of higher education would become universalized with the academy globally for centuries and thus arguably making it the single most influential contribution to the academy in the history of modern PSE.

The second most important period in the history of the modern academy occurred during the post-war period immediately after the second World War. During the immediate decades following this war many American war veterans sought to take advantage of the sweeping post-secondary educational benefits offered through the Servicemen's Readjustment

Act, also known as the G.I. Bill. The Canadian government also passed a similar bill establishing comparable benefits for Canadian veterans at this time (Lemieux & Card, 2001). The passage of these bills helped stoke an explosion of PSE enrollment in both the U.S. and Canada. Many additional non-veterans also joined the academy as there was exceptional opportunity to do so during a peacetime coupled with extremely healthy economic conditions, especially for the middle-class in both countries. These conditions accounted for what turned into an era of mass PSE enrolment and attainment which was historically unprecedented in world history. A causal effect of this was explosive economic growth and expansion of the middle-class in both the U.S. and Canada to levels which were then and still remain unprecedented in the history of both nations.

The Canadian government in particular responded to the success of mass PSE in the 1960s by building universities from coast to coast as “the expansion of public higher education became a key policy area and during the 1960s and 1970s new publicly-funded universities were established in most provinces” (Karram Stephenson et al., 2017, p. 8). This period would be the last substantial united push given to the public PSE system by the provinces in Canada that was properly supported by them. At the end of the 1970s the era of governments in the U.S. and Canada investing in Keynesian-type levels of social expenditures was dying and all but dead. Neoliberalism had swept the U.S. economic and political sectors and was on the eve of doing the same within Canada. By the mid-1980s the government of Canada was essentially in transition towards full adoption of the neoliberal economic model which at its core espoused reducing public expenditures by government as much as possible. In Ontario specifically, the Liberal government had overtly made an “attempt to link PSE policy to the province’s economic

agenda. Ontario's PSE policy at this time was focused on economic globalization" (Shanahan et al., 2014, p. 147). Globalization and neoliberalism go hand in hand and are analogous with each other if one considers that globalization is the offshoring element of neoliberal ideology such as: utilizing tax havens, exploiting cheaper labour markets in less developed countries, and focusing on consumers residing in areas of higher wealth concentrations, etc.

The Liberal government's embrace of neoliberalism led just a decade later in mid-1990s to the transformation of PSE in Ontario. This had been the Liberal mission, but it was essentially achieved by both the subsequent NDP and especially Conservative governments that came immediately after by their adoption of a globalized and neoliberal agenda for PSE in Canada. This was especially true when comparing governmental support levels that had declined significantly during this period culminating in hundreds of millions of dollars in funding for PSE being cut by the Mike Harris Ontario Conservative government (Shanahan et al., 2014). This history is critical for understanding just how captured by neoliberalism the modern academy has become within Canada, and specifically inside Ontario.

It is also important to review this history for grasping the extremely close socio-economic and political trends unfolding in both the U.S. and Canada as the former nation is the creator and lead proponent of neoliberal economics. These two nations because of their proximity and histories have had a uniquely intertwined relationship on almost every level, and especially in regards to the development of their PSE systems vis-à-vis the impacts of neoliberalism on both at roughly the same time. This advanced level of interconnectivity explains why it took a relatively short amount of time for the government of Ontario presiding

over the economic engine of Canada to eventually submit to the pressures emanating from the United States to transform all aspects of the economy towards neoliberalism, including PSE.

The neoliberal transformation of the Canadian academy was completed in principle by the mid-90s when it was evident that “The PC’s (1995-2003) clearly favoured market principles in linking PSE and the economy. This government’s postsecondary policy emphasized education as serving the economy, often at the expense of social and equity needs” (Shanahan et al., 2014, p. 166). From this precise point on PSE in Ontario has essentially been Canada’s leading emulator of the increasingly privatized U.S. PSE model. Because of its enormous size, and the scale of influence that Ontario’s PSE sector plays in Canada, with University of Toronto leading the entire academy in this regard, the Canadian academy is driven by the neoliberal educational reforms that have taken place in Ontario. Consequently, the history of the modern academy appears as an alarming omen foreshadowing potentially even further integration of neoliberal over social economy values in the management of the academy in Canada.

3.2 - Neoliberals Rise, Target and Transform PSE

In order to understand the rise of neoliberalism as the predominant form of capitalism exiting today it’s necessary to consider the variances in how capitalism has unfolded in different parts of the world as different kinds of capitalism exist in various regions. The motive to acquire profit and achieve ever greater profit growth still reigns supreme as the essential core of all capitalistic endeavours. This is true regardless of where this economic doctrine is practiced. However, the “Anglo-Saxon” (Stanford, 2015, p. 50) or neoliberal version of capitalism which has been employed to its fullest effect in North America and Europe is the most pernicious of all

the various forms of capitalism. This is partially because of the the extremely heightened level of aggressiveness towards government and civil society that was held by the founders of neoliberalism, most notably including Milton Friedman. Friedman would later win the Nobel Prize in economics.

However, early on the founders of neoliberalism garnered little attention or support from anyone including the business-sector or from ruling elites. This was during the early inception period of neoliberalism in 1947 when the founders were known as the Mont Pelerin Society. This group for decades would remain buoyed by just a handful of social theorists and economist supporters. Eventually, a base of operations was established at the University of Chicago School of Economics. It took years of persistence by Friedman and others before ruling elites in the American business sector and political sphere paid their ideas attention. However, the idea of market fundamentalism which was the backbone of neoliberal economic ideology was able to slowly creep into the discourse of business and politics. This happened largely in direct response to the increase of democratization as a result of the 1960s civil rights and student protest movements of which many social and economic reforms had been fought for and won by previously marginalized sectors of society (i.e., minorities, youth, women) (Chomsky, 2013). By adopting neoliberalism elites believed they could counter the rise of democracy. Having the private sphere dominate everything previously held in common or accessible within the public arena would restore the plutocratic class and help create a new gilded age for them (Harvey, 2005).

The current struggle for economic, social, and climate justice at U of T has been affected by the economic pivot towards a financialized and more aggressive neoliberal version of

capitalism. This relatively quick turn of events over the last few decades has dramatically transformed the amount of business-sector and elite interest in PSE resulting in sweeping changes to schools and education systems across the globe. Since the end of the 1960s neoliberal policymakers have specifically targeted what they considered the primary systems of indoctrination within capitalist society: government, schools, and religion (Crozier et al., 1975). Their goal in seeking to radically reform these institutions was to spur on acceptance amongst the population for neoliberal principals like free-market fundamentalism, globalization, and the privatization of the public sphere. In particular, the neoliberal elite took aim at the PSE sector due to their belief that colleges and universities just simply weren't doing enough to steer the young properly towards embracing or at least accepting the neoliberal fundamentalist model as inescapable. This feeling was especially strong towards institutions located in North America and Western Europe after such incidents like the student occupation protests in Paris during 1968 and the Kent State massacre of 1970.

Shortly after these student uprisings the first comprehensive neoliberal plan was drafted. Its goal was to address what elites felt was the out of control situation that had grown out of the organizing and actions of the student led campus activist movements. Students were particularly targeted for their resistance towards the aggression and destruction necessary to and inherent within neoliberal economic policies. The plan was ultimately to regain control over multiple sectors of society but had an emphasis on the education sector for its ability to indoctrinate. This opinion was thoroughly detailed in a historic report entitled "*The Crisis of Democracy*" (Crozier et al., 1975) by a group of early neoliberal intellectuals, business leaders, and politicians who called themselves the Trilateral Commission. Essentially the conclusion of

the governmental and business sector elites who formed this commission was that society had become far too democratic. Therefore, institutions such as governments, religious organizations, and the education sector should all be doing much more to curtail the expansion of rights being acquired by newly empowered groups of people. Many of these people gaining new rights were from formally marginalized and tightly controlled sectors of society (minorities, poor people, women, and many others who together comprise a vast majority).

The primary task given to PSE institutions by early neoliberal opinion makers like the Trilateral Commission was to simply do a better job of aligning higher education with obedience and servility to capitalism and the market system (Chomsky, 2000). Right around this time in the early 1970s, William Powell, an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court wrote an edict known historically as the *Powell memo* which called attention to U.S. lawmakers warning that that public opinion was quickly turning away from supporting the American business sector and private interests, and that corrective measures therefore needed to be taken (Powell, 1971). The response to these calls by political and business elites in North America, Europe, and Japan was incredibly swift. Within just a couple of decades the private sector had not only regained control over the public sphere, but private interests had also achieved near-total domination over the public and private institutions that shape public opinion. This was mostly done through implementation of aggressive neoliberal reforms to the existing system of state capitalism such as sharply reducing working wages and employment benefits, increasing precariousness amongst the working-class, and concentrating wealth into fewer and fewer hands. In this context education became no longer a place of higher learning but instead a requirement for

survival in a capitalist economy made hyper-competitive by globalism and the expansion of offshore private profit-making.

Neoliberalism is the form of capitalism that most explicitly puts shifting the global economy towards a network of fully deregulated financial markets. Neoliberal government deregulation raises the potential for serious global financial catastrophe. A prime example of this occurred during the global financial crisis of 2008. The disastrous effects of this event are still being felt by many poor and working-class people more than a decade later. Alarming the Canadian and American capital markets are comprised of an ever increasing share of financial services companies that technically produce nothing and are interconnected with companies largely responsible for the 2008 crash. Quite commonly these companies make massive profits primarily through money manipulation and other such financial transactions which include speculative trading and derivatives trading as two main examples.

Most importantly however, none of these kinds of financial activities have much concern or in common with furthering the collective aims of society (improving healthcare, support education, reducing poverty, etc.). Rather, the Canadian and American highly financialized versions of capitalism are unique in this regard insofar as they already benefit from the most relaxed government regulations and favourable involvement in their market operations. Still, steady pressure exists from many in both the private and even some public sectors in the U.S. and Canada to further deregulate and privilege market forces in favour of businesses and investors over the general public even when it comes to issues predominantly affecting the latter group. This is neoliberal doctrine in action, or what author David Harvey calls “the financialization of everything” (Harvey, 2005, p. 33).

With the historical background and context of neoliberalism in the U.S. and Canada sketched out it becomes much easier to understand the context for the current corporate sector and private interest in the University of Toronto. The capture of Canada's premier institution of higher learning by elite neoliberals is significant. The University of Toronto manageriat boasts about the indelible mark plutocratic donors have had on the University by remarking that recent advancement fundraising campaigns have successfully gained access to elite wealth and, as such, "[t]he campaign has also been defined by a number of transformational gifts from leading philanthropists to fields as diverse as architecture and urban design, astronomy and astrophysics, global affairs, high performance sport" (University of Toronto, 2016). The latter two departments being directly funded and established by wealthy families involved in mining and finance respectively. The University of Toronto ties to the political and business sectors of Canada date back many decades. However, connections to the private and political spheres of power established through massive donations and politically friendly actions taken at Queen's Park have rapidly expanded in just the past few decades. Due to this, there has been an influx of elite money and influence peddling directed at universities in Canada and elsewhere. Academics like David Harvey who study neoliberal trends over the course of history have concluded that "the advocates for the neoliberal way now occupy positions of considerable influence in education (the universities and many 'think tanks')" (Harvey, 2003, p. 145).

The alignment to neoliberalism and the neoliberal political establishment has also directly influenced the manageriat at the University of Toronto. It's led to the implementation of austerity measures mostly affecting unionized staff at the University. This was evident by the

across the board 2012 public sector wage freeze approved by the Ontario Provincial Government. The U of T manageriat utilized their labour relations negotiators to use this as a rationale for implementing collective bargaining wage increases to non-management staff that were below the cost of living (USW Local 1998, 2015, p. 35). During this same period of austerity, the Business Board of the Governing Council of U of T was reporting net profits in the hundreds of millions of dollars. The latest report cited that “revenues for the year ended April 30, 2016 were \$2.9 billion and expenses were \$2.7 billion for a net income of \$210.6 million” (The Governing Council, 2017, p. 2). This huge windfall came mostly at the expense of the University precariat who endured five years of meager wage increases. Soon after the freeze was lifted in 2017 many management staff at U of T were given enormous double digit percentage wage increases. This further expanded income inequality between the precariat and the manageriat at U of T and follows the hallmarks of the neoliberal era.

It is clear from past and recent history that neoliberalism has taken aim at the education sector and its effects are being felt significantly at the University of Toronto. However, there does not seem to be the same kind of radical resistance legacy in Canada and at U of T as there has been in America (Karram Stephenson, 2017; Ross, 1972). At comparable U.S. institutions the ghosts of the sixties era student protests against the Vietnam war and racial segregation still resonate with each major student demonstration. However, the University of Toronto isn't immune to the lingering presence of past battles waged by communities of social justice activists operating on campus.

3.3 – Critical University Studies

The critical study of universities dates back to the very beginnings of the modern academy which was founded in Prussia during the eighteenth century by Wilhelm von Humboldt. Humboldt himself was highly critical of the influence that government in particular had in shaping the academy to suit governmental purposes (Humboldt, 2014). Criticism of universities continued throughout the nineteenth century and twentieth centuries and by the latter era's leading intellectual in regards to education, John Dewey. He argued for a new education model that would incorporate the actual lived experiences of students and teachers (Dewey, 1997). Two of the twentieth century's most revered scholars, Bertrand Russell and Noam Chomsky, both focused many of their writings specifically on critical issues related to education and PSE in particular. In the current century there are many scholars and researchers whose academic work carries on this critical tradition. However, there is now an even more radical contingent within this group whose research can be at least partially or entirely identified as being situated within the field of critical university studies.

The research and writing involved in creating this thesis has been partially done so in an attempt to contribute to an emerging and relatively new field of study within academia labeled "Critical University Studies" (Williams, 2012). In 2012 academics Williams and Steffen coined the term after recognizing that there existed a long-standing and growing field of critical scholarship based on critiquing the capture of the academy primarily in the United States to the forces of neoliberalism and globalization. In particular, these scholars cited the plight and activism of the new cadre of highly-precarious adjunct, contract, and student teaching staff as the locus of current critical university studies scholarship. Precarious jobs on American

campuses have ballooned since the 1970s and have also steadily extended into the realm of teaching and learning over the course of the '80s and '90s. This occurred primarily because the university manageriat began hiring fewer tenure stream faculty, and instead, increasingly relied on non-tenure contacted teaching staff. Today the numbers of contract teachers outnumber permanent or tenured faculty virtually throughout the academy in both the United States and Canada (Newfield, 2016; Pasma & Shaker, 2018).

As a result of the enormous influx of typically highly educated precarious workers engaged on campus in teaching duties and other scholarly activity, and therefore having grounded insight into the actual realities of how the academy currently operates, a critical intellectual base was formed. This happened from within the academy by this group whose labour and contributions to their educational community were being exploited by university administrations primarily to keep expenses down and profits up. In response to this exploitation some of these precarious workers, scholars, and researchers organized, created associations, or even developed unionization drives and other forms of direct actions. While doing this many also engaged in utilizing their intellectual and scholarly abilities in support of critiquing the systemic oppression of precarious teaching staff by universities which had internally embraced repressive anti-worker neoliberal doctrine. These efforts formed a new wave of highly critical and adversarial scholarly literature that established the bedrock of the new field of learning that was to be called critical university studies.

As this name suggests, a key goal of those engaged in critical university studies is to explicate universities as important sites of societal struggle and thus necessitating detailed critical examination. Because of the declared critical lens of this line of academic inquiry it is

made explicitly clear that critical university studies challenges scholars and activists to use their intellectual and scholarly ability to confront and help dismantle the power and dominance of the academy, especially those university communities for which one personally belongs to. In doing so, critical university studies scholars start from the standpoint that the university as an institution is not simply innocently going about helping to educate people. Rather, critical university studies scholars argue that it's a highly contested site of class-conflict and struggle requiring sustained critical examination and direct actions in order to defend those who universities most negatively impact: the precariat. This notion on its face seems highly radical, but in many ways is actually a very neutral one as it does not deviate entirely from what most scholars regardless of their political leanings would attribute as a core goal of any form of higher education: encouraging and the providing opportunities for individuals to develop and exercise critical thinking skills. However, critical university studies scholarship does not exempt the university from highly critical examination which is often the case in other disciplines. The whole point of critical university studies is to focus specifically on the academy in an effort at ultimately "Remaking the University" by learning to "Unmake the Public University" (Newfield, 2016, p.78).

Critical university studies therefore is further differentiated from similar but more intuitively established areas of scholarship such as: higher education, educational leadership & policy, or educational studies because unlike these fields, critical university studies positions researchers to begin their search for truth and knowledge by immediately rejecting the false and taken for granted notions of benevolence and self-justification commonly attributed to powerful actors and groups operating within the university community, including their claims to

power. Notable scholars with a background in critical university studies who have written extensively in this regard include: Henry Giroux, Benjamin Ginsberg, Noam Chomsky, Stefan Collini, Christopher Newfield, and the late Bill Readings, among many others.

Critical university studies also have a direct linkage to the Adult Education and Community Development (AECD) program at U of T in which this Master of Arts thesis is being completed in order to satisfy the degree requirements. At the core of U of T's AECD program is the notion that a truly educated person will then combine their knowledge of critical philosophy with the need for direct actions in order to achieve a radical praxis and the best possibilities for advancing progressive social change in their communities. As such, AECD is rooted in the study of adult learners, community, and radical praxis which means that this program embodies the same core values as the more narrowly defined critical university studies which focuses solely on these very same issues albeit vis-à-vis within the academy. Both AECD and critical university studies disciplines strive to instill in learners the importance of developing their own unique abilities for critical thinking and radical action. Critical university studies in particular emphasizes that critical thinking should be undertaken within higher education institutions first and foremost by critically examining that very environment, its conditions, and the influence being imparted by those conditions onto learners and others operating within or with close relation to the university community. Therefore, with its inherent critical approach, critical university studies is a highly appropriate field of study to utilize and contribute to for achieving the aims of this thesis: attempting to answer how it is that the senior managers within the institution of the University of Toronto have not lived up to their responsibilities as leaders of a SEO leading the Canadian social economy.

A primary goal of critical university studies scholars is uncovering and identifying the ruling-relations (Smith, 1990) specific to the university and between university actors. Once these relations are identified, it's incumbent on critical university studies scholars to then ascertain whether these power-relations are in fact justified, and if not, then to posit appropriate ways of modifying, replacing, or outright dismantling these relations. Testing the legitimacy of the power that individuals wield and their status in hierarchical organizations and institutions is also a tenant of anarchist ideology as purported famously by Noam Chomsky in his landmark book *The Responsibility of Intellectuals* wherein he defines this as the need to "speak the truth and expose lies" (Chomsky, 2017, p. 17). Chomsky's audience for that message was initially his very own colleagues teaching within the academy in the U.S. during the 1960s. This effort by critical university studies scholars continues on and has been further refined and defined by the recent contributions of critical university studies scholars who are furthering the primary goals of critical university studies scholarship while not sparing to critically study and report on the very PSE institutions that employ them. This thesis will do this as well through examining in detail the truth concerning the manageriat's actions that have created a growing precariat at U of T. Ultimately this research will attempt to expose the tensions that sit at the very heart of much of the discourse that will be examined which suggests: U of T isn't living up to its social responsibilities even though the manageriat tries to convince Canadians that it does.

Chapter 4 – The Social Economy in Canada

This chapter on the social economy in Canada heavily relies on Quarter, Mook, and Armstrong's book *Understanding the Social Economy: A Canadian Perspective* (2018). This book is a fundamental text for defining and understanding the scale, scope, and importance of the social economy sector in Canada. The goal of this chapter will be to construct the basis for how a critical analysis of the U of T fits with and is augmented by a social economy analysis. This will entail establishing the following in this chapter: the core values of the social economy, why these values are important, and how the U of T began to show signs that it was not properly aligned with these values.

The University of Toronto and all other public universities in Canada operate in a third sphere of the overall economy that exists between the public and private sectors, categorized by many as the Canadian "social economy" sector (CSE). The scope and scale of the CSE is enormous and houses economic activity "estimated to be annually in the tens of billion dollars and to affect millions of Canadians' lives both directly and indirectly" (McMurtry, 2010, p. 1). It's also getting even larger as successive neoliberal-minded conservative and liberal governments in Canada enact policies and legislation that shift the responsibility for delivering and maintaining public sector services away from government funded by taxes and towards the social economy and/or the private sector.

Publicly funded universities in Canada reside within the CSE and not the government controlled public sector, nor the business-driven private sector. While funded in part by government (but increasingly less so as neoliberal practices of austerity have impacted the PSE tremendously in the last few decades), public universities in Canada operate at arms-length

from government and so can be better categorized as “public sector non-profits” (PSNPs) operating partly in the public sector and partly in civil society, with increasing participation in market activities (Quarter et al., 2018). Moreover, as PSNPs, every “institution operates independently and determines its own academic and admissions policies, programs, and staff appointments” (Shanahan et al., 2014, p. 125). For these reasons, it is more correct to consider Canadian public universities as PSNPs operating in the social economy, rather than strictly in the public sector.

Public universities in Canada receive a significant portion of their funding from both the federal and provincial governments with the amounts varying not insignificantly from province to province. Traditionally the funding that has been provided by government was sufficient enough to keep public sector PSE institutions in Ontario such as the University of Toronto squarely within public control. It also provided the main impetus for the alignment of quasi-autonomous senior university officials with the government and the public sector which are overseen by publicly elected officials. However, with the neoliberalization of the Canadian academy and subsequent changes in funding, more and more control over universities has been handed over by university senior administrators to unelected and unaccountable private-interests. This happens partially because private sector actors have stepped in to provide critically needed funding and other opportunities that the shrinking governmental sector diminishingly has the capacity or capability to give to public sector universities.

However, some might argue that through a comparative lens PSE in Canada has been less effected by neoliberalism than our American neighbours, for instance. This being said, it’s important to note that “while the neoliberal influences on PSE in Canada may be less

pronounced than they are in other Anglo-Saxon countries, the push towards marketization is well under way. This is particularly the case in Ontario” (Shanahan et al., 2014, p. 319). This corporate capture of prized public institutions reflects the increasing need for dramatic social change aimed at not only curtaining these developments, but also towards restoring public control and accountability to the entire PSE sector in Canada.

The sheer size and scope of the CSE may not be obvious to many outside of the academy, but the CSE is economically large and powerful enough on its own to provide an example of a new pathway for economics in this country—one that is neither completely beholden to government nor to private interests. The CSE model also helps to dismantle the neoliberal emphasis on profits and efficiencies by replacing it with a social paradigm that prioritizes the pursuit of attaining positive social impacts while also remaining financially viable and sustainable to support such efforts. Therefore, an exciting perspective some take of the social economy sector is for the potential that it has to undermine and possibly supplant the current neoliberal capitalist system. The only way to reasonably proceed this way is to address the problems existing within the CSE and to prioritize reform efforts at those SEO’s who are most responsible for diluting the transformative potential of this alternative economic structure. The University of Toronto shoulders the most culpability in this regard for the various reasons which will be further discussed in this chapter. In order to accomplish this as accurately as possible context will be provided within this chapter that examines the CSE and how the University of Toronto fits into this vital third sphere of the overall Canadian economy.

4.1 – Prioritizing Social Benefits over Private Profit

The social economy (SE) and social economy organizations (SEO's) are uniquely situated within the current neoliberal global economy insofar as they emphasize the creation and nurturing of social benefits over the attainment of private profits and benefits (Quarter et al., 2018). This is essentially the complete antithesis of capitalism regardless of whether it's capitalism exercised through a less regressive social democratic state system embodied by the Keynesian model, or by the highly adversarial and repressive market-based neoliberal economic model. This is an important point to illustrate because many economists today who do not align themselves with neoliberal economic policies generally consider the heights reached by the Keynesian model to be the ultimate economic success story in world history. It's imperative to understand the rise and fall of Keynesian economics in the U.S. and Canada because of its contrast with the current neoliberal ruling economic regime which "subjugates social policy to economy policy" (Shanahan et al., 2014, p. 26). The latter is a complete reversal of the main goal sought by SEO's and therefore puts neoliberal ideology in direct conflict with the ideology inherent to the social economy. Leading powerhouse SEO's such as the U of T should therefore be cautious if not outright resistant to being entwined with the financialized neoliberal economic model that values profit above all. However, this has not at all been the case. Therefore, this section will explain further how this historical inversion of private profit over social benefit became so dominant and even changed the conception of what individuals and organizations consider worthy of valuing.

The Keynesian economic model of capitalism was promulgated by the U.S. and many other western countries for much of the immediate post-war period after World War II. During

this period the business-sector and organized labour essentially struck an unofficial compromise with each other that resulted in roughly egalitarian economic growth and subsequently the greatest increases in the standard of living ever experienced by either country. Keynesianism held for two decades from roughly 1945 until the mid-1960s when the model began to collapse by a combination of geo-political instability (mainly caused by the America's destabilizing wars of aggression in Indochina) and an erosion of influence by competing economic models such as neoliberalism. However, even within the height of the Keynesian economic model success, it was still capitalism, and therefore the attainment and generation of profit was still the main priority of those with power.

Fast-forwarding to today, nearly all of the compromises between the business sector and workers have long since perished as a result of neoliberal economic policy's domination over the global economy. As a result, nearly all forms of economic growth for the vast majority of people in neoliberalized countries have stagnated or regressed while at the same time the wealthiest have gotten stupendously wealthier, leading Oxfam International to declare that "our economy is broken" (2019). In this dystopian economic context, the existence of a massive social economy sector operating within the established neoliberal capitalist economic structures of various nations seems highly paradoxical. This is true when considering the core goals of the SE and those of neoliberalism are diametrically opposed to each other. Because of this, SEO's persist in operating in the social economy between the public and private sectors primarily to further a social mission or purpose (Quarter et al., 2018). In varying ways, these organizations are resiliently challenging the financialized way that value is understood in the neoliberal era and doing so within the very heart of neoliberalized countries such as Canada. In

this way, the SE and SEO's are setting an alternate example for how value should be quantified within an advanced economy.

Over the last several decades the theory of value that has been by far the most privileged by economists and PSE institutions among many others pertains almost exclusively with economic value. This is considered by many to encompass the prices and profits that are generated through the market system along with the accumulation and distribution of wealth itself. On its face, this is a starkly different assessment of value than what has previously existed for much of human history when value was rooted not in financial benefit but in social benefit or social value. As David Graeber succinctly states, today “we speak of ‘value’ when talking about economic affairs, which usually comes down to all those human endeavors in which people are paid for their work or their actions are otherwise directed toward getting money. ‘Values’ appear when that is not the case” (Graeber, 2018, p. 203).

By this definition it is understandable that SEOs aren't exactly creating an entirely new conceptual understanding of the theory of value because the *values* that are represented by these organizations and the people within them are actually reflective of past iterations of what value itself was historically and widely considered to be: something aligned closely and even interchangeably with values. This realignment of value with values embodied by the social economy and SEOs is important because “[v]alues point to what should be and whose interests are served” (Nelson et al., 2008, p. 194). It also provides society with critical examples and encouragement to aid the notion that what's truly valuable cannot be appropriately measured, understood, or utilized through a market-based economic system (Graeber, 2018). Therefore,

the social economy and SEOs are a de facto challenge to the dominance and superiority of such a system.

In order to understand why the concept of value is important and how the social economy is assisting in recalibrating this understanding one must look at the historical context for how value has been generally interpreted. The notion of value is incredibly complex and its meaning has been extensively considered and debated for centuries. For much of human history, value was defined and quantified in ways that would be incompatible with the measurement methods modern economists now consider to be appropriate. Much of the prior historical assessment of value was rooted in the intangible benefits that came forth from human relationships between friends, family, and other people, and also, in peoples' relationships to their living environments or communities. However, the point of this isn't to reflect at history while wearing rose-coloured glasses. As Andrea Levy points out: "There is a danger, I think, of romanticizing the nature of interpersonal relations in community organizations" (Levy, 2000, p. 87). Instead, it's contextually important to understand that in ancient times being in debt to others was seen as having more value than owning tremendous wealth. It meant others relied on you and therefore gave your life and livelihood more value than someone not willing to accept this definition (Graeber, 2014). This ancient and longstanding human-centric understanding of value and how it's created and shared has been radically upended in just a couple centuries.

Not until relatively recently has the prevailing financialized theory of value been the dominant understanding. Value is now typically seen in strict relation to the financial bottom line as expressed by the understanding that "from an economic point of view, the choice of

using an additional hour of labor as an input should be made if, and only if, the value of the additional output from this hour is, at least, equal to the price paid for this hour” (Handy et al., 2008, p. 2). This has been the dominant lens in which value has been examined with since the industrial revolution when the concept of value began to take on a radically different meaning than had been previously understood. Prior to industrial societies people generally did not quantify value in economic terms that separated the actual human-beings creating value with the various reasons why they were doing so. However, with the advent of industrial labour and the subsequent rise of managerialism there came sweeping changes not only to how value is perceived and understood, but also changes to the relationships that value and value creation inherently entails.

Just before the industrial revolution, both “Adam Smith and David Ricardo, the founders of British economic science, had embraced the labor theory of value—as did many of the new industrialists” (Graeber, 2018, p. 230). However, the popular conception of the role of workers as being the main producers of value was systematically undermined and replaced as the industrial age advanced and economic decision-making increasingly became more and more concentrated in the hands of the owners of the means of production. Precipitating from this transformation was the transcendence and dominance in economics of a perverse capitalist theory of value which placed an abstraction in the form of wealth itself in-lieu of the workers creating it as the main driver and focal point of value creation. This monetization of the concept of value is still the prevalent understanding today for many within the public and private sectors of the modern economy. However, within the third sector, also known as the social

economy, a more traditional notion of value percolates. This is principally because SEOs exist firstly to fulfill their social missions rather than to increase profits (Quarter et al., 2018).

Therefore, SEOs at their core are essentially human-centric participants in the social economy existing within the broader neoliberal economic structure dominating the global economy. These organizations are then by definition more aligned with a theory of value that privileges people and encourages understanding the meaning of value in ways that are not limited to economic quantification such as utility, profit, price, etc. The development of a robust social economy within the current neoliberal economic system with opposite core values creates an internal historical schism because “[u]ndoubtedly there were more traditional forms of co-operation, mutuality, and charity, but developments in the 19th Century laid the foundations for the social economy as we now know it” (Spear, 2010, p. 4). Essentially, this means that if one looks at the advent of modern capitalism and neoliberalism one can see a Marxian prediction that these economic systems have to some degree sown the seeds of their own demise by establishing the conditions for an essential third sector to emerge, the social economy, and for SEOs to flourish and become increasingly more economically relevant to the growing majority of those exploited by neoliberalism.

When one thinks of value today certain things come immediately to mind. Typically, these are commodities, which can be bought, sold, or traded in the marketplace. This includes an endless amount of things which range from gold bullion to cattle to tar sands crude bitumen and an endless amount of other raw and finished commodities. However, the value of intangible things is not typically bought, sold, or traded. This does not mean that some of these things aren’t still considered valuable. It does mean though that a certain amount of value

existing in the economy cannot be quantified by the currently existing neoliberal understanding of what value means. A prime example of this is shown by much of the labour, output, and outcomes being performed and created by CEOs within the social economy sector.

A significant part of the social economy is engaged in a kind of caring labour that involves improving the lives of others through positive human relations between individuals or groups of people. This involves an equally unlimited amount of variation to what the private sector offers in terms of how value is created, but nearly all of it is based in a broader concept that social value is created through labour that deals with improving the lives of others. This is mostly done utilizing non-monetary means such as maintain or improving people's health, sense of self-worth, independence, dignity, etc. Strangely, these valuable forms of work are given little to no value by neoliberal economic doctrine and, furthermore, "in the same way as women's unpaid caring labor is made to disappear from our accounts of 'the economy', so are the caring aspects of other working-class jobs made to disappear as well" (Graeber, 2018, p.236).

Some of the most archetypal workers in the social economy are deeply engaged in caring labour such as: teachers, nurses, doctors, counsellors, child-care providers, caseworkers, social workers, etc. Much of the value that these type of workers create is synonymous with the values (caring, compassion, empathy) in which they do it with, and subsequently cannot be quantified or assigned a dollar figure. Therefore, it seems that much of the labour producing value within the social economy does not properly align to the financialized way that value is considered within a neoliberal economy. However, it would be equally as impossible for anyone regardless of their ideology to suggest that these jobs are not needed or that they are not

providing something truly valuable to society. Furthermore, as scholar David Graeber points out, a surprising amount of all labour is based in a type of hard-to-monetize caring-type labour:

...most working-class labor, whether carried out by men or women, actually more resembles what we archetypically think of as women's work, looking after people, seeing to their wants and needs, explaining, reassuring, anticipating what the boss wants or is thinking, not to mention caring for, monitoring, and maintaining plants, animals, machines, and other objects, than it involves hammering, carving, hoisting, or harvesting things. (Graeber, 2018, p. 235)

Neoliberalism's emphasis on financialization has significantly changed how value has been considered. This has been a relatively recent process with dramatic results that have changed history, changed how we view the majority of working-class labour, and how we account for the value created in the overall economy, including the social economy sector which primarily creates value through the utilization of priceless values like caring. The value created by people acting within SEOs existing within the social economy involve an infinite amount of inputs and outputs that are all underpinned by this economically heterodox sense of social value being privileged over financial value. In this sense, SEOs are helping to rectify the sharp inversion caused by capitalism and neoliberalism to our sense of what's truly valuable, or priceless, and therefore, what can't ever be precisely or economically accounted for. It's in this way that the priceless values represented by SEOs in the social economy fracture the chains of neoliberalism from within.

Housed within the CSE are all publicly funded PSE institutions in Canada. Together they have an obligation in resisting the neoliberal inversion of value because of their overall importance, this cannot be understated because "Universities are of such importance to organizations in the social economy that they could be characterized as a hub" (Quarter et al., 2018, p. 107). However, it is worthwhile and relevant to pay particular attention to U of T as a

SEO because of the influence this school has on domestic and international systems of PSE as proven by U of T consistently being the highest ranking Canadian PSE and in the top 20 in global rankings (Sorensen, 2018). It's a widely held belief by many SE theorists and experts that the largest (in terms of the overall amount of stakeholders and budgetary size) and most influential (in terms of socio-economic impacts) organizations in the third economic sphere between the public and private sectors are hospitals and PSE (Tremblay, 2012).

Universities and their partnerships with hospitals provide the intellectual driving force and breeding grounds for the research, breakthroughs, and discoveries in the medical sciences necessary for any modern functioning healthcare system. The Canadian universal healthcare system is widely regarded by Canadians as the most respected national achievement in Canadian society. Therefore, it isn't hyperbole to claim that universities should be seen as even more vital to Canadian society considering that the outputs and outcomes developed within or stemming from universities provide the very possibility of effective healthcare and healthcare systems like our own. This is why a focused study on the U of T manageriat's role in upholding their responsibilities as leaders of a SE powerhouse is highly relevant to the health and well-being of all Canadians.

By focusing in on the U of T manageriat it's revealed that one of the three core goals of theirs as stated in the University's budget model is to "introduce broadly-based incentives to strengthen the financial health of the university by increasing revenues and reducing expenses" (U of T Planning and Budget Office, p. 36). This important information is buried deep within the University's annual budget report and clearly shows that a fundamental pillar of University operations under the manageriat is to execute as many of the most important financial

decisions in as purely profit-driven of a manner as possible. By internally framing the University's financial interests as being closely aligned to the same core interests of virtually any large business organization within a capitalist state the manageriat also relegates its SEO status behind that of its business reputation. The loss of institutional emphasis on social benefits is inextricably linked to neoliberalism and privatization because of the normative shift and gradual acceptance of these economic ideas as an unchangeable status quo (Newfield, 2016). These actions directly contradict the manageriat's own designated status as leaders of a massive not-for-profit SEO devoted primarily to the betterment of Canadians and Canadian society.

The University of Toronto manageriat are already well on their way towards achieving more complete forms of financialization at the University as hundreds of millions of dollars in surplus revenue are generated nearly every year. In 2017 the U of T Business Board reported to the University's Governing Council a staggering "net income of \$417 million" (University of Toronto Governing Council, 2017, p. 3). The June meetings in which the Business Board of the University typically provides a fiscal update to the council contains particularly important economic information. In the last several years of the Business Board's June financial reports to U of T Governing Council it has been claimed that increases in enrolment are driving increased tuition revenue which in turn yields the massive net-revenues for the University nearly each year. Scarcely reported at council is the work that is done by the precariat to admit, register, enroll, teach, and support the University community among many other key roles that non-managerial/professional workers have at the University. This cycle of managers obfuscating the real wealth of the University by burying it in reports helps promulgate a continual cycle that's

been in place for years which enables the managerialiat to “secure surplus labour and obscure the power relations that make this process possible” (Burawoy, 1985, in Bratton et al., p. 47).

The labour of the precariat who comprise the vast majority of the workforce at the U of T is what actually generates the wealth and privilege reported to the Business Board. However, much more attention in these reports is attributed to the migration of an increasingly large pool of financially lucrative international students willing to pay sky-high unregulated international tuition fees to study at U of T. Rarely is their mention made of the work done by international recruiters, admissions teams, transition advisors, or the countless other workers largely responsible for facilitating this source of enormous revenue for the University. Instead, the success of the University is routinely characterized in ways that ignore and undermine the contributions of the workers who are the most responsible. For this reason, unions on campus at U of T including the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) and the United Steelworkers (USW) have rightfully used the slogan “U of T Works Because We Do” (Bañares & Mannie, 2018) to remind the University community that for all of its emphasis given towards the financialization of higher-education, the real bread and butter of how the university operates relies on the daily efforts and sacrifices of the precariat above all.

4.2 – The Urgency for Viable Economic Alternatives

Capitalism cannot continue much longer because at the present time the world faces multiple and converging existential threats in the forms of climate change and nuclear weapons. Noam Chomsky, the person deemed “the world’s top intellectual” (Campbell, 2005), points out that currently India and Pakistan have been facing extreme drought which is

threatening the potable water supply of both countries for millions of people. Scientists have for a long time predicted such effects as a direct result of runaway global climate change. However, in this particular case, the leadership of both countries are extremely hostile to each other, and both have stockpiles of nuclear weapons ready to be deployed a moment's notice. As climate change inevitably worsens the supply of clean water in both countries will surely diminish thus exacerbating an already tense and increasingly desperate situation. The possibility is very real that under these circumstances, and increasingly so with any further escalation, that any additional spark could lead to a nuclear war surely destroying both countries. This outcome would also entail the real possibility for creating an atmospheric nuclear winter effect which would further cause severe global famine and a chain-reaction certain to dramatically raise the potential death toll of such catastrophic events.

It must be underscored that these future possibilities are not musings related to science fiction or of a Hollywood screenplay. Instead, these are the recent and sober considerations of some of the world's most renowned scientists and scholars. Noam Chomsky is joined by an array of prominent intellectuals and scientists who are sounding the alarm in this regard, including the famous and revered Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist, the leading advocacy group of Atomic Scientists since its inception in 1947. Intellectuals and scientific organizations are increasingly cautioning the world that if expedient and radical actions are not taken to mitigate and reverse the threats posed by climate change and nuclear weapons that the human race may well very soon be thrust into such nightmarish and possibly terminal scenarios as mentioned above with no possible recourse (Ripple et al., 2017; Jha, 2006).

It is also clear that the existential threats of climate change and nuclear weapons have been caused primarily by the adoption of a capitalist system of global finance that encourages individuals to ruthlessly pursue the maximization of private profits within a financial system that promulgates a myth of endless economic growth while ignoring or externalizing for others to deal with the massive negative and ultimately deleterious consequences that capitalism produces. Under the dogma of capitalism an individual's goal of attaining and maximizing private profit is to be placed well above everything else. This includes for example: the pursuit or creation of social benefits for the public at large, or facilitating an egalitarian distribution of wealth, and most importantly, putting the accumulation of profit behind sustaining life on planet Earth. According to capitalism, profit is life, and it's what's most needed to achieve success in the capitalistic economic system. In this system clean air, water, food, shelter, and all other basic requirements of life are essentially subjugated to being mere market commodities in the ever-expanding quest for increasing the economic bottom line.

It is the subservience of capitalists and many others ensnared in the clutches of this system for believing or resigning themselves to an absurd notion of value. The value of individual profit generation and acquisition is placed over and above anything related to the attainment of real value, meaning: social value or that which benefits society as a whole. The individualist notion inherent in capitalism is made even stronger within the economic framework of neoliberalism as the former system had class-compromises which have been dismantled and replaced by neoliberal doctrine that espouses an ideology of domination by powerful elites and the global plutocracy over all others. The advent of this harsh and brutal neoliberal ideology entails that elite actors seek domination not only through acquiring profit,

but also by enabling plutocratic class-restoration (Harvey, 2005). These neoliberal projects have paved the way for the leaders of nations to selfishly betray humanity at large. This has been shown at its most extreme by the continuing development and then stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction in order to protect the powerful, and also by the rush to earn revenues through imperiling and destroying of our planetary ecosystem, while it still remains to be exploited.

If it is true that capitalism cannot continue then this presupposes that another economic alternative must replace it. Thankfully there are many different types of economic systems that have existed throughout history that we can learn from if we're to transition beyond the current system, past neoliberalism, and embrace elements contained in the heterodox alternatives that have previously existed or which currently still exist in other parts of the world outside of North America (Stanford, 2015). These alternatives and their examples are plentiful, however, the most important of them is the social economy which already exists within Canada and the United States. Therefore, it's vital that Canadians adopt the economic alternatives (the more radical the better) that are viable in order to abort a broken economic system that is literally wrecking the planet. Embracing the social economy provides a viable, sustainable, and already established existing alternative to unfettered financialized capitalism. It would be impossible to coherently compare every facet of the social economy in relation to the currently existing system of neoliberalism within this thesis paper. For instance, it is obvious that economies from hundreds or thousands of years ago operated in a completely different technological context and with vastly different assumptions about the theories of value for example (Graeber, 2014).

Economic systems have constantly changed over time, adapting not only to technological breakthroughs, but also changing in response to, and also influencing, social and ideological contexts and conditions, especially in regards to factors directing the priorities of state economic interests and activities. With this in mind then, it is not then farfetched to argue that the current socio-economic context involving rapidly immanent existential crises should cause people and the institutions they operate to immediately take bold steps to fully transition towards operating within the sustainable and democratic economic practices of the CSE. Historically there have been varying economic models adopted by individuals, groups, institutions, and states, so it is not unnatural that such a radical change may occur as time continues.

The current viable and proven economic alternative to capitalism in Canada and other countries has been called the “social economy”, or the “third way” as it occupies a third sphere of economic activity not captured entirely by the private or public sectors, and which seeks the attainment of social benefits first and foremost ahead of generating profit for profit’s sake (Quarter et al., 2018). The social economy is an economic behemoth generating billions of revenues each year that are (at least in theory) directed towards creating or sustaining social benefits and furthering the notion of an egalitarian distribution of wealth amongst society. With global economic inequality soaring this is precisely the goal that makes sense for an economic system worth pivoting towards.

More locally, and in the context of the city in which U of T resides and takes its namesake, income inequality in Toronto is well above the Canadian average and at crisis levels. Leading social advocacy groups warn that the deteriorating conditions for a majority of Toronto

residents comprising of “precarious work, rising costs of real estate and high costs of living are increasingly making Toronto a city of “haves” and “have-nots” (Toronto Foundation, 2017, p. 8). However, this wasn’t always the case, and for many decades the economic demography of Toronto was fairly balanced with a large and stable middle class making up the majority of the population. However, over the last few decades as the neoliberal project of elite class restoration and domination has come further and further into fruition the middle class of Toronto has dramatically shrunken and now all but disappeared. Toronto today is a highly socio-economically divided and stratified city along class lines with increasingly two main categories: upper-class, and lower-class (Hulchanski, 2010).

By thoroughly examining the disjuncture between managerial rhetoric and the realities on the ground for the precariat at U of T, and accounting for the overall class tensions rising throughout the city of Toronto, a lofty U of T institutional discourse that avoids class distinctions becomes patently absurd. For years the managerialiat at U of T has marketed the word “Excellence” as an approved motto for the financialized direction of U of T. This is fitting because one of the “preeminent signs under which this transformation is taking place are the appeals to the notion of “excellence” that now drop from the lips of University administrators at every turn” (Readings, 1996, p. 12). However, excellence as a motto means nothing without a meaningful and provable criteria applied to stakeholders that can back up this claim. This is impossible because it’s also a buzzword now being used by virtually every post-secondary institution, and thus this makes any reasonable grounding or comparison with reality virtually impossible. However, the symbolism of branding an institution as important as U of T with a word as meaningless and arbitrary as excellence is important. It reinforces an overall lack of

respect and attention by managerial decision-makers towards their important role in directly supporting the CSE by so prominently and repetitively adopting shallow private-sector type marketing slogans that essentially put a sheen on the status quo.

4.3 – U of T Breaks with the CSE

U of T is one of just a handful of universities in Canada that has a unicameral governance system with no fundamental separation between members who consider and vote on administrative and financial proposals versus those who consider and vote on academic proposals. The unicameral governance model at U of T was established by the University of Toronto Act (UTA) in 1971 which fundamentally changed the governance structure at the University. The passage of the UTA stands as the single most critical moment in which the University of Toronto clearly began to break from the Canadian social economy, especially in regards to its core principle of organizational democracy. The debates and discussions leading up to the UTA in 1971 are also the only period in time in which the U of T came close to establishing a real democratic governance system with power-sharing between teachers and students (Ross, 1972, p. 245). Therefore, this is also the closest the U of T has been to being a real leader of the CSE. A prerequisite of which should be to lead by example. However, since then, the University has been in a steady democratic decline that is precisely in-line with the rise of neoliberalism and the exacerbation of divisive class-based factionalism.

Understanding the reasons for why the U of T Act was implemented, how close the precariat came to seizing full-control over governance at the University, and the ramifications caused by the silence and complicity of the managerialiat is imperative for understanding the

broader claims made in this thesis. It helps to explain the long drawn-out history of U of T's slow withdrawal from honouring the core principals of the CSE such as cooperation amongst stakeholders and democratic governance, among others. This is precisely what happened during the development and implementation of the UTA as the manageriat were complicit with their governmental counterparts in shutting down the surging student-led protests and dissent on campus in support of democratizing U of T. Rather than acting as true leaders and helping to pivot the institution towards progressive change reflecting bold new ideas and a sustainable future, the manageriat at U of T instead elected to do the opposite. This may not have been done entirely as a blatant or deliberate action as it's possible to understand this course of action through the process and subsequent impacts known as "coercive isomorphism", in which powerful external influences (such as neoliberalism) help to wittingly or unwittingly shape the decisions and actions of organizational actors (DiMaggio & Powell, 2013). However, motives aside, there clearly existed a striking division between students and teachers on one side, and the University senior administration on the other. This is the origin of the precariat and manageriat at U of T and therefore the beginnings of the University's troubled relationship with the CSE.

The vast majority of universities in Canada today have a bicameral governance structure. This is typically composed of a board of governors comprised mostly of external, governmental, and manageriat appointed members primarily dealing with administrative and financial affairs. It also has a senate comprised mostly of faculty and students who typically deal with academic decision-making (Pennock, 2015). However, U of T has a unicameral governance structure with a single board of governors containing a range of representatives from faculty,

students, staff, external, management, and government appointed members among others. This arrangement is much more progressive than what previously existed before the UTA wherein faculty and staff were prohibited from sitting on the board of directors for University governance bodies who controlled administrative and financial decision-making. Prior to the UTA the Senate was composed of professors. The Board of Governors was composed primarily of men from the Canadian business-sector. As such, there was “always tension between these two bodies. The senate was concerned about effectiveness; the board with efficiency” (Ross, 1972, p. 242).

It wasn't until 1966 when the Duff-Berdahl report was commissioned and released at the behest of university teachers in Canada that the exclusion of faculty and students in critical matters of university governance in Canada began to change (MacDonald, 2018). Most of the changes however did not go as far as what the U of T community underwent when it was decided to completely dissolve the U of T Senate altogether. This extreme outcome only came about due to the systematic dismantling of solidarity between students and faculty at U of T. This group had formed a bond together through their mutual exclusion from the board of governors and by the activist spirit of the times throughout the '60s. Students and teachers were united in pressuring both the managerial and government not just for incrementally better representation, but instead, they wanted full-control of the entire Governing Council of U of T. Students and teachers at this time demanded to run the University together with equal representation within the Governing Council and without any other governmental or bureaucratic interference by administrators (Ross, 1972).

The historic and radical cooperation between students and teachers at U of T was ultimately torpedoed by the business-led board of governors who lobbied the Ontario government to shut down the efforts of students and teachers at U of T for taking joint control over the University (Ross, 1972). This led the Ontario Ministry of University Affairs in eventually rewriting the proposals commissioned in official reports done to explore joint student-teacher governance at U of T. The Ministry instead prepared its own version of the U of T Act which gutted these proposals with the final version of the U of T Act passing in 1971. Essentially this is the origin of the precariat at U of T, and it is signified by the outright betrayal of students and teacher in attaining their fundamental democratic and cooperative unity, and perhaps the ultimate values underpinning the CSE.

The anti-democratic nature of the changes forced by the Ministry at the behest of business-sector influencers came with the complicit silence of the manageriat. This resulted in governance at the time at U of T in which “students and academic staff have only a minority voice” (Ross, 1972, p. 253). Subsequently, this legacy has persisted through much of Canada as a more recent study has shown that “nearly three-quarters of senior administration (72%) felt they were able to influence decisions compared to 55% of faculty, and only 32% of student members” (Jones et al., 2004, p. 60). Had the U of T led the way in democratizing and co-operativizing University governance between teachers and students several decades ago the influencing ability of the nation’s top school may have caused others to also consider and implement such reforms. Based on the current available data regarding decision-making at PSE institutions in Canada it seems that such a radical change is still highly warranted and long overdue, and especially if the Canadian PSE sector is to be realigned with the CSE.

Chapter 5 – University of Toronto Divided

In this chapter I'll argue that the University of Toronto community has been fundamentally fractured since the social upheavals of the 1960s which culminated at that time with the highly divisive U of T Act of 1971. Stemming from this disjuncture there has been a prolonged period in which the U of T manageriat has established a clear pattern of alignment with neoliberal ideology by aligning University operations increasingly closer to the private sector. This process has unfolded over a substantial period of time and is a duration which obscures the totality of the changes that are occurring which supplant the U of T's social mission and role as a public sector non-profit SEO and leader of the CSE.

Therefore, it is essential to give a further analysis of just how this is being accomplished while also understanding that university administrators are constantly under the pressures of coercive isomorphism from both the business and governmental sectors. These sectors interact significantly with all PSE institutions including the U of T by providing funding and opportunities (among other things) to university administrators who in turn reflect the norms and values of the privileged and powerful sectors that support them in this regard.

In this chapter I'll show how coercive isomorphism and the adoption of a neoliberal private sector mode of managerialism by the manageriat has caused socio-economic harm to the University community and the University precariat in particular. I'll do this by exploring three prominent examples showing how the U of T manageriat is failing to put social benefit ahead of profit as they are obligated and therefore directly or indirectly serving private rather than public interests. The three critical case studies I'll examine in this chapter are:

- 1) Rising tuition fees & student debt: It's causing and exacerbating student poverty and precariousness by increasing student fees and debt loads at a uniquely economically difficult time for most people. These effects are also being compounded by U of T's managers increasing reliance on financially exploiting the non-resident international student market for profit.

- 2) Overreliance on contract teaching staff: This process is undermining and dismantling the tenure system by U of T managers hiring increasingly more contract academic staff who create a sharply two-tiered teaching system within the institution.

- 3) Policy on divestment: U of T managers have consistently sided with big-business on divestment policy by being on the wrong side of history in virtually all divestment proposals taken up at U of T (Apartheid, Tobacco, Fossil Fuels). The history and decisions made in this regard are the smoking gun that shows just how far U of T managers have gone to privilege profit and profiteers ahead of social benefit and protecting Canadians against social harm.

To conclude this chapter, I'll argue that U of T's position as a leading SEO and public PSE institution means that the impact of these decisions is critical and goes well beyond the boundaries of the U of T community by having national and even global impact and influence.

5.1 – Deconstructing the U of T Community

The University of Toronto is bifurcated into two very distinctly divided communities that are separated along sharp socio-economic lines. In order to properly assess the realities on the ground happening at Canada's top school it is essential to firstly deconstruct the major groupings of individuals operating within this environment. In doing so we see that on one side is a loose coalition of students and teachers, and to a lesser degree working-class staff (mostly non-managerial/professional administrators). Together these groups constitute the rank and file members of the University of Toronto community because they do the vast majority of the teaching and learning as well as the support functions that allow both of these core activities to happen. Ultimately this group forms the core of the U of T precariat because maintaining their basic socio-economic conditions (fair pay, decent benefits, job security, etc.) is increasingly a concern to many of them even though these groups have a vital role in making the wealthiest school in Canada function. This is in minor contrast to author Guy Standing's assertion that the global precariat is "not 'middle class', as they did not have a stable or predictable salary of the status and benefits that middle-class people were supposed to possess" (Standing, 2011, p. 6). However, in both versions, the precariat directly experience great economic instability existing amongst ordinary people struggling in various ways because of neoliberalism. Therefore, the U of T precariat are similar to Guy Standing's personal conception of this class, but they differ significantly because many within the U of T precariat have salaried jobs with benefits. However, even with this advantage, the U of T precariat are still struggling economically while helping to make Canada's largest SEO function at meeting both its social mission and core academic goals for achieving excellence in teaching, learning, and research.

The precarious social and economic conditions experienced by the precariat is exacerbated in some instances by people in the top positions of power at the University of Toronto. These actors constitute the manageriat at U of T because their interests are increasingly aligned with neoliberal economic ideology and the political establishment which perpetuates it. The manageriat at U of T includes professionals, senior managers, and other officials such as: Presidents, Chancellor, Provosts, Deans, Vice Deans, Senior Directors, etc. These people wield nearly ultimate institutional power over the precariat and they also reap a disproportionate share of remuneration for these efforts (SunshineListStats, 2019).

In contrast, the composition of the precariat at U of T includes: unionized and non-unionized non-teaching and non-managerial staff, with the latter simply being referred to as staff. This is a massive group of thousands of workers that are employed by the University in positions ranging from caretakers to business officers. There is a wide range and diversity of incomes, benefits, reporting relationships, levels of autonomy, power, and other factors that are derived from holding certain positions and performing these roles. However, in the institutional hierarchy of staff positions that have been created it is the unionized ones that are clearly better off. Even so, it's very typical that the average unionized worker at the U of T earns a fraction of the salary that their managers do (SunshineListStats, 2019). This is a growing inequality as many of the economic gains that unionized workers fight for and attain through collective bargaining are severely offset or negated by the soaring costs of living within the Greater Toronto Area (GTA).

Incorporating in this research a study of the staff working at the University is relevant because the livelihoods of thousands of people in the GTA rely on their employment status and

the working conditions at the U of T. As of 2017 there were 11,946 unionized, and 1516 non-unionized staff members working at U of T (University of Toronto Office of Planning and Budget, 2018). These workers by their sheer size and the importance of their work in helping to make the University of Toronto function represent a significant contribution to the overall workforce and GDP of the GTA. Their contribution to the health of the social economy can also not be understated because many of the unionized workers in this group are on the forefront of the fight to improve compensation, benefits, and job security for public sector workers.

However, the inclusion of staff into the working definition of the precariat as it exists at U of T and other PSE institutions is more complex than including their student and teaching counterparts. This is because the overwhelming majority of new staff positions being created throughout the academy are administrative non-teaching positions. This has coincided with the overall rise and expansion of institutional bureaucracy which some argue has led to the devaluation of teaching and learning in PSE institutions (Ginsberg, 2011). Additionally, a corporate bureaucratic shift has occurred in-line with the ramping up of neoliberalism since the 1980s. It became apparent by this time that administrators were beginning to outnumber faculty at universities. This trend has continued and now there are many staff at universities like and including the U of T who are employed in jobs that serve little to no purpose beyond that of simple functionaries. These roles are typically detached from the primary teaching and learning functions of the school they work at as well. The rationale for this phenomena comes from senior administrators who “have a strong incentive to maximize the power and prestige of whatever office they hold by working to increase its staff and budget” (Ginsberg, 2011, p. 33).

If one accepts that those without direct connection to the teaching and learning happening in PSE institutions should not be considered primary stakeholders, or that their roles by definition as support staff are to support those who can't be replaced, then it makes sense not to prioritize the role of staff in the same way as students and teachers. However, it still makes sense to include these workers in the precariat class-grouping at the U of T because of the fact that these people largely hail from the working-class and rely on their (employment) relationship with the school to provide for the livelihoods of themselves and their families in the same way students and teachers also leverage their relationship with the University for the betterment of themselves and society.

Most Canadian universities also have increasingly large departments of advancement which focus on outreach to and building connections with potential donors. The most skilled workers in these departments are assigned to target the wealthiest alumni and successful Canadians. These type of targeted fundraising activities have only grown more integral to the sustainability of university budgets in Canada as governmental funding has stagnated and declined over the last few decades across all provinces. As a result, "since the mid-1980s, PSE policies have served to blur the boundaries separating sectors within PSE (universities and CAATS) and, more generally, between public and private funding sources" (Shanahan et al., 2014, p. 170). This blurring between the public and private sectors has eroded the SE anchoring of many PSE institutions and caused their missions to drift towards revenue and profit generation.

Wealthy Canadians who give gifts or donate either directly or indirectly through their charitable fund donations have garnered much of the domestic focus of attention by the

manageriat at the University. From a strictly neoliberal perspective this actually makes sense logically when considering that “[s]ome funding areas receive much higher levels of support than others. In terms of total value of grants, top gifts foundations gave by far the highest levels of support to Education & Research organizations” (Imagine Canada and Philanthropic Foundations Canada, 2014, p. 13). As a result from this flow of donor cash to the U of T the branding of a building or faculty by one of these donors is now commonplace. However, often major institutional donors seek and receive much more than simple name brand recognition for their support.

In recent years there’s been a shift by wealthy Canadians towards “engaging in forms of charitable practice that have more of a business bent, for example, venture philanthropy with its increased emphasis on strategic investment and measuring outcomes” (Quarter et al., 2018, p. 17). Many of these elite Canadians who donate to PSE appear to routinely have the ear of top university officials by often being in frequent contact with them, or being purposefully photographed together by a university communications officer at glitzy events and galas held with an increasingly thin veneer of academic or institutional appropriateness. Still, benefits such as these do not necessarily go beyond the threshold of frivolous bought attention and recognition.

However, a far less superficial return on investment for wealthy donors can be seen by the various examples of these people wielding illegitimate and inappropriate power and influence over university officials and senior administrators. This has resulted in a troubling correlation between Canadians with business and/or political connections who occupy senior positions as university officials or governors simply because of their proximity to wealth and

power. Many of these people are not even alumni. Some, like the current U of T Chancellor and former chair of the University's Governing Council appear to have no formal post-secondary education at all except for an honorary degree. Their role as an executive with the Bank of Montreal also most likely provided the financial means behind their financing of several scholarships, fellowships, and awards offered in their own name (University of Toronto, 2018).

There are also troubling examples that have seen Canadian plutocrats and their interests become increasingly represented within the divided U of T community. Examples of this can be seen in the renaming of major parts of the University of Toronto after wealthy donors or their companies. Often these donors also have close relations with top University managers. One such fairly recent example resulted in a senior manager almost immediately taking on a position after retirement with the board of directors alongside a top Canadian CEO that they had been closely aligned with through their University interactions. (Jamasmie, 2013).

Examining the relationships between Canadian plutocrats and the U of T is important because it exposes potentially serious moral and ethical concerns about the priorities of the managerialiat at the University of Toronto. It also raises questions regarding who truly controls the most valuable assets within the CSE and for what reasons. Clearly PSE alignment with the public sector in Canada must not be diluted if the PSE is to prioritize social benefit creation. However, this can only happen if public pressure is levied against senior university officials when apparent or potential conflicts of interest arise with wealthy donors and plutocrats. A conflict of such kind would cause an untenable situation for PSE in Canada because even the *appearance* of a conflict between a public university official and a private sector actor is inappropriate: "Institutional conflict of interest (ICOI) is characterized as a situation in which the

financial investments or holdings of the university of the personal financial interests or holdings of institutional leaders might affect or reasonably appear to affect institutional processes for the design, conduct, reporting, review, or oversight of research, education, or management practices” (Krimsky, 2014, p. 236, in Turk, 2014). Therefore, the precariat at the U of T cannot afford to allow the managerialiat and wealthy Canadians to shift the priorities and commitments of a vital public institution like the U of T. It’s in the public interest to expose and vigorously fight against those that even *appear* to be doing so. For as long as such a burden exists, the U of T will remain a divided community.

5.2 – The Tuition & Student Debt Crisis

Universities cannot exist without students. They are the literal life-blood of the academy in Canada and everywhere. It is therefore ignominious that this group is being routinely financially exploited by the managerialiat at the U of T. This is happening despite the fact that the University is a public sector non-profit and one of the largest charitable organizations in Canada (Quarter et al., 2018, p. 106; Charity Intelligence Canada, 2019). Further compounding these matters is the fact that this financial exploitation is happening at the precise time that many PSE students are struggling to cope with an enveloping socio-economic state of precariousness that is currently a defining hallmark of the current generation of students. Fueling this has been the major burden on students and society that runaway tuition fees pose. The University of Toronto has led Ontario in raising these fees, and they have continued to soar, more than doubling on average from what they were just a couple decades ago (Pasma & Macdonald, 2015, p. 13).

It's now a given that students at U of T will be exploited in this regard like their counterparts at peer institutions elsewhere even though the former is the most financially privileged school, having more sources of funding and revenues available than any other in Canada. The President of the University of Toronto Students' Union shared this sentiment by responding to the news that U of T would once again increase its fees by stating that the student organization was "disappointed, although not surprised, that the university is increasing fees by as much as it possibly can" (Elpa, 2018). Financially squeezing students as much as possible has put an enormous financial strain on students and others who are responsible for figuring out a way to pay for a quality PSE that is nowadays essentially a requirement to survive in today's cutthroat globalized economy. In response, the marketing developed by those responsible for it within nearly all colleges and universities in Canada has been largely geared around driving home the message that PSE is a compulsory financial investment and a necessary prerequisite for any hope of securing employment after graduation. Alternately, and at the same time, there's been a diminished emphasis on institutional messaging that speaks to education for education's sake, or for the betterment of communities or society rather than solely for the individual.

The reality on the ground for most students has been one of systemic financial and social precariousness. However, this precarious reality has also begun to extend far beyond student's time in school and now is widely experienced by those who've graduated, commonly even being felt by those holding advanced graduate degrees. It is obvious that such a bleak outlook for students shouldn't be the case for graduates who've done their part to improve either themselves, their communities, or in many cases both—that they shouldn't be facing a

precarious existence for these virtuous efforts. It's also obvious that a main driver of this precariousness is the debt-burden experienced by almost all post-secondary students in Canada, and especially those in Ontario, which claims the title of most expensive province to get a post-secondary education, and more specifically the University of Toronto which has the highest tuition rates in the province.

What isn't obvious however is the role of the University of Toronto managerialiat in creating and exacerbating the precarious existence of their own students and recent graduates, as well as impacting all other students throughout Canada by virtue of helping to set dangerous financial trends and provocative governance signals across the entire higher education sector. In a recent interview with the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), the current University of Toronto President Meric Gertler responded to a question regarding the exceptionally high international tuition fees at U of T by revealing that making unregulated international tuition more expensive was driven not completely out of necessity. Instead, Mr. Gertler plainly revealed that the tuition policy pursued by the managerialiat under his leadership sought to increase already costly international tuition fees because of a belief by them that higher fees would attract wealthier students who could pay the very most tuition possible because this group viewed the worthiness of institutions by its prestige and exclusivity. The U of T president elaborated recently about this agenda to the BBC saying that "[w]e were a very highly ranked university – and yet we were so inexpensive, Prof Gertler says. In the international market place, people had a hard time reconciling those two facts. So when we increased price, we found demand went up – as did the quality of the applications" (Coughlan, 2019). This statement is evidence that decision-making happening at the highest levels regarding who to

recruit into the U of T is strongly driven by globalized market economics rather than academic or social benefit considerations. In fact, this process of seeking more lucrative profit margins by recruiting others in different countries to the detriment of the domestic population (in this case by encouraging overall tuition inflation and global market-based competition for student enrolment) is a textbook case of economic offshoring (Chomsky, 2017) problems for solutions rather than dealing with the root causes. This is much more akin to industrial relations and a factory setting let alone the PSE sector in Canada and U of T in particular.

Even more outrageous is how “quality” is invoked and associated with students solely because of the implied met criterion that they most likely come from wealthier backgrounds and can afford steeply increased tuition fees. President Gertler’s statements to the BCC stand in complete contrast to the U of T’s very own “Statement of Institutional Purpose” which claims that the university must uphold a “resolute commitment to the principals of equal opportunity, equity and justice” (University of Toronto Governing Council, 1992, p. 3). If a non-resident international student’s ability to pay or go in debt to pay a huge international tuition fee makes them more attractive for recruitment over a domestic student, then this clearly conflicts with arguably U of T’s most important policy regarding its institutional purpose which clearly espouses values that speak to the necessity of placing social benefit above profit seeking. Instead, a neoliberalized offshoring model has been taken by the manageriat in recent years which allows U of T to supplant the decline in provincial funding with private funding from international students (mainly from China) and their families. Historian and author Jonathan Manthorpe argues that the “inflated tuition fees can be considered a modern version of the head tax entry fee into Canada” (Manthorpe, 2018, p. 205).

Students must recognize that they are not alone in the precariousness that they are now expected to face and live with every day. They are the largest and perhaps most vulnerable group within the precariat at U of T, but these mostly younger people can and should unite together with teachers and staff on campus who are also under attack. These other groups have lived-experiences that are probably to be longer in duration than students have and therefore offer a depth of insight that may not be available to students within their own ranks and campus organizations. Clearly, things cannot continue as they have, and there is strength in numbers. Students cannot afford to wait around to enact change. An illustration of the need for urgency by the precariat in regards to soaring tuition and student debt can be seen in the wake of the 2008 global financial crisis. At that time the University of Toronto Governing Council announced and then approved a year later a motion to change the then currently existing Faculty of Arts and Science tuition fee structure from per course billing to a flat program fee based on full-time or part-time registration. Under the new policy any undergraduate Arts and Science (A&S) student exceeding an artificially created threshold of three or more courses would be considered as a full-time student by University administrators and thus subject to being charged full-time tuition fees. This change had the direct consequence of dramatically inflating undergraduate tuition fees for thousands of students by hundreds of dollars without those affected even receiving anything additional of value from the University in exchange. In effect, undergraduate Arts & Sciences students registered to take three or four courses for example were now being charged exactly the same as students taking five or even six undergraduate courses. (U of T offered to let students add an additional half or full-course beyond the normal five course full-time allotment at no additional charge. This was done in

light of, or perhaps because of the fact that student uptake of this provision would likely be minimal.)

The new tuition fees policy was seen by students as a brazen and radical financial attack being waged against them for the benefit of generating increased revenues for University coffers on the backs of already indebted students. The University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU) pursued a civil and legal campaign to fight back on behalf of the tens of thousands of undergraduate students they represent (University of Toronto Students' Union, 2013). However, these campaigns were unfortunately not successful and the policy stood. Even scholars from other Ontario peer institutions weighed in on the side of the student voices to echo their concerns and lament against the rhetoric from U of T officials (Kershaw, 2009). However, the manageriat at U of T viewed the change completely differently, at least according to their public statements. Three main proponents from this group offered public statements in support of the flat fees scheme. They were: Meric Gertler (then Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science), Cheryl Misak (then Deputy Provost), and Scott Mabury (then Department Chair, Member of the Arts and Science Budget Committee). Together they argued that the changes to tuition were in keeping with normal and common practices at U of T's peer institutions. They also claimed that the new policy would benefit students by encouraging them to expedite completion of their degree program and therefore enabling students to enter into the workforce or professional/graduate education programs sooner (Ibid).

The University manageriat also conceded that with the changes to tuition they anticipated to generate "net revenue of \$9 million to \$10 million after accounting for student financial assistance and the cost of hiring new faculty and staff and to meet increased demand"

(Ibid, 2009). Newly generated student financial assistance in this case was estimated by U of T management to be “about 10 percent of the anticipated revenues” (Ibid, 2009) from the scheme. Therefore, roughly 90 percent of the tuition fee increases for undergraduate Arts & Science students came out of the pockets of students and into University budgets for the manageriat to do with whatever it wanted, and over the strong objections of the student representatives at the UTSU. However, it wasn’t until 2015 when in response to the overwhelming complaints by students that the Ontario government finally stepped in and struck down the flat fees scheme hatched by the University manageriat (Morrow & Bradshaw, 2013). By then tens of millions of dollars had been collected from students in interest payments and from them paying for full-time fees for full-time course loads they couldn’t take, commonly happening because of the need for them to hold down multiple jobs in order to pay tuition and costs of living. Ultimately, a clear precedent had been set that it would require government involvement in order to halt the U of T manageriat from pursuing the implementation of clearly regressive fees structures against the loud concerns of student representatives and groups.

Completely absent from the historical understanding of this incident from published media reports and accounts by University community members is what happened to the lead manageriat perpetrators of the flat fees scheme in 2009-2013. A year after the unpopular introduction of the much more expensive fees structure the three main representatives of the manageriat who argued publicly in support of the change were granted enormous salary raises and/or lucrative professional promotions. The Ontario Public Sector Salary Disclosure lists their 2008 salaries as: Gertler - \$268,190, Mabury - \$177,366, and Misak - \$282,630 (Government of Ontario, 2008). A year later in 2009 after the Faculty of Arts & Science flat fees scheme was

implemented these individuals were paid the following: Gertler - \$324,999 (single year increase of \$56,809), Mabury - \$207,899 (single year increase of \$30,533), and Misak - \$348,333 (single year increase of \$65,703) (Government of Ontario, 2009). In addition to receiving large salary increases on top of some of the already highest public sector salaries, all three of these individuals also received lucrative professional promotions afterward. Scott Mabury was promoted in 2009 to Vice Provost, Academic Operations. Cheryl Misak was promoted in 2009 to University Vice President & Provost. In 2013 Meric Gertler was promoted to President of the University.

This information shows a potential correlation between managerial work done in support of key revenue generating efforts that raise tuition fees while also making students financial situations more precarious and then subsequently receiving increased salary compensation and job status as potential remuneration. Actions taken such as these view students as an asset to be further monetized despite widespread concerns from students themselves regarding their ability to financial cope. It also follows a common trait ascribed to powerful actors operating under neoliberal principals. Political theorist David Harvey describes this as a type of “accumulation by dispossession” (Harvey, 2005, p. 159). However, identifying a causal linkage is impossible because of the private and secretive nature of high-level internal decision-making regarding top University officials and the actual considerations taken in awarding Gertler, Mabury, and Misak sizable increases in salary and job promotions soon after they carried out their managerial duties in this regard. However, what is clear is that an identifiable pattern exists between these actors which constitutes another area of profound concern that the most senior members of the U of T managerial appear to be not as dedicated

to increasing social benefits as they are to extracting additional revenue and profits from members of the precariat.

5.3 – Precarious Teaching

Teachers and students are always the primary stakeholders within the academy if one considers that teaching and learning (including researching) are ultimately the primary missions for any worthwhile PSE. In the context of the precariat, teachers at U of T include all teaching staff and faculty regardless of whether these people are student teachers or professional teachers etc. Precariousness now exists for all teaching groups at U of T because of the erosion of job security that happens when labour markets and jobs become increasingly segmented (Stanford, p. 185). Both teachers and students at U of T have deeply shared interests in this regard and this interrelatedness should be noted. Further underscoring this point is the fact that around the same time students were feeling the competitive and financial squeeze by pressures imposed on them as consumers of education under the neoliberal reforms to education starting in the 1980s, teaching groups throughout the Canadian academy were beginning to be also similarly targeted and repressed.

Prior to the 1980s most undergraduate and graduate teaching positions at the U of T had been a source of quality employment and professional development for burgeoning academics and freshly minted PhD graduates. Teaching at U of T typically followed a reasonable pathway to or through the tenure system and towards attainment of life-long secure employment. However, in just a few short decades virtually all of this has been upended. What was previously the norm for those seeking to become faculty members at U of T is now a

distant and virtually non-existent reality. Teachers, lecturers, teaching assistants, non-tenure track and tenure-track instructors, and even tenured professors (Ginsberg, 2011, p. 131) —all of these teaching groups are now members of the precariat.

Developments such as these would've previously have been unfathomable at a school as extremely wealthy and privileged as the University of Toronto. This could have only transpired through a complex series of socio-economic changes occurring both internally and externally to the University. A reasonable understanding of these changes and the part they've played in creating the precariat at the U of T is possible by examining the recent plight of teachers at this institution in the neoliberal era. Attention to the advent of precarious teaching in the Canadian academy and at U of T specifically is especially relevant to the overall analysis of this thesis because this particular segment of the precariat has been one of the hardest hit groups by the neoliberal reforms to the Canadian PSE sector. This is especially true for women teaching in the academy as a recent survey of a dozen universities in Ontario revealed that "more than 60% of sessional instructors are women and the majority hold PhD's" (Karram Stephenson et al., 2017, p. 27).

What's happened to teaching staff at U of T is also quite analogous to many other unionized and non-unionized non-managerial working groups at the University whose voices have not been able to penetrate the key decision-making conversations. Even members of the most powerful teaching group, the U of T Faculty Association, concede that it "has not been able to secure an adequate faculty role in the top governing structure of the University" (Nelson, 1993, p. 162). However, the most important change imposed on all teachers by senior administrators at the University of Toronto in the neoliberal era has been the unnecessary

dismantling and erosion of virtually all notions of job security. This regressive development was unnecessarily undertaken by the U of T manageriat as this group has the tremendous benefit of operating the wealthiest school in the country. This means that other options and choices existed and could have been utilized first and foremost to avoid or at least offset increasing precariousness for teaching staff at U of T. Instead, a “reliance on contract faculty appears to be largely driven by choices made by university administrations...” (Pasma & Shaker, 2018, p. 6). Aside from the great recession in 2008 there has been no real financial pretext for this shift to relying on contract faculty at U of T. Instead, this appears to the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives and many others as a deliberate managerial choice rather than a requirement. Choosing to increase worker insecurity and precariousness (essentially the feeling or actual loss of social and economic safety and security) when other options exist isn't a morally sound decision. This is true whether these choices target students through tuition hikes or teachers via the erosion or loss of their job security. It's also a direct affront to the notion of putting creation of social benefits ahead of balancing budgets on the backs of workers and students.

Teachers are the backbone of any university's educational reputation because of their scholarship which is commonly shared by many students and non-students alike. Although it would seem that this consideration is fairly obvious and therefore would sway the manageriat towards enacting measures favourable to teachers at U of T, instead the manageriat has continued to embrace policies and decisions that exacerbate worker insecurity. This has mainly been done in an effort aimed at fragmenting labour and sharply reducing its costs, core goals of neoliberalism. This is primarily achieved by imposing various policies which increase worker insecurity (Uchitelle, 1997) because workers without a sense of having real job security will

commonly accept reductions in wages, clawing back of benefits, increased workloads, and other concessions that fit with the managerialist goal of extracting additional surplus value from workers. Many working groups within the U of T precariat have been subjected to these very measures. The most striking example of this is the recent plight of teaching staff within the Canadian PSE sector, and especially at U of T, the largest employer of PSE teachers in the country (University of Toronto School of Graduate Studies, 2016).

There has been an explosion of contracted temporary teaching staff at U of T and many other PSE institutions in Canada. This shows the incredible progress of this neoliberal project within the Canadian academy. Ironically education faculties have been some of the hardest hit by having "...the second highest proportion of contract appointments of all the subject areas, nearly 90 per cent of them are part-time appointments" (Pasma & Shaker, 2018, p. 20). However, the greater irony, and the more salient point about this trend is how incongruent it is to the status of non-profit public sector universities like the U of T which are technically and legally charitable not-for-profit organizations. This status and the positioning of the U of T within the social economy in Canada presupposes that this organization would not willingly, nor seek to make their staff members increasingly precarious. However, this appears to be what's happened and it's been a major contributor to the creation of an entrenched plutocracy and precariat on campus. The ways that this contracting out of teaching work might end are not clear because "[t]he solutions to precarious faculty work in Canadian universities are multi-faceted. Universities need to take seriously their responsibility to their students, to their workers and to the public that finances them" (Pasma & Shaker, 2018, p. 6).

One of the most central neoliberal projects undertaken by most of the university manageriat in North America over the last few decades to increase worker insecurity for increases profits and revenues has happened by undermining and eroding working conditions, job security, and the financial stability of for a large segment of university teaching staff throughout the U.S. and Canada. This project has culminated in the majority of teaching work on PSE campuses across North America now being performed by teachers who are non-tenured and/or are staff subject to typically short-term (semester, academic year) employment contracts (Ginsberg, 2011, p. 136; Pasma & Shaker, 2018, p. 5). Because of the emphasis by managers on offering contract teaching positions rather than tenure or tenure-stream positions, for the vast majority of teaching staff at universities job security has become virtually non-existent and precarity has become institutionally normalized. As a result, it is common practice for contracted teachers to have to reapply each year for their own jobs, often to teach the same courses that they have taught for years. In essence, the relationship between university managers in charge of hiring and budgets and the teachers they seek to employ has developed in a relatively short amount of time in an extremely exploitive manner, dramatically devaluing and precariatizing teaching at most PSE institutions in North America.

The manageriat at University of Toronto has shown in numerous ways that it is willing to increase worker precariousness as a means for enhancing the financial bottom line and encouraging the docility of the University workforce to their superiors. A critical recent example of this commitment was evident during the 2015 labour dispute between University of Toronto and the CUPE Local 3902, Unit 1, whose membership comprises some 6000 graduate students who work as teaching assistants and course instructors, mainly teaching undergraduates at U of

T. The University side was represented by a negotiating committee comprised of members of the U of T manageriat. The dispute arose over the inability of both sides to reach agreement on an updated collective agreement after several months of talks following the expiration of the previous agreement in 2014. During this time U of T teaching assistants were technically working without a contract.

This labour dispute turned into a strike on March 2nd, 2015 and lasted roughly a month until March 26th, 2015 when the union membership voted in favour of ending the strike and taking their dispute with the University manageriat to binding arbitration. Eventually, the University won the arbitration dispute against CUPE after the sole arbitrator, William Kaplan, decided against the CUPE member's main point of contestation that the new bursary and tuition support funds being offered shouldn't be capped at a fixed amount. Rather, they argued that these new provisions be individually guaranteed to ensure their consistent applicability if membership were to grow in-between bargaining periods thus requiring appropriate immediate increases to both funds (Kaplan, 2015, p. 17-18).

Particular attention must be paid to the 2015 CUPE strike at U of T beyond the final arbitration outcome, this is because it's apparent that a business-like ideology was held by the manageriat in their decisions to cap costs and suppress the union's call for structurally addressing the real socio-economic concerns from thousands of teachers and graduate students at U of T. The course of action by the manageriat to strategically separate students from their employment roles at the University for financial advantage is a glaring example of completely legal neoliberal labour market segmentation used to divide and conquer the precariat. The sole arbitrator specifically noted this tactic by stating that there was "nothing

that precludes the University from continuing to insist on a separation between employee compensation and graduate funding” (Kaplan, 2015, p. 19). In response, a significant faction of the University precariat felt compelled to take job action in order to pursue what should be considered basic and necessary improvements to their working conditions and employment relationships with the U of T. These basic requirements also included demands for modestly increasing their guaranteed funding packages from \$15,000 to \$23,000, extending guaranteed funding into the later years of graduate degree programs, and other reasonable quality of life provisions like enhancing parental and maternity leave etc. (Yelland, 2015).

In the course of bargaining the union’s proposal for \$23,000 in basic guaranteed funding packages for graduate students at U of T was beaten back by the manageriat to a meager increase of \$2500 a year or just \$17,500. In real percentage terms the manageriat offered students and contact teaching staff a raise amounting to “a disaggregated 4.5 per cent wage increase (0.5 per cent every six months for 2.5 years, then 0.75 per cent in January 2017 and 1.25 per cent in May 2017). This raise does not even account for the inflation rate of the past seven years as the TA funding package stagnated at \$15,000” (Sondarjee, 2015). The takeaway from this point is that it’s well understood by many of those in the workforce and those who study it that employers that offer so-called wage increases that fall below the yearly cost of living are actually offering wage decreases. This is a common smoke-screen tactic used by exploitive and/or financially strained employers. In this case, the U of T manageriat could be well-judged to fit the first criterion, but at the same time not qualified for the second because as they were attempting these claw backs the University was earning double digit percentage

net revenue increases from its investments for the 2014-2015 fiscal year (University of Toronto Governing Council, 2015).

The membership of CUPE 3902, well aware that the costs of living in Toronto far exceeded the increased being offered by the U of T manageriat (Mangione, 2015) had no choice but to flatly reject the tentative offer made to them and voted to strike. However, the response given by manageriat spokesperson and U of T Vice President Cheryl Regehr was framed in ways to suggest that “[t]he University of Toronto says it has tabled a generous offer to its teaching assistants” (Choise, 2015). It’s also important to note the context of this statement as it was given to the media rather than directly to students or the CUPE bargaining committee who represented them. This could be seen as a deliberate tactic taken by the manageriat in an attempt to sway public opinion against the U of T precariat, and possibly a disingenuous one by issuing a message to the media that was both inaccurate and a gross oversimplification. At its core the U of T manageriat were essentially telling the Canadian public they were being generous and striking students were being selfish.

Cheryl Regehr, the University Provost and Vice-President, and the very person promulgating the notion that University contract offers to students, offers that fell well below the low income cut-off line for living in Toronto at the time (Statistics Canada, 2015) were “generous” ones was earning a yearly salary of \$357,999 (Government of Ontario, 2015), or more than twenty times the “generous” yearly amount being offered to graduate students teaching and assisting other students at the U of T. Some of these students who also work (mainly teaching) for the University were in fact employed at the Faculty of Social Work wherein Cheryl Regehr was Dean. A group of these graduate students who are also workers and

CUPE 3902 members decided to submit an article to Rabble.ca a leading Canadian left-wing news source in which they reminded the Canadian public that Cheryl Regehr as a social worker is “compelled to advocate change for the overall benefit of society, the environment, and the global community. Cheryl is not telling you that her membership with the Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Service Workers obligates her to advocate for our rights, not diminish them” (Various, 2015).

The 2015 CUPE Local 3902 strike at U of T stands out as a prominent example of the discord between the precariat and the manageriat. As the case examples given in this thesis show, the general nature of manageriat priorities can be accurately summarized as putting profit ahead of social benefit, which is the exact opposite of their obligations as a leading social economy organization in Canada. This should not come as a surprise to anyone who takes an even cursory examination of the internal socio-economic factors behind such priorities. This is shown remarks of one of the University’s very top manageriat spokespeople during the height of a critical labour and dispute despite the fact that the U of T manageriat on average are earning salaries many times higher than the poverty line, and many times higher than the contact teachers and teaching assistants who often times work alongside them, for them, or assisting them in the classroom.

Addressing the kind of structural inequality clearly present within the University community should be a key concern and top priority of professionals and managers at U of T who are in positions of power if they truly were attempting to live up to their social responsibility obligations. Instead, on the whole this group has taken charge to combat the very measures that would improve the socio-economic conditions for thousands of people working

and studying within the University community. The manageriat has done so primarily by using the status of the University as a public sector non-profit as a smokescreen to conceal their actions that could be viewed as spreading disinformation to the general public about the precariat and by taking an extremely adversarial position towards this group in regards to their calls for guaranteed funding above the poverty line along with other very modest economic proposals. The plight of the nearly 6000 graduate students employed in teaching roles at U of T and how they've been treated is a powerful case example of the U of T manageriat's quest to secure profits ahead of social benefits.

5.4 – The U of T Divestment from Fossil Fuels Campaign

The manageriat's handling of the U of T fossil fuel divestment campaign and the 2015 fossil fuel divestment petition that arose from it is the preverbal smoking gun which most brazenly demonstrates how the University of Toronto is not living up to its responsibilities as a powerhouse SEO. These events entailed the U of T precariat directly challenging the moral standing of the manageriat by holding this group accountable for choosing to invest the University's funds (including the precariat's) in companies that directly cause social harm to society. This campaign also revealed to many that the U of T manageriat has for decades been consistently on the wrong side of history regarding many absolutely crucial decisions of concern to all Canadians.

Over the last four or five years the precariat at U of T has increased their resistance to the complicity of the University manageriat in the destruction of human life and the planet as we know it. They've done so in an attempt to reverse the social harm being done through

exposing the manageriat's apparent hypocrisy specifically in regards to their decisions to funnel of tens of millions of dollars from U of T pension and endowment investments into companies that cause social harm, namely the fossil fuel industry (Maina, 2016). As such, it's well understood by the precariat at U of T that the manageriat who control these funds are required to be at the same time upholding their social and ethical responsibilities to the University community and Canadians.

The U of T manageriat are clearly aware that their amoral and risky position to reject fossil fuel divestment has garnered much unwanted attention by virtue of their discourse on this subject. An example of this can be seen when U of T President Meric Gertler took aggressive measures to counter the negative appearance of not divesting by greenwashing his decision to formally reject the precariat-led petition for fossil fuel divestment. Mr. Gertler also rejected the main recommendation from an ad-hoc committee struck by himself to officially respond to the petition. This involved rejecting the consensus of the ad-hoc committee in which they mostly agreed with the rationale given by the precariat for divesting. Most risky of all, President Gertler rejected the ad-hoc committee's plea to immediately and without hesitation divest the University's holdings in ExxonMobil. This company is the foremost purveyor of disinformation on climate science and a company that has spent millions to skew the public's education and perception about climate change. To date it's estimated that ExxonMobil has "lavished more than \$30 million on think tanks that systematically spread doubt through the press about the reality of climate science" (Klein, 2017 p. 67). By advocating an inappropriate incremental strategy for addressing climate change that includes retaining the University's partnership with ExxonMobil there can be little doubt that the U of T manageriat to some

degree are subservient to the private sector when it comes to minimizing and neutralizing the progressive discourse surrounding the most critical social benefit issue ever in preventing global climate catastrophe.

In an attempt to pivot away from its rejectionist positioning the U of T manageriat has recently gone on the offensive by tasking its investment managers to adhere to newly implemented ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) factors when making their investment decisions. This action was not expressly called for by the divestment petition that was submitted in 2015 thus making it seem as a greenwashed repackaging of investment principles that should've already been the norm at U of T to begin with. It's a sort of formalized bait and switch tactic that follows the simple negotiating logic that "When he discovers what the proper channels are and becomes proficient at the procedures, change them" (Gambill, 2010). Canada's First Nations have long since been accustomed to this type of response in their struggles with the federal government.

Most frustrating is the fact that upon even cursory investigation it becomes clear that implementing new investment measures that do not involve the potential for divestment is simply a contribution towards widening the corporate social responsibility smokescreen on climate. This might be established to give the illusion that the investments of powerful investors like the University of Toronto Asset Management Corporation (UTAM) have been properly vetted. However, the illusion of responsible investing quickly unravels when it's understood that the same companies that are the subject of the ESG auditing are the ones who primarily provide the data and reports that are used to assess their own progress and compliance in relation to ESG. This massive conflict of interest is part of the current industry

standard in place to offset negative press and reputational damage for corporations and their allies. Through this responsible investing scheme U of T is now directly part of the greenwashing process which puts the institution in the position of actively doing the work of corporate P.R. firms. None of this is new to the neoliberal playbook as corporate watchdogs have long known “[t]he reality is that Business for Social Responsibility has become a public relations organization for big corporations” (Mokhiber & Weissman, 2005). It is particularly concerning that these disinformation tactics have been utilized by the manageriat at an institution vested with upholding the highest integrity in matters relating to the knowledge and information it helps facilitate to the public sphere for advancing public benefit.

The University manageriat is directly serving the interests of the private sector over the public interest by co-opting its own community’s outcry for responsible investing through divestment. It’s doing this explicitly by not divesting, and instead, touting a new strategy for investing responsibly through what amounts to a superficial corporate social responsibly public relations campaign. This is especially nefarious because “social control is manifested in manifold ways: by the appropriation and resulting redefinition of movement discourse” (Coy & Hedeem, 2005, p. 407). Through this kind of obfuscation the U of T manageriat has attempted to regain control of the institutional and public narrative on climate change from the precariat by aggressively spinning its regressive rejectionist position, going so far as to have the U of T President Meric Gertler appear on the Business News Network to announce to the business-class audience that he was essentially standing up on their behalf against the precariat’s demands for divestment from fossil fuels (Business News Network, 2016). As the leader of both the Canadian academy and the Canadian social economy these actions denigrate the

intellectual and ethical credibility of the managerialiat because they so blatantly have managed the fossil fuel divestment issue through a business lens that privileges return on investment and ahead of the voices and recommendations of students, faculty, and staff who have been united together in one of the largest sources of campus activism in decades.

Fiscal prudence and fiduciary responsibility are the twin terminologies commonly used by managerialiat elites at the University of Toronto in order to counter the moral objections by the precariat to the University's investment policies. This was also one of the tactics used as justification for withholding from divestment from apartheid South Africa and the tobacco industry. A succession of University of Toronto presidents have posited the same kind of neoliberal mantra over several decades, putting financial stakeholders over ensuring that the morals and ethics of University decision-makers are in keeping with the expectations of the University community as a whole and Canadian society at large.

In order to further illustrate the pattern of unethical decision-making by the managerialiat regarding the issue of divestment at U of T the following information is taken from research that was conducted during 2017 by myself and two other graduate researchers at U of T: Ko Clementson, and Mandy Poon. Our study looked in detail at the U of T divestment from fossil fuels campaign of 2015. We utilized an institutional ethnography lens in order to pinpoint and explicate the specific disjuncture that was caused by the lack of appropriate moral and ethical leadership on the part of the managerialiat in regards to possibly the most important issue ever debated and struggled for in the history of the University of Toronto:

We drew on institutional ethnography (IE) methodology to examine a disjuncture expressed by most of the Committee in response to *Beyond Divestment* (Gertler, 2016),

that the key principle they recommend the University to commit to – the Yale Principle of not doing business with socially injurious firms – is one that was not adopted in the President’s Response. In an op-ed article published in *The Varsity* on April 4, 2016, nine of the ten members of the Committee “[argue] that the university should go further” than the President’s Response (Burns et al., 2016). They elaborate that “the university should not invest in activities that cause social injury,” and specifically, that the University should divest from “firms whose actions blatantly disregard the international effort to limit the rise in average global temperatures to not more than 1.5 C. These are fossil fuels companies whose actions are irreconcilable with achieving internationally agreed goals, inordinately contributing to social injury and greatly increasing the likelihood of catastrophic global consequences” (Ibid). We attempt to take the standpoint of these Committee members in our following analysis.

On March 3rd, 2014, Toronto350.org submitted a 190-page petition (Petition) to the University to divest from fossil fuel. Toronto350.org was the Toronto offshoot of a larger global environmental activist network called 350.org. Their petition to the University, “The Fossil Fuel Industry and the Case for Divestment”, called for University divestment from a list of the top two hundred companies with the largest ownership of global fossil fuel reserves (Toronto350.org, 2014). It was supported by multiple activist and employee groups working at the University and was released following a global media campaign by 350.org leader Bill McKibben which targeted institutional divestment of fossil fuel holdings.

The President’s Office, upon receiving the Petition, activated the 2008 Policy on Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Divestment and established an ad-hoc committee of ten “qualified individuals with relevant expertise from among the teaching staff, students, administrative staff and alumni” (University of Toronto Governing Council, 2008, p. 2), to analyze the fossil fuel divestment petition against the University’s “social and political positions” and make recommendations to the President on how to proceed. On December 15th 2014, the Committee submitted their recommendations entitled: Report of the President’s Advisory Committee on Divestment from Fossil Fuels to the President’s Office. They concluded that “The University should, in a targeted and principled manner, divest from its holdings in such firms” (Karney et al., 2015, p. 2).

On March 30th, 2016, the University’s President responded with a report entitled Beyond Divestment: Taking Decisive Action on Climate Change. Administrative Response to the Report of the President’s Advisory Committee on Divestment from Fossil-Fuels (Beyond Divestment). In Beyond Divestment, the President’s Office rejects the Committee’s recommendation for ‘targeted divestment’ and, by redefining ‘targeted’, redirects the University’s focus from divestment to implementation of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) factors in the University’s investment activities. The President’s Office thereby neglects the most critical piece of the Recommendation – that UTAM prioritize ethical standards when engaging in investment activities. (Clementson et al., 2017)

The divestment campaign of 2015-2016 stands as the most defining example of the U of T's negligence in upholding their social and ethical responsibilities to students, staff, and faculty at the University, and to all other Canadians. There can be no doubt that the U of T managerialiat have essentially damaged their credibility, perhaps irrevocably, as leaders of the CSE in their choice to continue profiting from the fossil fuel industry which is causing grievous social harm to the planet. Profit was put above social benefit in a profound way with the decision to not divest. The U of T's credibility to the CSE could have been substantially upheld and augmented had the managerialiat instead accepted and championed the calls by the precariat to divest and turn towards supporting: green energy, a just transition for workers to the new green economy, environmental sustainability, indigenous land and water rights, and many other critically needed developments for all Canadians.

Chapter Six - Overall Conclusions

The central conclusion that is drawn from this study is that the University of Toronto as a whole, especially in its non-democratic governance and the financial decision-making of its managerial leadership, should not be considered a social economy organization—or, at minimum, that it is not living up to its responsibility of an SEO. By situating the tendencies of the senior administration at the U of T and linking them to the isomorphic forces guided by neoliberal values and practice it becomes clear that the managerialiat has substantially gone against the core tenant of the social economy which necessitates privileging the creation of social benefit over profit. The fixation on financialization and profit shown by managerialiat in this study regarding decisions and policies of the highest levels of importance impacting many people demonstrates the steady and consistent pattern to do the opposite.

Furthermore, because of its wealth, power, and influence over so many lives within the U of T community, and throughout Canada, this institution plays a key role in many ways at fulfilling the goals and policies of the neoliberal capitalist state. Ultimately, because capitalism and neoliberalism are not sustainable economic systems and must be radically changed or completely dismantled, powerhouse and leading universities like the U of T should be in the forefront of spearheading such change. Prefiguring an appropriate direction for this development entails relying on the social economy principles which have proven successful, such as worker and stakeholder cooperation and ownership. Partnering this with the critical university studies position that “it is inadequate to defend or make critical university studies by trotting out standard fare” (Petrina & Ross, 2014, p. 66) brings to the fore a bold overall conclusion that universities should be run by a partnership between students and faculty with

the least amount of coercion and interference from non-primary stakeholders, and especially those representing external private interests.

Due to the massive socio-economic scale and complexities inherent in reorganizing any university system, moving to a provably successful democratically established multi-stakeholder cooperative (Vieta et al., 2016) arrangement would seemingly be the most appropriate social economy configuration for large institutions such as the U of T that require a combination of voices in their governance structure. This should begin with the two primary stakeholders within the academy: students and teachers. The logistics of this kind of transition are far from impossible as both of these groups already have well-established organizing capabilities through the respective unions and the U of T Faculty Association which together represent the vast majority of students and teachers at the University. These unions and the Faculty Association are also typically run through processes involving democratic decision-making and therefore are experienced in facilitating the creation, modification, and cancellation of policies and procedures affecting the core constituencies at U of T: students and teachers.

After students and teachers take over and run the University an expanded stakeholder membership could then be achieved in accordance with the democratic participation of both initial parties. However, expanding the control and ownership of the University of Toronto hasn't always been seen as necessary as during the early 1970's "Students and Teachers at U of T at the time wanted to run the university together with equal representation on the governing council" (Ross, 1972, p. 245). This thesis has hopefully shown that there exists an urgent need for reconfiguring the U of T into the real powerhouse SEO that it should have always been. By putting students and teachers in charge the most crucial steps toward reclaiming U of T's

legitimacy within the CSE can be accomplished. Empowering these core members of the precariat in this way is vital to the future of the U of T and the academy in Canada because according to them: “U of T works because we do” (Bañares & Mannie, 2018).

6.1 – Implications of this Research

It’s nearly impossible to predict the implications of this research on others because of its complexity, and because of the diversity of standpoints on the issues that it raises. However, I can definitely speak to what I predict could be the personal implications that might arise. The personal implications of the research I’m pursuing are very serious, and even possibly life-altering. Among but a few of these implications are the real possibilities of having my employment terminated, my thesis rejected, and the threat of various reprisals that can be enacted against me from individuals or groups who might be or consider themselves to be negatively implicated by my research. The totality of these considerations adds considerable tension to nearly all aspects of contributing to “enforcing the non-profit status of universities” (Connell, 2019, p. 191) by publishing this type of social activist research.

A potentially very positive implication of this study is that it may meaningfully contribute to the new and emerging scholarship in the field of critical university studies. This is particularly needed from a Canadian perspective as most of the literature in this field of study originates from and focuses on either the U.S. or U.K. PSE systems. Canadian universities are routinely ranked among the world’s best educational institutions alongside their American and British peer institutions among others. Therefore, examining Canadian PSE through the lens of

critical university studies is absolutely necessary for understanding PSE as a whole and how it can and should be remade at all levels and across all boundaries.

Finally, as a result of undertaking this research it has become apparent that one of the most appropriate and necessary settings for discussing and learning about the future research in the field of critical university studies should be inside the university classroom or lecture hall. This is apparent because enabling and nurturing critical thinking is an uncontroversial and primary goal championed by nearly all PSE institutions and regardless of the fields of study they offer. However, critically thinking about the university specifically isn't typically regarded as a priority in the development of critical thinking skills for many students even though the university plays a central role in facilitating this very kind of intellectual development. A major implication of this research is for more work to be done towards integrating the necessity for critical thinking with critical university studies.

6.2 – Limitations of the Study

This study analyzed only universities specifically within the PSE system and exclusively utilized primary and secondary sources of written information about these institutions. Deeper insight into the personal and emotional impacts felt by PSE stakeholders and the U of T precariat in particular may have been uncovered if an interview process had been conducted. However, there is concern that in doing so the views of rank and file members of the academy may not be as accurately represented as possible because of the fear of reprisal. Therefore, most of the primary and secondary sources of information used are from prominent scholars, union leaders, governmental agencies, or senior university administrators and spokespeople.

This study is also limited by primarily focusing on public universities in Canada and does not engage in a broader analysis of the Canadian PSE system which has an enormous college sector within it. Canadian colleges play an influential role in the overall landscape of PSE in Canada and among them are fully private career colleges which are relevant to critical university studies as university officials increasingly market and connect the purpose of PSE to potential career outcomes.

Finally, because publicly disclosed information and statements were exclusively relied on for analysis the filtering effects of self-censorship may be present in the statements given by any of those currently working in the academy that are mindful of the potential for workplace reprisal in retaliation for speaking out against their employer. Also, many of these people would be members of a union or association which may limit their ability to openly discuss or detail matters that are relevant to this study but cannot be shared due to confidentiality restrictions imposed by these groups such as matters relating to the collective bargaining process, grievance hearings, the tenure review process, etc.

6.3 – Recommendations for Future Research

There are two areas of future research that this study can be applied to. The first area would be towards developing a deeper analysis of the class-based divisions existing within the academy and specifically at the wealthiest school in Canada, the U of T. Much of this discourse is currently framed as an occasional labour-relations struggle between unionized workers and the University during times of collective bargaining. A more focused class-based analysis of these parties and the people within them which looks at the everyday lived experiences of

individuals may help further illuminate what class differences actually look and feel like for members of the precariat and the manageriat at U of T.

The second avenue for further research promoted by this study is in the area of social economy research. An argument has been given in this thesis that shows how the SE is an established and viable alternative to capitalism and neoliberalism. Therefore, further research on the most critical pillars of the SE embodied by education and healthcare institutions is highly warranted and necessary. This is especially so considering the urgency needed in implementing sustainable socio-economic alternatives within our daily lives and the overall economic and political frameworks that we operate in. Moreover, this research could include the study and assessment of international and even Canadian attempts at establishing cooperatively managed public universities, or the emergence of cooperatives within public sector universities (see, for instance, van der Veen, 2010).

Finally, the third area of future research this study recommends would be for expanding critical university studies within the Canadian PSE system. Currently most critical university studies scholars are focused on either the American or British PSE systems as both have undergone radical changes within the last few decades. However, so has Canadian PSE, yet there is not as many sources of critical study devoted specifically to researching how senior administrators at prominent Canadian universities are contributing to the problems of precarity and the short-sighted privileging of profit-making, among many other serious concerns. Critical university studies are a relatively new and exciting field of research which deserves to be supported by critical scholars whose scholarship, and, in many cases, livelihoods depend on universities.

Appendix – List of Abbreviations

AECD – Adult Education & Community Development

CSE – Canadian Social Economy

CUPE – The Canadian Union of Public Employees

CUS – Critical University Studies

ESG – Environmental, Social, & Governance

GTA – Greater Toronto Area

PSE – Post-Secondary Education

PSNPs – Public Sector Non-Profits

SE – Social Economy

SEO – Social Economy Organization

U of T – University of Toronto

USW – The United Steelworkers

UTA – University of Toronto Act

References:

- Bañares, I., Mannie, K. (2018). *CUPE 3902 holds strike countdown rally outside Simcoe Hall*.
<https://thevarsity.ca/2018/02/07/cupe-3902-holds-strike-countdown-rally-outside-simcoe-hall/>. Toronto: Varsity Publications Inc. Accessed: July 30th, 2019.
- Burawoy, M. (1985). In Bratton, J., Helms Mills, J., Pynch, T., & Sawchuk, P. (2003). Ch. 3: Groups, work teams and learning. In, Bratton, J., Sawchuk, P., Mills, H., C., J., Pynch, T. (Eds.) *Workplace learning: A critical introduction*. Aurora: Garamond, p. 47.
- Burns, P., Coulter, G., Green, A., Hoffmann, M., Hosios, A., Karney, B., Matthen, M., Sherwood Lollar, B., O'Brien, R. (2016). Op-ed: An open letter to the University of Toronto on fossil fuel divestment: In defense of the Toronto principle.
<https://thevarsity.ca/2016/04/04/op-ed-an-open-letter-to-the-university-of-toronto-on-fossil-fuel-divestment/>. Toronto: Varsity Publications Inc. Accessed: September 11th, 2019.
- Business News Network. (2016). *U of T rejects call to divest fossil fuel holdings*.
<https://www.bnnbloomberg.ca/video/u-of-t-rejects-call-to-divest-fossil-fuel-holdings~838976>. Toronto: Bell Media. Accessed: April 30th, 2019.
- Campbell, Duncan (2005). *Chomsky is voted world's top public intellectual*. The Guardian, Tuesday, October 18th, 2005.
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/oct/18/books.highereducation>. Accessed: May 30th, 2019.
- Carroll, W.K., & Shaw, M. (2001). *Consolidating a Neoliberal Policy Bloc in Canada, 1976 to 1996*. Canadian Public Policy/Analyse de Politiques, Vol. 27, No. 2, p. 195-217.

Charity Intelligence Canada. (2019). *University of Toronto: Finances*.

<https://www.charityintelligence.ca/charity-details/51-university-of-toronto>. Toronto: Charity Intelligence. Accessed: July 19th, 2019.

Choise, S. (2015). *University of Toronto urges teaching assistant union to vote on offer*. Toronto: Globe and Mail, March 2nd, 2015.

<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/education/university-of-toronto-teaching-assistants-set-to-take-up-picket-lines/article23241319/>. Accessed: May 10th, 2019.

Chomsky, N. (2000). In D. Macedo (Ed.), *Chomsky on Miseducation*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., p. 5, 17, 42.

Chomsky, N. (2013). *Noam Chomsky on Democracy and Education in the 21st Century and Beyond: Noam Chomsky Interviewed by Daniel Falcone*. Truthout.

<https://chomsky.info/20130601/>. Accessed: July 20th, 2019.

Chomsky, N. (2017). *Requiem for the American Dream: The 10 Principles of Concentration of Wealth & Power*. New York: Seven Stories Press, p. 37-40.

Chomsky, N. (2017). *The Responsibility of Intellectuals*. New York: The New Press, p. 17.

Clementson, K., Holloway, J., Poon, M. (2017). *Divestment from Fossil Fuels: an Institutional Exercise?* Toronto: University of Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Collini, S. (2017). *Speaking of Universities*. London: Verso.

Connell, R. (2019). *The Good University: What universities actually do and why it's time for radical change*. London: Zed Books Ltd., p. 191.

Coughlan, S. (2019). *Breaking down walls not building them*.

<https://www.bbc.com/news/education-47116649#share-tools>. London: BBC News.

Accessed February 8th, 2019.

Coy, P., G., Hedeem, T. (2005). *A Stage Model of Social Movement Co-Optation:*

Community Mediation in the United States. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4120946>.

Taylor & Francis. *The Sociological Quarterly* 46.3, p. 405-435.

Crozier, M., Huntington, S., Watanuki, J. (1975). *The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the*

Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission. New York: New York

University Press.

Dewey, J. (1997). *Education and Experience*. P. 26. New York. Touchstone, p. 17.

DiMaggio, P., J., Powell, W., W. (1983). *The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and*

Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 48, No.

2. Washington: American Sociological Association, pp. 147-160.

Elpa, A. *Business Board approves widespread tuition fee increases for all students*.

[https://thevarsity.ca/2018/03/26/business-board-approves-widespread-tuition-fee-](https://thevarsity.ca/2018/03/26/business-board-approves-widespread-tuition-fee-increases-for-all-students/)

[increases-for-all-students/](https://thevarsity.ca/2018/03/26/business-board-approves-widespread-tuition-fee-increases-for-all-students/). Toronto: The Varsity, March 26th, 2018. Accessed March

10th, 2019.

Gambill, G. (2010). *On the Art of Stealing Human Rights, extracts from the speech delivered by*

Gerry Gambill in 1958 at a Human Rights conference, Tobique Reserve.

<http://radicalprofeminist.blogspot.com/2010/07/on-art-of-stealing-human-rights.html>.

Julian Real. Accessed: May 25th, 2017.

- Gertler, M. (2016). *Beyond Divestment: Taking Decisive Action on Climate Change: Administrative Response to the Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Divestment from Fossil-Fuels*. <https://www.president.utoronto.ca/secure-content/uploads/2016/03/Beyond-Divestment-Taking-Decisive-Action-on-Climate-Change.pdf>. Toronto: University of Toronto. Accessed: March 1st, 2017.
- Ginsberg, B. (2011). *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why it Matters*. New York: Oxford University Press, p. 33, 131, 136.
- Giroux, H. (2007). *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, p. 114.
- Government of Ontario. (2000). *Employment Standards Act, 2000, S.O. 2000, c. 41*. <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/00e41>. Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario. Accessed: August 30th, 2019.
- Government of Ontario. (2008). *2008 salary disclosure*. <https://files.ontario.ca/en-2008-pssd.csv>. Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario. Accessed: July 15th, 2019.
- Government of Ontario. (2009). *2009 salary disclosure*. <https://files.ontario.ca/en-2009-pssd.csv>. Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario. Accessed: July 15th, 2019.
- Government of Ontario. (2015). *2015 salary disclosure*. <https://www.ontario.ca/page/public-sector-salary-disclosure-2015-all-sectors-and-seconded-employees>. Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario. Accessed: July 15th, 2019.
- Graeber, D. (2014). *Debt: The first 5000 years*. Brooklyn: Melville House, p. 35.
- Graeber, D. (2018). *Bullshit Jobs: A Theory*. New York: Simon & Schuster, p. 203, 230, 235, 236.

- Handy, F., Mook, L., Quarter, J. (2008). *Interchangeability of Paid Staff and Volunteers in Nonprofit Organizations*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0899764007303528>. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 37 (1), p. 2. Accessed: August 29th, 2019.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc., p. 145, 159.
- Hulchanski, D. (2010). *The Three Cities Within Toronto: Income Polarization Among Toronto's Neighbourhoods, 1970-2005*. <http://www.urbancentre.utoronto.ca/pdfs/curp/tnrn/Three-Cities-Within-Toronto-2010-Final.pdf>. Toronto: University of Toronto. Accessed: June 3rd, 2019.
- Humboldt, W. (2014). *The Sphere and Duties of Government*. Mansfield Centre: Martino Publishing, p. 62-72.
- Imagine Canada and Philanthropic Foundations Canada. (2014). *Assets & Giving Trends of Canada's Grantmaking Foundations*. <http://sectorsource.ca/sites/default/files/resources/files/trends-canadas-grantmaking-foundations-sept2014.pdf>. Imagine Canada, p. 13. Accessed: March 4th, 2019.
- Jamasmie, C. (2013). Barrick: *Thornton takes control April, former De Beers exec becomes COO*. <https://www.mining.com/thornton-is-barrick-gold-new-chairman-72541/>. British Columbia: Glacier Media Group.
- Jha, A. (2006). Climate threat from nuclear bombs. *The Guardian*. Tuesday, December 12th, 2006. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2006/dec/12/nuclearindustry.climat> echange. Accessed: June 17th, 2019.

Jones, G. A., Shanahan, T., Goyan, P. (2004). *The Academic Senate and University Governance in Canada*. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education: Volume XXXIV, No. 2, 2004, p. 35-68.

Kaplan, W. (2015). *In the Matter of an Arbitration Pursuant to Section 40 of the Labour Relations Act, 1995. Between The Governing Council of the University of Toronto and CUPE Local 3902, Unit 1*.
[https://www.sdc.gov.on.ca/sites/mol/drs/ca/Education%20and%20Related%20Services611-23051-17AA%20\(805-0048-17AA\).pdf](https://www.sdc.gov.on.ca/sites/mol/drs/ca/Education%20and%20Related%20Services611-23051-17AA%20(805-0048-17AA).pdf). Ontario: Queens's Printer for Ontario, p. 17-19. Accessed: May 8th, 2019.

Karney, B., Burns, P., Coulter, G., Green, A., Hoffman, M., Hosios, A., Matthen, M., Mitchell, C., O'Brien, R., Sherwood Lollar, B. (2015). *Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Divestment from Fossil Fuels*. <https://www.president.utoronto.ca/secure-content/uploads/2015/12/Report-of-the-Advisory-Committee-on-Divestment-from-Fossil-Fuels-December-2015.pdf>. Toronto: University of Toronto, p. 2. Accessed: September 8th, 2019.

Karram Stephenson, G., Jones, G.A., Bégin-Caouette, O., Metcalfe, A., & Toor, A. (2017). *Responding to Change, Assessing Difference: A Review of the Literature on Professors at Canadian Universities*.
https://www.oise.utoronto.ca/hec/UserFiles/File/APIKS_Survey/31.03.2017_-_APIKS_Lit_Review_-_CIHE_Web_Version_FINAL.pdf. Toronto: Centre for the Study of Canadian and International Higher Education, OISE, University of Toronto, p. 8, 18, 27. Accessed: May 3rd, 2019.

Kershaw, A. (2009). *"U of T switches to controversial flat-fee tuition."*

<https://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/u-of-t-switches-to-controversial-flat-fee-tuition/>. Canada: University Affairs, June 15th, 2009. Accessed: May 16th, 2019.

Klein, N. (2017). *No Is Not Enough: Resisting the New Shock Politics and Winning the World We Need*. Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf Canada, p. 67.

Krimsky, S. (2014). In J. Turk (Ed.) *Academic Freedom, Conflicts of Interest, And the Growth of University-Industry Collaborations*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd., p. 236.

Lemieux, T., & Card, D. (2001). *Education, Earnings, and the 'Canadian G.I. Bill'*. The Canadian Journal of Economics / Revue Canadienne d'Economique, Vol. 34, No. 2., 313-344.

Levy, A. (2000). *Reflections on Work, the Social Economy and the Dangers of "Carefare"*. In E. Shragge & J., M. Fontan, *Social Economy: International Perspectives and Debates*. Montreal: Black Rose, p. 87

Macdonald, M. (2018). *University boards in the spotlight*. January 3rd, 2018.

<https://www.universityaffairs.ca/features/feature-article/university-boards-spotlight/>. Accessed: July 2nd, 2019.

Maina, N. (2016). *The State of Fossil Fuel Divestment in Canadian Post-secondary Institutions*.

<https://sepn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Divestment-Research-Brief-2018-08-30.pdf>. Saskatoon: Sustainability and Education Policy Network, University of Saskatchewan. Accessed: May 2nd, 2019.

- Mangione, K. (2015). *Toronto ranked best city, but cost of living still high*.
<https://www.ctvnews.ca/lifestyle/toronto-ranked-best-city-but-cost-of-living-still-high-1.2213557>. Toronto: Bell Media. Accessed: May 29th, 2019.
- Manthorpe, J. (2019). *Claws of the Panda*. Toronto: Cormorant Books Inc., p. 203-206.
- Marx, K. (2013). *Capital*. London: Wordsworth Editions Limited, p. 501-504.
- McMurtry, J.J. (2010). *Living Economics: Canadian Perspectives on the Social Economy, Cooperatives, and Community Economic Development*. Toronto: Emond Publishing, p. 1-7, 16.
- Mokhiber, R., Weissman, R., (2005). *HIJACKED*.
https://www.csrwire.com/press_releases/18659--u-HIJACKED-u-By-Russell-Mokhiber-and-Robert-Weissman. Northampton: CSRwire LCC. Accessed: May 2nd, 2017.
- Morrow, A., & Bradshaw, J. (2013). "*Ontario lightens postsecondary costs for part-time students*". <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/education/ontario-to-make-it-easier-for-students-with-loans-to-pay-tuition/article15783496/>. Toronto: Globe and Mail, December 5th, 2013. Accessed: May 12th, 2019.
- Nelson, G., Janzen, R., Trainor, J., & Ochocka, J. (2008). Putting Values into Practice: Public Policy and the Future of Mental Health Consumer-run Organizations. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 42, p. 194.
- Nelson, W. (1993). *The Search for Faculty Power: The History of the University of Toronto Faculty Association 1942-1992*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc., p. 162.
- Newfield, C. (2016). *The Great Mistake: How We Wrecked Public Universities and How We Can Fix Them*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, p. 40, 54, 78.

- Oxfam International. (2019). *5 shocking facts about extreme global inequality and how to even it up*. <https://www.oxfam.org/en/even-it/5-shocking-facts-about-extreme-global-inequality-and-how-even-it-davos>. Nairobi: Oxfam International. Accessed: August 15th, 2019.
- Pasma, C., Shaker, E. (2018). *Contract U: Contract faculty appointments at Canadian universities*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, p. 5, 6, 17, 20.
- Pasma, C., Macdonald, D. (2015). *What's the Difference? Taking Stock of Provincial Tuition Fee Policies*. https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2015/09/Whats_the_Difference.pdf. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, p. 13. Accessed: June 22nd, 2019.
- Pennock, L., Glen A. Jones, Jeff M. Ledere, Sharon X. Li. (2015). *Assessing the role and structure of academic senates in Canadian universities, 2000-2012*. Higher Education Vol. 70, No. 3, September 2015, pp. 503-518.
- Petrina, S., Ross, E. W. (2014). *Critical University Studies: Workplace, Milestones, Crossroads, Respect, Truth*. Workplace, 23, p. 62-72.
- Powell, L. (1971). *Confidential Memorandum: Attack of American Free Enterprise System*. https://www.thirteen.org/wnet/supremecourt/personality/sources_document13.html. New York: Education Broadcasting Corporation. Accessed: July 4, 2019.
- Quarter, J., Mook, L., Armstrong, A. (2018). *Understanding the Social Economy: A Canadian Perspective, 2nd edition*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, p. 4, 6, 17, 106, 107.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p. 12.

- Reisigl, M. (2017). The Discourse-Historical Approach. J. Flowerdew, J. E. Richardson. (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Routledge, p. 51.
- Ripple, W., Wolf, C., Newsome, T., Galetti, M., Alamgir, M., Crist, E., Mahmoud, M., Laurance, W. (2017). *World Scientists' Warning to Humanity: A Second Notice*.
<https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/67/12/1026/4605229>. *BioScience*, Vol. 67, No. 12. Accessed: June 17th, 2019.
- Ross, M. (1972). *The Dilution of Academic Power in Canada: The University of Toronto Act*.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41822145>. *Minerva*, 10(2), 242-258. Accessed: July 2nd, 2019.
- School of Graduate Studies, University of Toronto. (2016). *10,000 PhDs Project: Executive Summary, 7. Post-Secondary Education Sector Breakdown*.
<http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/data/Pages/employment-outcomes.aspx>. Toronto: University of Toronto. Accessed: June 4th, 2019.
- Shanahan, T., Jones, G., Fisher, D., Rubenson, K. (2014). Contradictory Trends in PSE Policy in Ontario. In D. Fisher, K. Rubenson, T. Shanahan, & C. Trottier (Eds.), *The Development of Postsecondary Education Systems in Canada: A Comparison between British Columbia, Ontario, and Quebec, 1980-2010*. Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press, p. 26, 122-199, 319.
- Smith, D. (1990). *Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling*. London: Routledge, p. 4-6.
- Sondarjee, M. (2015). *Toronto teaching assistants on strike for rights as both workers and students: U of T's administration is waging a misleading public relations campaign about*

- its offer to TAs*. Ricochet, March 8th, 2015. <https://ricochet.media/en/345/toronto-teaching-assistants-on-strike-for-rights-as-both-workers-and-students>. Accessed: April 20th, 2019.
- Sorensen, C. (2018). *U of T Places No. 1 in Canada, No. 20 globally in U.S. News & World Report's rankings of best universities*. <https://www.utoronto.ca/news/u-t-places-no-1-canada-no-20-globally-us-news-world-report-s-ranking-best-world-universities>. Toronto: University of Toronto. Accessed: February 16th, 2019.
- Spear, R. (2010). *Social Entrepreneurship and Social Movements*. https://www.academia.edu/4183726/Social_Entrepreneurship_and_Social_Movements Oxford: Paper presented at the Skoll Colloquium on Social Entrepreneurship, Oxford University, p. 4.
- Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, p. 6-7.
- Stanford, J. (2015). *Economics for Everyone*. Ottawa: Pluto Press, p. 50, 58, 189.
- Statistics Canada. (2015). *Low income cut-offs (LICOs) before and after tax community size and family size, in current dollars*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=1110024101>. Canada: Statistics Canada. Accessed: May, 29th, 2019.
- SunshineListStats. (2019). *University of Toronto - Sunshine List 2019*. <https://www.sunshineliststats.com/Employer/9/?n=universityoftoronto&year=2019>. SunshineListStats. Accessed: March 26th, 2019.

Times Higher Education. (2019). *World University Rankings: University of Toronto*.

<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/university-toronto>.

United Kingdom: Times Higher Education. Accessed: August 2nd, 2019.

Toronto350.org. (2014). Appendix II: The 200 companies with the largest fossil fuel reserves. In

The Fossil Fuel Industry and the Case for Divestment, (2014).

<http://www.uoftfacultydivest.com/files/fossil-fuel-divest.pdf>. Toronto:

uoftfacultydivest.com., p. 183-189.

Toronto Foundation (2017). *Toronto's Vital Signs Report*. [https://torontofoundation.ca/wp-](https://torontofoundation.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/TF-VS-web-FINAL-4MB.pdf)

[content/uploads/2018/01/TF-VS-web-FINAL-4MB.pdf](https://torontofoundation.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/TF-VS-web-FINAL-4MB.pdf). Toronto: Toronto Foundation, p.

8. Accessed: May 26th, 2019.

Tremblay, C. (2012). Advancing the Social Economy for Socio-Economic Development:

International Perspectives. In R. Downing (Ed.), *Canadian Public Policy and the Social Economy*. Victoria: University of Victoria, p. 33.

Uchitelle, L. (1997). *Job Insecurity of Workers Is a Big Factor in Fed Policy*.

<https://www.nytimes.com/1997/02/27/business/job-insecurity-of-workers-is-a-big-factor-in-fed-policy.html>. New York: New York Times. Accessed: May 4th, 2019.

University of Toronto. (2016). *U of T's Boundless Campaign Surpasses Historic \$2-billion Mark*

and Expands Goal to \$2.4 Billion. <https://www.utoronto.ca/news/u-t-s-boundless-campaign-surpasses-historic-2-billion-mark-and-expands-goal-24-billion>. Toronto:

University of Toronto. Accessed: June 9th, 2019.

University of Toronto. (2018). *Rose Patten Elected to Serve as the 34th Chancellor of the*

University of Toronto. <https://www.utoronto.ca/news/rose-patten-elected-serve-34th->

chancellor-university-toronto. Toronto: University of Toronto. Accessed February 5th, 2019.

University of Toronto Governing Council. (1992). *Statement of Institutional Purpose*.

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/mission.pdf>. Toronto: University of Toronto, p. 3. Accessed: January 28th, 2019.

University of Toronto Governing Council. (2008). Policy on Social and Political Issues With Respect to University Divestment.

<https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/secretariat/policies/investment-policy-social-and-political-issues-respect-university-divestment>. Toronto: University of Toronto, p. 2. Accessed: September 9th, 2019.

University of Toronto Governing Council. (2015). *Report Number 220 of the Business Board*.

<https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/import-files/r061811266.pdf>. Toronto: The Office of the Governing Council, University of Toronto, p. 4. Accessed: July 10th, 2019.

University of Toronto Governing Council. (2017). *Report Number 233 of the Business Board*.

<http://www.governingcouncil.lamp4.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/r0615-2016-2017bb.pdf>. Toronto: The Office of the Governing Council, University of Toronto, p. 3. Accessed: April 6th, 2018.

University of Toronto Office of Planning and Budget. (2018). *Facts and Figures 2017*.

<https://data.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Facts-Figures--online-version.pdf>. Toronto: University of Toronto, p. 77. Accessed: February 26th, 2019.

University of Toronto School of Graduate Studies. (2016). *Employed and Engaged: An Overview of the 10,000 PhDs Project*. https://wp.provost.utoronto.ca/www-sgs-utoronto-ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/253/2019/06/SGS_Overview_10KPhDsProject.pdf. Toronto: University of Toronto, p. 7. Accessed: June 8th, 2019.

University of Toronto Students' Union. (2013). *Thousands of University of Toronto Students Object to Paying More for Less*. <https://www.newswire.ca/news-releases/thousands-of-university-of-toronto-students-object-to-paying-more-for-less-513322571.html>. Toronto: CNW Group Ltd. Accessed: May 11th, 2019.

USW Local 1998. (2015). *University of Toronto Collective Agreement: For the "Staff Appointed" Bargaining Unit between The Governing Council of the University of Toronto and The United Steelworkers*. <http://www.usw1998.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/FINAL-USW-SA-Collective-Agreement-w-ELP-2014-2017-June-2015.pdf>. Toronto: University of Toronto, p. 35, 38. Accessed May 11th, 2019.

van der Veen, E. Wilma. (2010). *The New University Cooperative: Reclaiming Higher Education: Prioritizing Social Justice and Ecological Sustainability*. <https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/affinities/article/view/6156>. Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action, Volume 4, Number 1. Kingston: Queens University, p. 199-204. Accessed: September 22, 2019.

Various. (2015). What the University of Toronto isn't telling you about the TA strike. <http://rabble.ca/blogs/bloggers/campus-notes/2015/03/what-university-toronto-isnt-telling-you-about-ta-strike>. Canada: rabble.ca. Accessed: May 2nd, 2019.

Vieta, M., Quarter, J., Spear, R., Moskovskaya, A. (2016) Participation in Worker Cooperatives.

In D. Horton, R. Stebbins, J. Grotz (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Volunteering, Civic Participation, and Nonprofit Associations*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan, p. 436-443.

Watts, R. (2017). *Public Universities, Managerialism and the Value of Higher Education*.

Palgrave Critical University Studies. London: Palgrave Macmillan, p. 181-214.

Williams, J. J. (2012). *Deconstructing Academe: The birth of critical university studies*. The

Chronicle of Higher Education, February 19th, 2012.

<https://www.chronicle.com/article/an-emerging-field-deconstructs/130791>. Accessed:

June 2nd, 2019.

Yelland, T. (2015). *Striking Grad Students on What It's Like to Live on \$15,000 a Year*.

https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/nn9jdb/striking-grad-students-on-what-its-like-to-live-on-15000-a-year-284. New York: Vice Media. Accessed: July 9th, 2019.