

CAFAS Update No. 81

17 March 2014

Council for Academic Freedom & Academic Standards

Website: www.cafas.net; <http://cafas.org.uk>

Next Meeting:

Saturday 28 March 2015

2.00 pm

Room 631

Birkbeck College

Malet Street

London WC1

Underground: Goodge Street, Euston Square, Euston, Russell Square, Holborn

Note

This Update contains selected articles and list of organisations concerned with academic freedom and academic standards. All can be found on the Internet. The articles by Thomas Docherty (first published in Times Higher Education) and John Holmwood (first published by the Campaign for the Public University) reveal an intensifying assault on academic freedom and the negative impact of this on social freedom and democracy. Janet Collett reports on action taken by adjunct faculty in the USA. There is much to be done.
GT, PB

Thomas Docherty on academic freedom

4 DECEMBER 2014

Managerial fundamentalism has taken hold in universities, with scholars viewed as resources that must be controlled, argues the Warwick scholar



The modern university is, in some ways, always at war; and one contemporary battle in that war is for the maintenance of academic freedom

The concept of academic freedom is a product of the modern era. Its exercise is usually considered in terms of the questioning of received wisdom within a discipline; and most non-academics might wonder why we get so concerned about it,

thinking that we arrogantly consider ourselves deserving of special attention or privilege. However, the exercise of academic freedom is instrumental in determining political authority in societies. Through reasoned dialogue in which views are freely and honestly expressed, societies can establish informed democratic legitimacy. The scope of academic freedom reaches well beyond seminar rooms and laboratories. In that sense, it extends beyond discipline; and its value is diminished if it is circumscribed as merely a matter of academic procedures or protocols. It should be extended as widely as possible; yet, today, it is “managed” – managed, in fact, almost to death. The power of unconstrained knowledgeable dialogue is marginalised; and, potentially, democracy itself – based on authority given by free and open debate – is thereby weakened.

Pre-modern universities and societies found their governing authority in fundamentalist, absolutist forms of theology: in sacred, canonical texts. By contrast, modern and contemporary institutions, especially those funded by states and national governments, address expressly secular matters. In our everyday profane world, unlike a heaven-on-earth where all sing the same hymn, there are many conflicting voices, voices of probing and unsanctioned dissent. Modern governance aims to orchestrate that into a uniform harmony that obscures difference. In the 20th century, universities were harnessed to national war efforts. Wartime replaces the certainties of theological fundamentalism with demands for unquestioned commitment to military fundamentalism: propaganda. A clear trajectory emerges: from pre-modern theological to modern military fundamentalisms; and now, the unquestionable verities of contemporary market and managerial fundamentalism.

The spirit of many institutional values in the modern university has been determined by responses to international conflict. The Haldane principle of 1918 reasserted the priorities of academic decision-making over governmental prerogative after the military mobilisation of UK university research during the Great War. In 1944, the US GI Bill gave returning veterans access to universities, incidentally changing their demographic constituency and their demotic norms. In 1946, Karl Jaspers’ revised *Idea of the University* yielded a de-Nazified German institution, with academic freedom re-established by wedding teaching to non-partisan research. Conflicts and protests over Vietnam reconfigured universities in the US and Europe, making non-deferential questioning of establishment authority a new cultural value. During the Cold War, President Eisenhower warned that the military-industrial complex threatened free academic enquiry, hijacking

science and the university by aligning them with the demands of military power and money. Post-9/11 anxieties produced new protocols for academic conduct, specifically related to alleged campus radicalisation. The modern university is, in some ways, always at war; and one contemporary battle in that war is for the maintenance of academic freedom.

Legitimate authority, for any government, is challenged directly by two fundamental things: war, either international or civil; and widening participation in the franchise, or free-speaking democracy. Real questions emerge when governing bodies appear to be at war with those they govern: out-of-touch Westminster elites who ignore electorates; managers too distanced from those they manage.

Militarisation requires unquestioned compliance with hierarchical authority; but academic freedom thrives on scepticism, on disagreement. In short, academic freedom threatens managed uniformity; and thus threatens any power that assumes an authoritarian and complacent capacity to behave with impunity. In our times, however, the absolutes of God or of presidents have become subject to questioning. Consequently, both theological and military fundamentalisms have been dislodged in enlightened thinking; but we now have to negotiate a new and subtler force – “managerial fundamentalism” – which is the latest threat to free expression, or disagreement, in the university and beyond.

A creeping incremental assault on academic freedom threatens not just what can be spoken aloud, but also what it is permissible to think: thought itself is to be subjected to management, so that its critical power is neutered or constrained. We may still make controversial statements; but we cannot be permitted actually to behave in accordance with them or to live according to moral principles that diverge from accepted norms. Academic integrity – indeed the ethical conduct of the university itself – is thereby threatened.

Carl von Clausewitz told us that war constitutes a mode of politics, and one political purpose of war is the control of minds. Recent warfare amply validates his observation that, “When we speak of destroying the enemy’s forces we must emphasize that nothing obliges us to limit this idea to physical forces: the moral element must also be considered.” In short, don’t stop at material superiority, but crush the spirit too – especially if it is nonconformist.



The history of some high-profile cases illustrates the incremental deepening of the assault on academic freedom. In 1900, Jane Stanford fired Edward Ross from his post in Stanford University. Ross (whose racist views were not directly the issue) had made statements in class critical of the railroad companies in which Mrs Stanford had financial interests, interests that helped to fund Stanford University. It was as a direct result of the controversy surrounding this and similar cases that the American Association of University Professors drafted its 1915 Declaration of Principles governing academic freedom. That document stresses the teacher's "independence of thought and utterance", arguing that it must be disengaged from pecuniary profit or motive. Further, "the responsibility of the university teacher is primarily to the public itself"; and faculty "are the appointees, but not in any proper sense the employees", of university trustees or boards. Propositions such as these have been systematically weakened, essentially by being subjected to the priorities of management. Recently, in Canada's University of Saskatchewan, the dean of the public health faculty, Robert Buckingham, was summarily dismissed and escorted from campus by security in a bizarre parody of a third-rate TV police drama. His crime? He wrote "The Silence of the Deans", a paper critical of Saskatchewan management's planning, a crime aggravated when he published it locally – against management strictures committing him to silence. Management's plan was motivated by money, pecuniary profit: "reallocating resources for future success" – which means cuts and job losses in hopes of eventually enhancing league-table reputation. Although Buckingham was later reinstated, the controversy revealed the limits to which management would go to enforce conformity by

the managerial silencing of disagreement. Steven Salaita was fired from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign – two weeks before he had even begun working but months after he had been appointed – because the president there found that the language of some tweets on his Twitter account was "uncivil". Perhaps she hasn't read much classical literature. The argument advanced to justify the firing is that his Twitter account reveals an ethos (attitude or predisposition) that may possibly make some students uncomfortable in class. If reading Joyce, say, unsettles you, then Teacher is there to comfort you and make you feel that all's well. The normative demands of our own National Student Survey endorse such views: "Be happy, don't worry."

This extends the assault on academic freedom surreptitiously yet significantly, for it constitutes an attack upon freedom of thought or upon one's rights to have a specific attitude or mood towards the world. The logical extension of this is that academic colleagues and students cannot ever safely express an opinion at all, lest at some unspecified point that opinion is deemed to be "sensitive" or controversial, or its mode of expression deemed uncivil, potentially discomfiting to someone, somewhere, sometime. By what right does a university management claim jurisdiction over civility? Civility is not a matter for senior management teams to determine, from ivory silos too often divorced from research, teaching, even the real world. Such matters are determined by whole societies, through debate and free discussion. Despite the casual language in which senior managers identify themselves as "the university", a university is a community of scholars and students living within a social community; and that whole community rightly has a say in determining moral values.

That entails democratic participation in governance, not prescription from above; and for that to flourish, we need academic freedom. Otherwise, we have the simple imposition of top-down hierarchical management; and our duty is no longer to the public but to carrying out orders unquestioningly – and also to comport ourselves while doing so in some managerially approved fashion: shiny, happy people. While civility is indeed desirable, its alleged lack cannot become a reason for summarily dismissing a point of view – or those who hold it. If one's disposition – the very tendency of one's thought – can be so policed by university management that it constitutes grounds for firing, then academic and civic freedoms are all but lost.

What is more uncivilised than modern management-speak, whose plethora of linguistic abstractions and acronyms are designed to protect management from scrutiny, ensuring that

it acts with impunity at all times, safe within its own codes and protocols? “Strategic planning”, for example, often means “restructuring”, which in turn means “lots of you are fired”. This is rude, barbaric incivility: the speaker, through the ostensibly courteous euphemism, evades his responsibility for destroying careers and livelihoods, in the service of money.



If one's disposition can be so policed by management that it constitutes grounds for firing, then academic and civic freedoms are all but lost

Many more serious cases worldwide involve the straightforward jailing or torture of academics in authoritarian regimes. Never jailed for loudly (or silently) endorsing university management or social orthodoxy, however unsavoury, they are victimised only when their views, expressed in public or in private, threaten power.

Management's preferred presentation of the university brand to the world is always conformist: “whatever you say, say nothing”, Silence the Deans, smile benignly. Dissenting thought and expression become secular blasphemies. However, if thought manifests its autonomy precisely by the extent that it questions received wisdom, it follows that political incarceration is but the extreme form of a model that is elsewhere applied with the greater subtleties of managerial fundamentalism. Closer to home, David Browne, a lawyer with SGH Martineau (which boasts a large university-management client base), attracted controversy with his now infamous blog, advising university clients that “outspoken opinion” threatens “brand-reputation” and must be curtailed. In the resulting Twitter-storm, the SGH Martineau brand itself was very obviously damaged. Did Browne sack himself? Well, as Eliza Doolittle rudely said, “Not bloody likely.” What matters is not “being outspoken”; what matters is that, if

you speak, you must parrot the approved and accepted authority and lexicon of your institution, or alternatively the consensual views of a public opinion that is itself managed by a plutocratic Establishment, whose priorities are often too slavishly accepted as normative.

Academic freedom is increasingly menaced by demands for managerial ventriloquism: the puppet, sitting on the boss's knee or close to his office, speaks with his master's voice in the interests of the brand's commercial wealth. Called “corruption” elsewhere, this passes increasingly as smooth managerial operation, with academics and students walking the far-from-neutral corporate line. Characterised as civil or courteous, it actually institutionalises the obsequious courtship of unwarranted power. Institutional governance learns from political government, and mimics it. Just as Westminster views electorates as people to be managed and not represented, so also the same prevailing cynical predisposition views academics and students as recalcitrant human resources whose thoughts and actions must be contained. Modernisation and reform are predicated on the belief that everything can and must be managed: faculty, students, research, learning, debate, teaching, even experience itself. The possibilities for participation in democratic change are denied, because everything, including dissent, is managed and circumscribed to keep existing authority in power. Institutionally, it's called “change-management”. We are perilously close to a position where the unquestioned power of management is declaring war on the academic community, the university, itself: civil war in academia.

During the English Civil War in 1644, Milton's *Areopagitica* presented free expression as a brake on unrestricted power. Today, power lies in money; and its symbolic form lies in the unearned authority of oligarchical or privileged elites. For these, money means freedom; and freedom, thus eviscerated of any moral quality, equates simply with wealth. Hence institutions ape corporate business and senior managers ape extravagantly paid CEOs. When money means freedom, then, logically, the demand on thinking itself – that *raison d'être* of the university institution – is that it must justify the existing power of wealth. A university sector that endorses this has fallen into decadence and forgotten the morality – the ethos, the ethics – properly demanded by the very act of thinking. At the conclusion of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is not enough that Winston simply says he loves Big Brother: the love must be real. “You are a flaw in the pattern, Winston...It is intolerable to us that an erroneous thought should exist anywhere in the world.” Such corporate managerial fundamentalism demands

complete moral adherence to brand-think norms. Opinion itself now constitutes just such a flaw in managed institutions.

If democracy is to survive our emergent authoritarianisms, academic freedom must be sustained. The dignity of thinking might just be more important than economic profiteering.

PRINT HEADLINE:

Article originally published as: *Hostile takeover* (THE 4 December 2014)

AUTHOR:

Thomas Docherty is professor of English and of comparative literature at the University of Warwick and author of *For the University: Democracy and the Future of the Institution*. He writes here in a personal capacity. His new book, *Universities at War: The World, the University, the Citizen*, has just been published.

First published in *THE*, 4-10 December 2014, pp40-43.

<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/features/thomas-docherty-on-academic-freedom/2017268.fullarticle>

(With kind permission of the author.)

Academic Freedom and the Corporate University

28 comments

Posted by **John Holmwood** on Jul 4, 2014 in **Action, Comment** | **28 comments**



In a recent blog, David Browne, Senior Associate on the Employment Team for SGH Martineau, Legal firm with clients in Higher Education argued that universities face the problem that 'high performing' academics can damage their 'university's brand' by their 'outspoken opinions or general insubordination'.

[Readers searching for the blog will discover that it has been changed and clarified, without providing an explanation of what was at issue – the original blog is no longer available – **UPDATE 15.21** - we have screenshots of the original blog here and here!]

The blog drew an analogy with the Suarez biting incident, but seemed to show an ignorance about 'value' both in football and in the academy. A partner at the same firm and head of education, Smita Jamdar, joined the debate on Twitter, to suggest that the blog was intended as metaphorical exploration of 'what happens when people stray outside the freedoms permitted by their respective positions'.

What is at issue is precisely what is permitted by virtue of academic position and how that is being re-interpreted in the new managerial regimes now governing universities. As Adam Hedgecoe suggested in another tweet, academic freedom is specified in the Education Reform Act 1988, Section 202 (2). The clause, setting out the role of a new body of University Commissioners, is quite specific: "to ensure that academic staff have freedom within the law to question and test received wisdom, and to put forward new ideas and controversial or unpopular opinions, without placing themselves in jeopardy of losing their jobs or privileges they may have at their institutions"

The relevant test is within the 'law', not within the managerial definition of 'brand protection'. It is significant, but also worrying, that Smita Jamdar left the twitter exchange with the comment that we will 'just have to agree to differ'. The relevant clause does not permit her interpretation and seems quite specifically to require that academic staff's freedom of expression should be protected against the actions of employers. Her colleague, David Browne, subsequently changed his blog to allow that 'lawful exercise of academic freedom does not amount to misconduct'.

Notwithstanding, the original version of the blog and the trope of 'damaging the brand interest' remains. This is, of course part of the new marketised regime of higher education where reputation, rank orders and market position are all-consuming concerns of senior managers. As I have argued elsewhere, Vice Chancellors have been very keen to argue for the autonomy of universities. 'Autonomy' is a powerful signifier in the academic community, it is also a shifting one. For scholars, autonomy stands for the academic vocation and academic freedom. However, for today's university leaders, it usually stands for something else: the right to manage their university in a higher education market.

This isn't the vision of autonomy previously embedded in collegiate organisation or in the idea of academic vocation. However, as soon as

'brand' trumps the commitment to knowledge and its critical engagements, the very idea of a university is at issue. In this context, it is not merely that academics have a right to speak out, they have a duty to do so, since what is at stake is so crucial.

In a powerful essay on the embroilment of LSE in the scandal of Libyan money, Craig Calhoun, subsequently to become Director of LSE, argued that the problem was that universities had become corporations just like any other. But the point was that they weren't like any other and had an academic mission associated with public values. The problem is that senior managers no longer think it necessary to express those values. Academic freedom is precisely what is necessary to protect the corporate university from the very threats to its integrity that derive from market freedom. It is not simply that universities should tolerate outspoken academics. The present situation requires them.

John Holmwood, a co-founder of the Campaign for the Public University, is Professor of Sociology at the University of Nottingham and for 2014-15 holds a fellowship at Princeton University.

<http://publicuniversity.org.uk/2014/07/04/academic-freedom-and-the-corporate-university/>
(With kind permission of the author.)

News Flash from across the Atlantic: “Adjunct” Faculty Rising Up to the Challenge

As many of the less well-established and less well-endowed American Universities have given in to their more corporately-minded administrators and Boards of Trustees/Governors in employing part-time, short-term and shamefully poorly paid teachers, the number of these 'adjunct' faculty has swelled to enormous proportions. This has risen from about 25-30% 40 years ago (a number in keeping with sabbatical replacement, specialist professional teaching, etc.) to about 65 – 70% of all academic appointments today. The economic attractions of these appointments are obvious: low salary bills, no requirements for benefits, and enormous “flexibility” in employment. The costs to quality, of course, are enormous, as maintained steadfastly by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP and AAUP Foundation – see websites for fine articulation

of CAFAS principles) in their concern about the requirements of tenure for academic freedom and its fundamental importance in sustaining intellectual integrity in academic pursuits.

But an “academic spring” seems to be coming as armies of these adjuncts are organizing across the US (and Canada), - thanks as always to access to social media. February 25th 2015 was declared a day of strikes by adjunct faculty to raise their visibility and to open debate both inside and outside of ‘their’ institutions throughout the US. The first item on the agenda for many was the right to strike, counter to their contractual requirements. Where courage and contracts intervened, rallies, films and teach-ins substituted in the effort to raise awareness.

Their efforts in some universities have met with immediate response. Longer contracts, (somewhat) higher pay, agreement to allow participation in meetings of ‘real’ (tenured) faculty and the possibility of establishing a trade union for collective bargaining were among some of the gains made. But at best it is only the beginning of resetting the mindset. There is a long way to go in shifting the primacy of cost-effectiveness to quality-effectiveness and its special requirements: a career structure for professionals, an understanding of the ingredients of integrity and their provision in academic freedom. But it is a good start. And may it also inspire their counterparts in the UK!

Janet Collett

References:

www.aaup.org

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/11/11/adjunct-faculty_n_4255139.html

<http://wagingnonviolence.org/2015/02/first-ever-adjunct-walk-raises-awareness-crisis-higher-ed/>

Campaign for the Public University - publicuniversity.org.uk/ -

Its founding statement is:

‘The UK Campaign for the Public University is open to all. It is a broad-based campaign with no party or other political affiliation. It has been initiated by a group of university teachers and graduate students seeking to defend and promote the idea of the university as a public good. We believe that the public university is essential both for cultivating democratic public life and creating the means for individuals to find fulfillment in creative and intellectual pursuits regardless of whether or not they pursue a degree programme.’

Also to visit:

Academics For Academic Freedom
afaf.org.uk

The Council for the Defence of British Universities
cdbu.org.uk

Academic Freedom Aotearoa
academicfreedom.nz

The University and College Union (UCU)
ucu.org.uk

‘Learning my Lesson’ by Marina Warner

<http://www.lrb.co.uk/v37/n06/marina-warner/learning-my-lesson>

Academic Freedom

CARA - the Council for At-Risk Academics

(some weblinks in the original text are removed for the printed form of Update. GT, PB)

Academic Freedom is the principle which underpins and informs CARA's work defending the right of individuals to explore the world of ideas, literature and science unfettered by political, social or religious oppression, censorship, or sanction.

The importance of Academic Freedom was expressed by Albert Einstein, speaking on behalf of CARA at the Royal Albert Hall in October 1933. He called upon his audience to *“defend the liberty of the individual which has brought us every advance of knowledge and invention – liberty without which life to a self-respecting man is not worth living.”*

Einstein encouraged his audience to **“resist the powers which threaten to suppress intellectual and individual freedom”** and explained that **“without such freedom there would have been no Shakespeare, no Goethe, no Newton, no Faraday, no Pasteur and no Lister”** and how **“It is only men who are free,**

who create the inventions and intellectual works which to us moderns make life worthwhile.” (The full text of Einstein’s ‘Science and Civilization’ lecture, scanned from the CARA archives, is available [on the website]. And an audio recording of a small section is [also] available



In 1966 Lord Lionel C. Robbins (above) addressed the Royal Society, as its president, on the issue of Academic Freedom. He asserted that *“a society which respects and cherishes the freedom of its academic institutions and their members is much less likely to fall victim to the enemies of freedom in general than a society which does not”*, and went on to pose the question: *“Without freedom, how little of what happens on this planet has ultimate moral significance?”* (Proceedings of the British Academy Vol. 52 pp45-60).



More recently Professor John Sexton (above), President of New York University, in his address to the Inaugural Meeting of the CARA SAR UK Universities Network, in March 2006, reiterated the importance of academic freedom; *“By seeing what happens in societies where universities and scholars are put at extreme risk, we come to better appreciate why we defend what we do and better recognize the warning signs of the erosion of those freedoms... without genuine academic freedom, our universities will not fulfil their core mission: the enlargement of what we know, how deeply we know, and the number of those who know.”*...

The extract above is from cara1933.org

CAFAS Update seeks to provide an open forum for opinion and discussion.

Items do not necessarily reflect the views of the Council.

Defending-Academic-Freedom JISCMail List

Members are urged to join – go to www.cafas.net and open the link – to contribute to the discussions and to assist others.

NOTICES

Next Meeting

**Saturday 28 March 2015, 2.00 pm
Room 631
Birkbeck College, Malet Street, London.**

Agenda

- 1. Attendance & Apologies**
 - 2. Minutes & Matters arising**
 - 3. Academic Freedom**
 - 4. Casework**
 - 5. AOB**
- Pre-meeting from 1.30pm. All welcome.**
-

June AGM and Meeting

**Saturday 27 June 2015
AGM 2.00 -2.30 pm, Meeting 2.30-4.30
Room 253
Birkbeck College**

All positions in the committee are open. Please send nominations to the Secretary, Elahe Mohtasham by 26 June.

Committee

Co-Chairs:

John Fernandes

76 Bois Hall Rd, Addlestone Surrey KT15 2J

johnfernandes500@gmail.com

Professor Eric Barendt

74, Upper Park Road,
London NW3 2UX
020 7586 9930; e.barendt@ucl.ac.uk

Secretary:

Membership Secretary & Treasurer:

Kirit Patel

19 Greenhill Road, Harrow, Middlesex HA1 1LD
kiritone@live.co.uk, Tel: 02084115534

Casework Coordinator:

Colwyn Williamson

83 Fairwater Grove West, Llandaff, Cardiff CF5 2JN
029 20195020; m: 07970 838 276

cafascoordinator@gmail.com

Cafas Update Compilers:

Patrick Brady

3 Ingleby Way, Chislehurst BR7 6DD
0208 467 2549; patrick.brady28@goolemail.com

Geraldine Thorpe

7 Benn Street, London E9 5SU
0208 986 3004; thorpegm@goolemail.com

David Regan Appeal Coordinator:

Dr Janet Collett

Undercliffe House, Malling St, Lewes, East Sussex,
BN7 2RB; Tel: 01273 473 717

janet.collett@gmail.com

Students' Complaints:

Ben Cosin

3 Halliday Drive DEAL Kent CT14 7AX
01304 361074 Brcosin1926@yahoo.co.uk

John Fernandes

76 Bois Hall Rd, Addlestone Surrey KT15 2JN
johnfernandes500@gmail.com

Website

Ian Hewitt, Dr Rashid Mehmood

Cafas Legal Advisors

Professor Eric Barendt

74, Upper Park Road,
London NW3 2UX
020 7586 9930; e.barendt@ucl.ac.uk

Dr Amir Majid

32 Forest Drive West, London E11 1LA
0208 556 1990, drmajid47@goolemail.com

Health & Safety

Ian Hewitt

Ian.Hewitt@phonecoop.coop

Founding Members

Michael Cohen

Colwyn Williamson

DO YOU BELIEVE

- That academic standards have been dumbed down throughout the higher and further education sector?
- That this decline has been accompanied by the escalating rhetoric of ‘excellence’ and ‘world-class’?
- That the number of contact hours between teachers and students, which the Dearing Report described as a proper measure of the quality of education, has been reduced across the board?
- That there are all sorts of pressures on examiners to pass candidates who would previously have failed?
- That it is far easier to obtain Firsts and Upper Seconds than it used to be?
- That practices which used to be treated as academically unacceptable, or even as cheating, are now widely regarded as normal and inevitable.
- That the effect of the RAE and other pressures on academics is to increase the quantity of research, not the quality, and to restrict innovative and critical thought?
- That there are pressures, often of a commercial nature, to avoid certain areas of research, or to falsify results or to distort their conclusions and significance?
- That, despite lip-service to the importance of teaching, universities and colleges take little account of this in career advancement?
- That academic values have been largely displaced by market values?
- That the stated ‘mission’ of universities to serve the community has been abandoned in favour of commercial priorities?
- That education in the UK no longer has the status of a right bringing social benefits, but is instead treated as a commodity to be bought and sold?
- That discrimination against women and ethnic minorities is still rife in the employment and promotion practices of tertiary education, despite the multicultural community it is supposed to serve?
- That the work of the union in fighting discrimination and victimisation can usefully be supplemented by specialised advice and support from an organisation which focuses on issues of academic freedom and standards?

If you believe that many or most of these propositions are true, you ought to be a CAFAS member and your UCU branch ought to affiliate.

Membership Secretary & Treasurer: Kirit Patel, 19 Greenhill Road, Harrow, Middlesex HA1 1LD, Tel: 02084115534

If you would like a speaker from CAFAS to address a branch meeting, contact: Colwyn Williamson, 07970 838 276 cafascoordinator@gmail.com

Have you paid your SUBSCRIPTION?

Please send your cheque or standing order to the Membership Secretary, Kirit Patel, 19 Greenhill Road, Harrow, Middlesex HA1 1LD
kiritone@live.co.uk, Tel: 02084115534

CONSTITUTION

CAFAS’ aims are outlined on the membership form. The full constitution can be obtained from the Secretary or www.cafas.net.

CAFAS was founded in February 1994. It depends on subscriptions and an active membership. It meets in March/April, July and September/October.

Next deadline: 3 June 2015

Please send letters, news items and articles to:

Pat Brady
patrick.brady28@googlemail.com &
Geraldine Thorpe
thorpegm@googlemail.com

You can also send us items at any time for earlier publication on the website.

Further weblinks from the Convention for Higher Education, Brighton, 25 May 2013:

Thomas Docherty: The World, the University, the Citizen,

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LI2cK_Lgjsc

John Holmwood: Markets, Democracy and Public Higher Education:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=plcjTopShSg>