CAFAS Update No. 50

7 April 2006

Council for Academic Freedom & Academic Standards

http://www.cafas.org.uk

Next AGM & Ordinary Meeting:

Saturday 22 April 2006
1.30 pm (AGM) 2.00pm (OM)
Room 252
Birkbeck College
Malet Street
London WC1

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

"The List"

Essex County Council secret List 98 is no secret anymore. At last, the media has caught a whiff of it.

The Independent Newspaper on Wednesday 18 January 2006 stated:

One of the country's largest education authorities, Essex County Council, revealed that less than half the cases of teachers it referred for inclusion on 'List 99' had been registered.

In a 15-year period from 1992, only 54 of the 110 cases referred to the DfES ended up on the list. As a result, the authority started up its own 'List 98' giving details of teachers considered to be too dangerous to be allowed into the classroom – although it did not have the legal force of the Government's list.

When I brought this to the attention of Essex County Council, the response was thus: *(cont. p2)*

Is your subscription due?

The former List 98 was an initiative conceived during the 1970s.
List 98 has been superseded by a similar system, now called simply "The List".

However, I was told that Essex County Council Index B replaced Essex County Council List 98 in 2003. I am yet to find out what has become of Index B.

Southend-on-Sea local paper, Southend **Echo**, on Friday 20 January 2006, quoted Cllr Stephen Castle, Essex County Council's cabinet member for education, in a piece referring to Essex County Council:

The county council had already revealed it kept its own blacklist of around 250 sex offenders, thieves and fraudsters – dubbed List 98 – to run alongside the Government's existing List 99 of those banned from working with children.

Asking Cllr Castle for explanation, I received from Mr Dominic Collins, Essex County Council Cabinet Support Officer, the following:

I can confirm that the former List 98 was not a banning list in any way. List 98 has been superseded by a similar system which we now call simply "The List".

I wonder. Does this mean that the 250 sex offenders, thieves and fraudsters in "The List" are not banned in any way [presumably from working in Essex educational institutions] though they were considered too dangerous to be allowed into the classroom?

Majzoub B Ali
36 Viking Court
Gunfleet
Shoeburyness
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA
Essex
SS3 9PT
Phone: 01702 587 995
MajzoubBAli@Gmail.com

AUBREY BLUMSOHN

We reported in the last issue of Update on the case of Dr Aubrey Blumsohn at the University of Sheffield. The case involved refusal of a pharmaceutical benefactor (Procter and Gamble) to provide raw data to University academics, inhibiting the ability of those academics to verify research findings presented in their names. Following intense media criticism Procter and Gamble produced a new "Bill of Rights" for researchers discussed in the press release below:

==========

`Bone Researcher Charges P&G with Continuing Data Concealment

March 1, 2006, Washington, D.C.

Procter and Gamble (P&G) continues to subvert the integrity of research regarding its osteoporosis drug Actonel by suppressing critical data even as the company touts its new openness, charges Government Accountability Project (GAP) client Dr. Aubrey Blumsohn. Blumsohn is a senior medical faculty member at Englands Sheffield University and lead researcher on a P&G grant to study the effectiveness of Actonel, the number two drug in sales in the highly lucrative osteoporosis market. Blumsohn charges that P&G is again trying to avoid proper scrutiny of its questionable claims and is running roughshod over research integrity in the process.

Blumsohn visited with U.S. Congressional officials last week to inform them of P&G's data concealment regarding Actonel. In 2004, Blumsohn discovered that P&G concealed and omitted Actonel data in an apparent attempt to improve the drug's image of effectiveness. For more information on his case, visit http://www.whistleblower.org/content/press_detail.cfm?press_id=371.

Faced with growing public scrutiny in both England and the U.S., P&G launched a public relations offensive last week in announcing a new Bill of Rights for researchers, stating that it would release the data from disputed clinical studies on Actonel to an independent statistician named by Sheffield University. Sheffield University, which receives substantial grant support from P&G, suspended Blumsohn six months ago for speaking to the media about his concerns regarding P&G data concealment and the way in which the University approached matters of integrity. Despite its new Bill of Rights promising unfettered access to data, P&G still refuses to provide Blumsohn with the raw data required to interpret his research into the drug.

Welcoming what he terms the company's battlefield conversion in issuing the Bill of Rights, Blumsohn maintained that Procter and Gamble is talking the talk but not walking the walk. Blumsohn also observed that P&G continues to

refuse to release data to him despite being the named author on medical abstracts, draft publications and statistical reports derived from his research.

P&G's Bill of Rights was issued in the throes of widespread, trans-Atlantic attention to Blumsohn's charges of data concealment by the company. P&G previously had asserted that it was typical for its internal statisticians to carry out analyses for supposedly independent external researchers and to withhold the full, underlying data set from the researchers. Blumsohn asserts that this makes a mockery of scientific integrity.

Researchers have an ethical duty to review the data that supports their findings, stated Blumsohn. If a company can pick and choose what data the researcher can see, that compromises the ethics of the researcher and the integrity of the researcher's findings.

Researchers are supposed to be granted access to full data sets to reach informed conclusions. In 2001, an international coalition of the world's leading medical journal editors called for all journal article authors to pledge that they had full access to drug study data. This was recommended in order to avoid data manipulation by corporate sponsors of product information. That editorial appears in the September 18, 2001 edition of the Annals of Internal Medicine.

GAP Food and Drug Safety Director Mark Cohen, Blumsohn's lawyer, noted that Dr. Blumsohn would be pleased to work with P&G and Sheffield to ensure that this Bill of Rights is more than a public relations whitewash. If P&G is acting in good faith, the place to start is releasing the necessary data to him and to allow proper scrutiny. It will be necessary to compare any data provided with existing data, several previous intended and actual reports, and company statements about the process.

Blumsohn added, I hope that the university will join me in asking appropriate authorities for a critical review of this matter and the way it has been handled. This is the high road, and it would be better if it were taken.'

==========

Since this "Bill of Rights" there has been a number of developments.

CAFAS has written to the Vice Chancellor of Sheffield University.

We also wrote on behalf of *Cafas Update* to ask what the University had done to make sure that P&G implemented its fine words. The University responded but it failed to address the questions asked.

However on the 1st of April Dr Blumsohn received an assurance from a Vice President of P&G in Ohio that he would be provided with the data.

Dr Blumsohn commented "This is excellent news, albeit three years too late. I have yet to receive the data. Clearly the first step will be to attempt to verify whether any data received is genuine, and it will need to be compared with all the various materials produced by the company. Only then will it be possible to publish the correct findings of this work. There also needs to be extensive discussion about the rights of academics involved in research with industry. Over two decades pharmaceutical companies have ridden roughshod over fundamental principles of scientific enquiry such as proper access of scientists to unadulterated raw data. They have done this with the quiet acquiescence of governments and regulatory bodies."

Dr Blumsohn resigned from Sheffield University as on 31 March 2006, and the University has dropped disciplinary charges relating to Dr Blumsohn's communicating with the media. A joint statement read:

"Dr Blumsohn and the University of Sheffield are pleased to announce that they have compromised their differences upon mutually satisfactory terms which they have agreed will remain confidential."

An article in the *THES* last week (7.4.06) reiterated Dr Blumsohn's concerns about the way in which government regulatory bodies have failed to understand, and have exacerbated serious problems at the industrial-University interface.

'Malign' effect

by Phil Baty, *THES*, 7 April 2006

An MP is concerned about the limited progress of a government-backed

investigation into the conduct of Sheffield University's study of Actonel, Procter & Gamble's billion-dollar osteoporosis drug.

After *The Times Higher* reported concerns last November that Sheffield researchers had put their names to the findings of a study on Actonel without carrying out their own independent analysis of the firm's drug-trial data, the Government's Chief Medical Officer asked the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency to investigate.

But correspondence between the whistleblower, Aubrey Blumsohn, and the MHRA shows that little progress has been made.

On February 15, he wrote to Ian Oulsnam, the MHRA's senior investigator: "I have not been asked to provide any documentary evidence or data, no party at the MHRA has arranged to meet with me." In early March, he wrote: "I have no idea what you are supposedly 'investigating' since, as you know, you have had no relevant evidence or information from me and seem not to understand the ethical or scientific problem."

In the correspondence, Mr Oulsnam calls the case "low priority" and explains that the MHRA does not have a proper remit to investigate the issue because its "priority" is to inspect clinical trials where the risk
to patients is "more apparent and immediate".

Paul Flynn, a Labour MP, said: "I trust entirely in Aubrey Blumsohn's integrity, but if the MHRA told me it is Monday I'd check the calendar. I have long campaigned against the malign selfish, greedy influence
of the pharmaceutical industry in academic life and in subverting science. Their tentacles spread everywhere including deeply into the MHRA, which is the pharmaceutical industry regulating the pharmaceutical industry."

Reviewers Wanted

As readers of my web site "SexandPhilosophy.co.uk" will know, my current scientific work is on evolutionary theory. I am something of a dissenter about this field and feel that genes should NOT be treated as the foundation of evolution. My alternative approach is to describe evolution in terms of data and to treat genes as formatting some of the data on DNA. I call this data-based, gene free approach to evolution "Bioepistemic Evolution" - reflecting the fact that it arises from epistemology and scientific philosophy as well as from biology.

In principle, I think that bioepistemic evolution should be applicable to all forms of evolution, not just biology. So far I have applied it to the analysis of social organization, the origins of humanity's unusual sexual traits and to the nature of humour - you can read some of this work on my web site.

More recently, my thoughts have turned to "prebiotic evolution" - the evolutionary processes that created life from the primordial soup. Last

This too is, was if you prefer, an example of gene free evolution, so it makes sense to try to apply bioepistemic evolution to understanding it.

So, I have been constructing a picture of prebiosis based on bioepistemic evolution and, last February, the Royal Society allowed me give a poster about it during a meeting on the conditions for the emergence of life on the early earth. The work, "The Evolution of Prebiotic Oscillations," does seem original and I have been further developing it. I now want to find a few people who would be willing and able to read the paper with a critical eye, pointing out anything from bad style and typos to illogicalities in the reasoning. It has become quite long, about 17,000 words, though I don't think I waste many of them. Obviously, my preference will be people, with expertise in a relevant area - chemistry, biochemistry, evolutionary theory and IT - but the main thing is an ability to follow a reasoning flow and to possess an eye for detail. If you know somebody suitable, who would be willing to give this some time, or if you are such a person, please contact me at john.hewitt22@ntlworld.com.

For others, who would just like to read it, expect a first version to appear on my web once some reviewers have read it.

Sincerely

John Hewitt

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN MEDICAL RESEARCH

I am currently writing a dissertation as part of my course at Cambridge University and one of the issues involved is academic freedom. However, I am interested in such a freedom outside the sanctity of institutions such as universities and colleges. I am currently trying to formulate a possible argument that could support medical researchers who, in the current situation are bombarded with regulations, arduous processes, principles and many other obstacles. In order to further my research I am trying to find out the current legal framework surrounding the right to research and right to academic freedom in the UK that lies outside the boundaries of the 'academy', (namely universities, colleges and the like).

I am interested in pinpointing from where such rights to carry out research actually derive and the scope of any such right. If anyone is aware of the present legal position surrounding this area any kind of response would be very much appreciated. Thank you for your help, it's nice to know that there are others who are interested in this area.

Zabrina Shield
zshield@hotmail.com

(For further contact details, please ask Cafas Update, 0208 986 3004)

SUKUMAR SENGUPTA

A. The Background: It is difficult to update adequately the long and complicated story of my fight and sufferings against the discriminatory victimising treatment from the employer in the limited columns of CAFAS but I shall endeavour to do so. I am a qualified teacher and most of my qualifications are from distinguished institutions in London where I have been living since 1966.

In 1985 I started teaching in secondary schools at Tower Hamlets where the mother tongue of the majority of school population is Bengali or Sylheti and as I can speak the community languages, the School Inspector thought I should be a role model to the community with high rate of underachievement. However, since the demise of the Inner London Education Authority in 1990 and the new management in our school I started experiencing serious discriminatory treatment. I complained to the Black Teachers Group in 1992 when my contract was changed arbitrarily, which made it difficult to progress in mainstream teaching. The new Project also denied me the incentive allowance given to other junior teachers in the Borough for the same work. The Union took up the matter with the employer but their half-hearted approach produced little result. The employer started marginalising me for my complaint in various ways since then. The Head soon removed me from teaching of my subject specialised area (Business Studies) first by employing a new person to do the job and then by removing this popular subject area from the curriculum altogether although the success rate of students in my subject was higher than the average (100% one Year). He also denied me access to the teaching of other specialised subject area (IT) although I have professional qualifications to teach the subject and the School became a Technology College in IT using the very good track record of my previous subject specialised area. I continued to suffer other marginalisation from the management and started grievance proceedings but experienced discrimination and victimisations in the proceedings. Moreover, I was denied application forms for some posts, not short-listed for others and when short listed not selected for a post which unlike the other short-listed candidates I did elsewhere for several years. The Union finally decided to lodge a complaint of continuing discrimination and victimisation in 1996. . I lodged another complaint in 1997 for failure of the grievance proceedings. The employer proposed settlement for an incentive point, which was denied since 1992. The proposal reduced my teaching further, failed to address other hostilities and marginalization by the employer but the Union decided to withdraw its support when I refused to withdraw all cases in exchange of one additional point. So I started fighting alone and in the process lodged five cases against the management. In 1998, because of delays, untimely consolidation of cases and other irregularities I sought help from

the Commission for Racial Equality and CAFAS. Dr Majid of CAFAS agreed to provide me a further legal opinion on the merit of my cases. The CRE also took another independent legal opinion and agreed to provide legal support. The CRE withdrew one case with a view to reach settlement but it did not work.

B. My five cases lodged since 1996 were unfairly dismissed in 2000 – 01,after several adjournments and total hearings of 22 days over three years. Untimely consolidations, discontinuation of legal support from the Union, withdrawal of a case by CRE in late 1998 and then the changes of CRE solicitors and Counsels due to promotions, change of administrations etc had fragmented and segmented my cases. Finally the tribunal accepted mainly the employers' verbal evidence even when these contradicted my contemporary documentary evidence and also 'adopted a fragmented approach which inevitably had the effect of diminishing any eloquence that the cumulative effect of the primary facts might have on the issues of racial grounds.' I appealed against the decision but like the employer I could back it by tax payers' money. I was also suffering from stress related illness. The Union and CRE refused support for lack of fund.

C. Following the unfair dismissal of discrimination cases in 2001, the management continued systematic and persistent pressures urging me to accept voluntary redundancy. The early retirement offers of the employer showed that my service record was reduced arbitrarily. My salary was not paid regularly. I refused to consider any early retirement proposals until outstanding matters are resolved. The management raised the issue of budget crisis in 2003. However, money for my job comes from the Home Office. The management found shortfall of £13,000 and decided to reduce 0.5 of my job although I was the first teacher employed under the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant of the Government in 1999 and the Head assured to the Union and the CRE in 1999 in writing when I raised concerns that even if the fund is reduced later my job would be the last to go. My original contract was for mainstream teaching. Since 1999, the employer recruited many unqualified teaching assistants under the fund but only my post was targeted for redundancy in 2003. However, at the end of July 2003 the Chair of the Governor sent a letter to all staff that due to new jobs and retirement of 10 staff the budget was in balance. Not withstanding this the management created a subcommittee of the Governors to target my job. On the 8 December the Union informed me that a new committee would decide the fate of my post. The formation of the Committee, the procedure they followed and the facts they considered were disputed by me with evidence on the 15 Dec but the Chair of the committee treated the issues in one-sided way in the grievance hearings also and I was singled out for victimisation. The committee decided to make my post fully redundant. My work was distributed to two posts including a new one. It was Christmas holiday and I had to go to India as my sister and uncle died and I informed it to the school and the Union. I fell ill due to stress related illness and was examined in hospitals. The employer arranged appeal in my absence in the last week of January 2004 with the help of the Union and terminated my job from the 30th April 2004 but they failed to serve the notice to me or to the Union. When I enquired about it through the Union […] the employer sent me a letter dated 2 Feb 2004 signed by the Director of Education. The school appeal committee took the decision in the last week of January and with the weekend intervened it was practically impossible for the Director of Education to consider the Appeal Committee decision, and sign and send the notice to me on the 2 Feb 2004. Moreover, why did they not send the notice to the Union who attended the appeal? My contract was with the LEA and not the school and the LEA could appoint me to other schools. I had written to the LEA, the Union and the CRE with evidence why procedurally and substantively the redundancy was unfair and unjust. I was isolated, not well and lacked resources; I could not take up the matters against the employer to the court again. The employer not only breached the provisions of Employment Rights 1996, the established redundancy procedures but it was also clearly a case of victimisations under S-2 of Race Relations Act 1976.

D.The outstanding matters and payments continuing from the unfair redundancy and discriminatory treatments about which I started writing to the Director of Education through the MP are as follows:

I The redundancy is unjust and unfair both procedurally and

substantively. The outstanding issues/payments are:

II. The notice to terminate my job was improper: (a) The combined effect of the Employment Rights Act (1996), The Teachers Pay & Conditions of Service (The Red Burgundy Book) and the established employment practice suggest that a long serving teacher is entitled to at least one term notice as new job in unlikely to be available at the middle of a term. The 30th April was not the beginning of a term and a notice served after January does not even provide a minimum of 3 months notice. In order to make the notice proper under the circumstances, the next serving date should have been the end of the term on 31 May terminating my job on 31 August 2004 or payment in lieu of notice as allowed in law.

(b) The LEA informed my notice was delayed by 2 days (it was impossible for LEA to send notice on 2 Feb given the appeal meeting in the school had taken place in the last week of January with the weekend intervening) and the Union said it was delayed by a few days. Even for one-day error, it was an improper notice, which would entitle me to a new notice ensuring one term notice terminating at the end of a term on 31 August 2004 or payment in lieu of notice.

(c) This is supported by the fact that I was given sabbatical leave for one term instead of one year as given to other long serving teachers and this was independent of the redundancy measures. The sabbatical leave allows teacher to return to school which would take my job to 31 August and a notice of redundancy from 31 August would have ensured my service to 31 December 2004 and higher pension but the redundancy measures included limp sum for sabbatical leave. The employer and the Union later asked me to commute it for work until 31 August to cover the lack of proper notice. I did not agree as it was financially not helpful

(d The change of contracts and hostilities from the employer denied me the opportunities to apply for threshold or performance awards of the government, which many junior teachers were enjoying. In September 2003 I applied for it and in May 2004 after my job was terminated I received it backdated to September 2003. So, in all fairness I should have been allowed to enjoy it for one year so that it could reflect in pension entitlement fully.
(e) The Union informed at the December Redundancy meeting that "Tower Hamlets had allowed redundant staff to be on a redeployment register for a term to enable them to seek out alternative employment.' Another rep said it on 10/7/03. So my job should not have been terminated on 30/4/04 and I am entitled to salary until 31/8/04

III. My last salary on 30/4/04 given by the Education Department to the Teachers Pension was incorrect as it did not include the recruitment and retention point, GTC payment etc and this had reduced my premature teacher pension entitlements.

IV. Redundancy payment reduced because of incorrect deductions from my redundancy lump-sum at the time of taking out May & June salary which they paid to cover incorrect notice but then retracted by taking the 30 April as the last day and in the process I was denied the correct payments.

V. The one term sabbatical lump-sum was calculated in December 2003 but since then I received threshold awards, inflation pay rise, GTC etc and payment did not include these changes. So, it should have been updated and balance to be paid. There is an element of interest to be added because the payment was delayed by seven months.

VI. My service records have been messed up by the employer during my tribunal cases perhaps to show I was not much senior to the comparators. Protracted correspondence with Teachers Pension and other authorities including Ombudsman restored my records with back payments between 2/9/85 and 27/4/87 as the employer submitted the later arbitrary date as the beginning of my service career but could not produce any contract or documents to substantiate it. On the other hand I produced contemporary documents including Department of Education & Science letter, the then Head teachers' testimonials, the ILEA and the present LEA letters that my job was pensionable and contributions were collected as well as some 18/19 years salary slips. The London Pension Fund Authority (and also TP blamed the LEA) informed that the LEA liable under law for inaccurate records but the Dept of Education & Skills (previously DES) and the Ombudsman found not enough contributions and asked me to pay the backlog after 18/19 years. The Ombudsman informed I could take the matter

to law but I would not get legal aid and the Union & CRE refused legal support. At the redundancy meeting, the LEA proposed 2 years of enhancement in addition to normal enhancement for those wrong records but I was not aware was possible or a trap to persuade me to accept voluntary redundancy and the Union did not pursue it in the appeal in my absence. The Teachers Pension after 30 April accepted my requests for 2 added years and I reminded LEA to pay for it as they proposed it to compensate their arbitrary records.

VII. My AVC contributions to Prudential have been also messed up which would reduce my pension income from this source as well. Instead of 6% deductions agreed in the contracts dated 6/4/89 and 12/4/94, the employer sent flat rate deductions of 3.37%) for several years which reduced my contributions and return from it. The LEA also delayed the implementation of AVC contracts for no good reasons. The contributions were sent to Prudential long after my salary was sent to the bank resulting in loss of over 272 days of investments since 1996. As investment of fund and return from it is calculated on daily basis, I would suffer serious losses of pension benefits from this source as well. The monthly returns before 1996 are not available to provide evidence of further losses. The LEA informed that they did not have papers from the ILEA and then on what basis they made wrong deductions? They did not answer other irregularities.

VIII. The 1996 Employment Rights Act, the Teachers Pay & Conditions (The Red Burgundy Book), the employment practice in the LEAs allow discretionary compensations, pay for additional years, severance payments etc particularly where teaching was terminated compulsorily due to rationalisation of jobs rightly or wrongly. This type of compensation can also finance added years that the TPA has now agreed.

IX. In the course of examining payslips, assessment, salary booklets showing pay spine etc I found following evidence of arrears, unpaid allowances etc (i) My 1985 salary point did not increase automatically with experience as indicated in the pay booklets (ii) The ILEA and the LEA (1988-89) contracts allowed me one responsibility point in addition to salary for my mainstream teaching contracts. In 1992 Home Office S-11 Project F for Home Liaison and 1999 EMAG Project for Home Liaison allowed 2 points but the employer continued to pay one point despite my complaints until my tribunal cases in 2001.. The employer and the Union agreed to honour this additional point from 1997 if I withdrew my tribunal cases but it was not possible to accept the offer. It seems following my evidence at the tribunal the employer wanted to be fair to me on this point This means I am entitled to arrears on management allowance from 1992 to 2001 (iii) The Recruitment and Retention arrears for 2000 to 2003 to be paid because the employer agreed in writing in 2003 that like others I was also entitled to it since the demise of ILEA in 1990 (iv) Sick pay arrears with interest was not paid to me fully (v) Full salary was not given when the employer paid sick pay arrears or 50% taxable travelling allowance (allowed to S-11 or EMAG post holders. The overall monthly pay packet showed higher salary because of those payments but the real salary fell below my entitlements (vi) My annual salary in some years did not increase from one year to the next despite pay awards, usual inflation pay rise yearly etc (vii) I have spotted less Inner London Allowance than I am entitled to in some years (viii) The deductions made and total received sometimes did not agree (ix) The P60 and annual salary figure and the bank salary statements sometimes did not agree. I can show evidence and these can be covered by compensations and or payments towards buying past added years to support low pension and losses.

X. I have been asking for an agreed open testimonial from the employer since 2002 but have not received it yet. I can work until 65 but it is difficult because of the above circumstances.

.

The Union said to me in October 2004 meeting that it could arrange settlement provided I agree to withdraw all claims. I suffered persistent marginalization, discrimination and injustice in the job. I suffer stress related allergy, loss of all teeth and vitreous haemorrhage in the right eye, which is now blurred. The consultants at the hospitals thought it was stress related. It is not easy to forget it without an apology. However, time span to take the matter to law is over now. An isolated individual cannot fight against the Leviathan. My initial permanent contract was with the LEA and not the school. In 2004 I received performance award and the LEA could also

re-deploy me to avoid redundancy. I had to accept redundancy also from my evening teaching job in the College of the same Borough and neither NUT nor NAFTHE could help me. My protracted correspondence through the MPs over the last two years led to a letter from the Director of Education that I should return to the HR Manager of the LEA to conclude the case. The MP advised that I should take with me an advocate in view of the complexities of the issues. I approached the Union, Black Teachers Group, Teachers Support Network and CAFAS. In the last CAFAS meeting John Fernandez, the Chair agreed to accompany me. Unfortunately, the Acting HR Manager came unprepared although I sent her a one page resume outlining the outstanding issues and supported it with information and evidence I submitted to the Director of Education. I have not received any offer to conclude the case yet.

The complexities of the issues may make a shorter version incomprehensible. I shall welcome feedback.
Thank you,

S. Sengupta

.

NOTICES

Nominations for the CAFAS Committee 2006-07

Positions
1. Chair
2. Secretary
3. Membership Secretary/Treasurer
4.Update Compiler(s)
5. Auditor
6.Student Complaints
7.Regan Appeal Fund
8.Health & Safety

Please send nominations by 21 April 2006 to:

Dr John Hewitt
Secretary
33 Hillyfields, Dunstable, Beds LU6 3NS
john.hewitt22@ntlworld.com

NEXT MEETING
Saturday 22 April 2006
AGM 1.30pm
Reports
Elections

OM 2.00pm Agenda
Presentation
1. Minutes
2. Matters arising
3. Report on Academic Freedom case.
4. Intellectual Property & Patents
5, Expenses
6. Other case reports
7. AOB

There will be an officers' meeting in Room 252 at 12.45pm

Informal lunch and chat from 12.00 in the Junior Common Room, 4th floor, extension wing, Birkbeck College, Malet Street. All welcome.

CAFAS - ISBN Publisher

Cafas is now a certificated holder of the ISBN Publisher Prefix 0-9550782

We have been allocated 10 numbers two of which are now assigned to:
Michael Cohen & Colwyn Williamson, 2004, *The Mission Betrayed*, Cafas.
ISBN: 0-9550782-0-2
Michael Cohen & Colwyn Williamson, 2004, *The Tangled Web*, Cafas
ISBN: 0-9550782-1-0
Copies of *The Mission Betrayed* can be obtained from Cafas Membership Secretary for £3 (including postage) and of *The Tangled Web* (including the petitioners' final submission) for £2 (including postage).

Academic Freedom e-list and Defending-Academic-Freedom JISCMail List

There are two ways to join.
I. Go to Cafas website http://www.cafas.org
1. Open the link to Defending Academic Freedom (Email list) on the Home Page.
2. Click on 'Join or Leave the List…'
3. Write your email address and your first and last names in the boxes (complete both) and click on the box that says 'Join…'

II. Email JISCMAIL directly.
1. Send to: LISTSERVE@JISCMAIL.ac.uk
2. Leave Subject blank.

3. Send the text:
Subscribe Defending-Academic-Freedom YourFirstName YourLastName

Details are on Cafas' website.

Committee

Chair:
John Fernandes
76 Bois Hall Rd, Addlestone Surrey KT15 2JN
01932 840 928
Shakti81@aol.com
Secretary:
Dr John Hewitt
33 Hillyfields, Dunstable, Beds LU6 3NS
john.hewitt22@ntlworld.com
Membership Secretary & Treasurer:
Dr Eva Link
17 Highcliffe, Clivesdon Court, London W13 8DP
02089982569;
rekgemL1982@yahoo.co.uk
Founding Member:
Colwyn Williamson
3 Canterbury Road,
Swansea SA2 0DD
Tel: 01792 517473
m:07970 838 276
colwynwilliamson@hotmail.com
Founding Member
Michael Cohen
The University, Swansea SA2 8PP
m: 07917 670555
Mike.cohen4@btinternet.com
Update Compilers:
Geraldine Thorpe & Pat Brady
CAFAS Update, 7 Benn Street, London E9 5SU
Tel 020 8 986 3004;
g.thorpe@londonmet.ac.uk
patrickbrady@onetel.net
geraldine.thorpe@onetel.net
Auditor:
Majzoub Ali
36 Viking Court, Gunfleet, Shoeburyness, Southend-on-Sea SS3 9PT; 01702587995;
majzoubbali@hotmail.com
David Regan Appeal Coordinator: Dr Janet Collett
University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9QN 01273 473 717
j.i.collett@sussex.ac.uk
jcollett@oeb.harvard.edu
Health & Safety Spokesperson: Dr David Heathcote
Dept of Applied Psychology, Bournemouth University BH12 5BB
01202595283;
dheathco@bournemouth.ac.uk
Students' Complaints:
Dr Harold Hillman
3 Merrow Dene, 76 Epsom Road, Guildford GU1 2BX
01483568332;
harold.hillman@btinternet.com
Website
Dr John Hewitt
33 Hillyfields, Dunstable, Beds LU6 3NS
john.hewitt22@ntlworld.com
http://www.ahabitoflies.co.uk

CONSTITUTION

CAFAS' aims are outlined on the membership form. The full constitution can be obtained from the Secretary or www.cafas.org.uk.
CAFAS was founded in February 1994. It depends on subscriptions and an active membership. It meets in January, April, July and October.

NEAR

Cafas has linked to the Network for Education and Academic Rights (NEAR).
Information is on the website http://www.nearinternational.org/
'NEAR's purpose is to facilitate the rapid global transfer of accurate information in response to breaches of academic freedom and human rights in education.'

Next *Update*
Please send letters, news items and articles to:
CAFAS Update
7 Benn Street, London E9 5SU
0208 986 3004
g.thorpe@londonmet.ac.uk
patrickbrady@onetel.net
geraldine.thorpe@onetel.net
Deadline: 30 June 2006

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

Items do not necessarily reflect the views of the Council.

SUBSCRIPTION

Dear Members!

Some of you have forgotten to pay your membership fee.
Could you please be kind enough to check the date of your last payment on the address label? If you should find there "*" or "***!!!" could you please send a cheque without further delay as your contribution is absolutely crucial to the well being of CAFAS.**
Many thanks for your contribution.

Your Treasurer and Membership Secretary
Eva Link
17 Highcliffe,
Clivesdon Court,
London W13 8DP

JULY MEETING

Birkbeck College 15 July 2006 at 2.00pm: Room 253