

MESSAGES FROM TWO FAUW PRESIDENTS

“It is with a combination of regret and relief that I am stepping down,” writes FAUW President Catherine Schryer (English Language and Literature) whose term ends April 22. During her three years as President, Prof. Schryer believes that the FAUW accomplished many worthwhile goals but wishes that it had accomplished even more.

In his message as incoming FAUW President, Roydon Fraser (Mechanical Engineering) draws from a lengthy service with the FAUW Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and more recent experience with the Faculty Relations Committee. Prof. Fraser emphasizes the need for “collegial diligence” – to continue a good working relationship both within the FAUW and with the university administration.

IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURALISM: Readers respond

to the articles that appeared in the March 2004 issue of the *Forum*. Reactions range from “offended” to willingness to “support any further discussion”. Also appearing in this issue are articles that were written in response to the discussions on these controversial issues at the recent FAUW Annual General Meeting.

OUR FRACTURED FUTURE

The Contrasting Experience of U of C Departments

The University of Calgary Faculty Association recently released a report about the impact of successive years of budget cuts and academic restructuring on the work of the university. The report is based on replies to a questionnaire sent to all academic unit heads on campus asking about the impact of change in five broad areas: classes and students, teaching and evaluation methods, research activities of individual faculty, academic staff more generally and overall effects on the department or unit.

This report and a previous one (*Our Faltering Future*, produced in 1999) can be found at: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/TUCFA/news.htm>

Inside this issue:

President's Message <i>Catherine Schryer</i>	2
President's Message <i>Roydon Fraser</i>	3
Letters to the Editor	4
On Scholars and the Involvement in Politics	5
Something in the Forum Provoked Me	6
Funding "Wasted on Third-Class Universities"	7

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



*Catherine Schryer
Department of
English Language
and Literature*

It is with a combination of regret and relief that I am stepping down as President of the Faculty Association. During the three years that I have been President, I believe the Association has accomplished many worthwhile goals but in several areas I wish we had accomplished more.

Over the last three years, I believe that the Association has improved its infrastructure and its lines of communication both within the Association and with the administration. We now have another office and another staff person and are in the process of developing a more useful web site. We have improved communication with our Council of Representatives (CoR). Our meetings with our CoR members are now more productive as these meetings have become venues where the Board learns about problems in diverse areas across campus and receives feedback about its past progress or its future plans. The CoR also now has its own email list and receives updates on issues occurring across North America.

The Association has used the Faculty Relations Committee productively to bring issues of importance to faculty to the attention of the Administration. For example, problems associated with parental leaves, the status of the academic librarians, hiring practices, workload issues, examination timing, and the software infrastructure have all been the subject of intense discussion at the FRC. Wherever possible we have found some common ground through the FRC and facilitated useful changes. Sometimes, of course, we had to agree to disagree.

As an Association, we stood our ground on several crucial issues. Most importantly we did not back down from the grade changing issue. In the long run through much discussion and through Senate we achieved policy language which ensures that an administrator will not unilaterally change the grades of an entire course. We stood by our colleagues in the library in their attempts to achieve status as academic librarians, a status which most

other university librarians in Canada have achieved. And we will continue to maintain our support for them. Through the efforts of Metin Renksizbulut and Bill Power, we also continued to maintain our claim that we deserved competitive salaries if we wanted to be one of the top research universities in Canada. Finally, as an association, we assisted many academic colleagues through the Academic Freedom and Tenure committee. The deliberations of this committee are confidential, but I am proud of the settlements that that committee has achieved over the last three years.

Of course, there are some areas in which I wish we could have achieved more. For example, we have one of the lowest rates of hiring female faculty members of any university in Canada. According to CAUT figures, we rank just above the Royal Military College. Sadly, too, we have among the lowest rates of women moving toward tenure of any university in Canada (CAUT figures for 2001). These figures do not bode well for us, especially since over 60% of the students graduating from universities in Canada are, in fact, women. My view is that we need a policy position on this issue as well as a concerted effort to address the situation. I also wish that I could have brought the issue of sessional lecturers more into the center stage. Many areas on campus depend on the work of sessional instructors and yet most are badly paid and experience difficult working conditions – no benefits, sporadic and apparently arbitrary employment, crowded (or no) offices. These individuals are our academic colleagues and deserve a better deal.

Finally, I have many people to thank for the help that they have provided over the last three years. The previous FAUW Presidents, especially Fred McCourt, Ian McDonald, Len Guelke and the late John Wilson, consistently offered support and advice. I also could not have survived a week into the position without the help of our Administrator, Pat Moore. Her knowledge of the Association and the University made it possible for me to do my job. Throughout the last three years, the active participation of Board members, including Sandra Burt, Melanie Campbell, Mieke Delfgaauw, Danine Farquharson, Roydon Fraser, Conrad Hewitt, Ray McLenaghan, Bill Power, Metin Renksizbulut, Frank Reynolds and Ed Vrscay, has also made the work of the Board possible.

I am entirely confident that the Board and the new President, Roydon Fraser, will continue to make the University a better place to work. And I will continue to support their efforts.

Thank you for your support during the last three years.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



Roydon Fraser
Department of Mechanical Engineering

Collegial Diligence

Greetings. It is my pleasure to have this opportunity as your new FAUW President to continue to actively work to represent the interests of UW faculty and to support the continuation of a strong and collegial relationship between UW faculty, staff, and administration.

As we are all aware, there are stresses and strains being placed on the University that continue to increase the workload and expectations placed on faculty, e.g., increases in class size, the offloading of administrative duties to faculty as staff support is reduced, and space pressures. In adapting to these changes there is a need to remain diligent as policy and procedures change so that the possibility of institutionalizing undesirable working conditions for faculty is minimized. It has been my pleasure to work with UW's administration this past year in a collegial and caring manner, and as FAUW President I wish to continue this good working relationship. As with any healthy relationship, a lot of work is needed – more work than can be done by one or two individuals. I therefore must acknowledge, with much gratitude, that the work of FAUW is done by a team of colleagues who care and desire a healthy and welcoming UW community.

For about ten years now I have been working with the FAUW Academic Freedom and Tenure (AF&T) Committee to ensure that faculty members are treated fairly by UW policies and procedures. This past year I discovered that UW is unique in various ways when it comes to faculty governance. For example, I attended a recent CAUT meeting for senior grievance officers which started with a presentation detailing some of the more

important grievance procedure policies for faculty. The number one grievance policy seen as a necessity by other associations was the need for *no* individual carriage (individual carriage is where a faculty member initiates and follows through on his or her grievance). The other faculty associations believed that the association should carry all grievances and decide which grievances it will or will not carry. UW, in contrast, is dominated by individual carriage, which means that an individual faculty member engages UW's grievance procedures without judgement from FAUW. UW's approach favours the individual over the association; an association that prohibits individual carriage can terminate a grievance if the outcome might hurt the association as a whole, even if the individual would see justice. Furthermore, to the surprise of other associations, UW also has an external arbitrator option, a rarity when there is individual carriage. Combining individual carriage with an external arbitrator option means that UW's grievance procedure offers an excellent pathway to justice for the individual faculty member. Therefore, even though it seemed to me like I did not belong at the CAUT senior grievance officer workshop, I was very proud of UW's distinct differences and the fact that FAUW is not a union. It is an association of members who work as a unit to make UW great. This all said, it is understood that individual carriage places a larger responsibility on individuals, which may represent a barrier for some seeking justice. To this end, I encourage anyone seeking advice and colleague support for a grievance to contact the FAUW AF&T committee.

A second way UW is relatively unique is that salary negotiations and policy changes are not part of a total collective agreement package negotiation, as is the case for unionized associations. This means that attention and solutions remain focussed on the problem at hand which, in general, leads to better solutions in an environment of collegial diligence.

In conclusion, I hope to work towards maintaining or improving the collegial, caring, diligent activities of FAUW with a focus on the fair treatment of faculty, coupled to a great concern about faculty workload. If anyone would like to assist FAUW in these goals please introduce yourself to me or any member of the FAUW Board. Live, Love, Laugh.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

In response to title page "UW's operating budget to be slashed by 35% next year ...":

May I suggest that the FAUW refrain from such *irresponsible* attempts to attract attention. Thank you!

Bob Prus
Department of Sociology

Immigration and Multiculturalism

The latest issue of the *FAUW Forum* raised the issue of Canada's immigration and multicultural policies. In addition it published a selection of articles on the European situation. The justification given is that the articles were reprinted to encourage discussion and debate. These articles were all culled from the extreme right wing press.

They portray a biased and often racist perspective. The arguments are at best specious and generally false. For example it is asserted in one of the articles that Canada's immigration laws caused 9-11. It is unfortunate that your magazine has provided a platform for these views. This represents an unfortunate lapse of your editorial judgment. Freedom also carries responsibility.

Phelim P Boyle
School of Accountancy

Just for the record, since it appears you are keeping track of responses, I was very offended by the article on immigration in the latest issue of the *Forum*.

Keith Freeland
Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science

I congratulate the *Forum* on raising this thorny issue. It is long past time.

There is no doubt that immigration has throughout Canadian history brought into our citizenry some of the most talented people in history, folk of every nationality and language, who are responsible for the remarkable history of Canadian achievement in social, religious, business and cultural affairs. One has only to look at the current student, staff and faculty members at UW, from the youngest to the oldest, the least experienced to the most, to see the evidence.

However, there is also no doubt that our immigration policy in recent decades has made it easier for illegal immigrants and those using the refugee quotas as a ruse to enter the country than it is for legal immigrants who would satisfy the most stringent criteria.

As a consequence we risk a major fragmentation of the social structure. It is also in part responsible for the

plethora of terrorist networks in the country, the \$35 million announced recently by the press as terrorist funds held in our banks.

In fact I wonder if the high profile expulsion from Canada of a handful of octogenarian post-WWII Germans who have been leading exemplary lives for 50 years is a diversion from the fact that hundreds of known terrorists walk the streets of Canadian cities, men released after immigration hearings in which they were ordered to return at a certain date for expulsion from the country, but who in fact never re-appear. I also wonder why it is that reports of corruption in many foreign Canada Immigration offices abound, but we hear never a word about procedures to correct the problem?

In recent weeks the press reports that more than 25,000 Canadians 'lose' their passports each year. An acquaintance working at the Vancouver International Airport tells me that the going rate for a 'lost' passport is \$4,000. The press reports that one currently high profile immigrant family is notorious for the many number of passport 'losses' it has had in that single family.

Who better than the sociologists, anthropologists, legal studies experts, the philosophers, historians and religious studies scholars at UW to help us identify and correct the flaws in our immigration policies? We do not necessarily need fewer immigrants, but we do need better screening. We might consider, for instance, whether the immigration flow from various countries ought to be better balanced. Or whether our policy of multi-culturalism needs adjustment. How can we ensure that UW student applicants born in Canada are sufficiently fluent in English that they can pass the ELPE exam?

Such research and discussion might help us avoid the kind of extreme reactions which are tearing apart other countries in the West. For it is the culture, business ethic, rule of law, health standards, ethical middle class, religious freedom, educational standards and valuing of the individual that explains why the West is the destination of choice for the vast majority of would-be immigrants.

John North
Department of English Language and Literature

The *FAUW Forum* has rendered the university community a real service by raising issues of immigration and multiculturalism in the March 2004 issue. For more than half a century changing demographics have altered the identity of many nations in profound ways. There is need for a serious examination of how concepts such as nationalism and patriotism are or are not compatible with globalism and local multicultural allegiances.

Many years ago the campus paper *Imprint* was kind enough to publish a three part series I wrote on multicul-

turalism (May 29, 1992). While it is only a treatment of some of the matters of importance in the current debate, the series may be of use in the current debate.

Joseph A. Novak
Department of Philosophy

I confess to a mixture of amusement and dismay at your report to the AGM of FAUW on April 2. It was amusing (and amazing) when you expressed puzzlement that anybody could have found anything particularly “right wing” about the selection of topics for discussion in the *Forum*. (I’ve been waiting for the series of articles by eminent Creationists to appear in the *Forum*, in an attempt to force those sanctimonious biology professors to defend themselves ...) Personally, I’m worried less about the right wing slant of the *Forum* than I am about the selection of right wing voices – for instead of a *Forum* for FAUW, it often seems a forum for the stupidest, least thoughtful and most strident voices on the right. That is, I object to the stupidity of the articles selected from people like Johan Goldberg, rather than to their being right wing.

The dismay, on the other hand, came from your attempt to portray the reprinting of such dismal stuff as part of a solution to some sort of intellectual crisis on campus, the evidence for which is the lack of people taking it seriously enough to bother to respond. The refusal to descend to the gutter to fling invective back at the ravers and lunatics seems to me an entirely sensible response by somebody committed to rational debate – it’s not worth the time of somebody with serious work to do to “debate” with someone who’s clearly beyond having his or her mind changed by mere information. For the same reason I don’t bother writing extended replies to articles by people like Jonah Goldberg, I don’t reply to the several emails I get

every year from people claiming to have a proof of the inconsistency of arithmetic.

As for the recent issue of the *Forum* devoted almost entirely to reprints of articles from such reliable newspapers as the *Edmonton Sun* and the not-at-all-right-wing, Conrad-Black-owned-at-the-time *Daily Telegraph*, perhaps one point is worth making. Consider this remarkable sentence reproduced from a column by Paul Stanway, member of the editorial board of the Christian History Project and frequent contributor to the *Edmonton Sun*: “Canada’s immigration laws have been all rhetoric and no common sense for 30 years, and 9-11 showed they can have truly lethal consequences.” Critical Thinking exercise ... there’s a clear gap in logic here. What is the author probably presupposing to fill the gap? For there’s no evident connection between Canada’s immigration laws and 9-11. In particular, there’s no evident connection between 9-11 and the kinds of changes Stanway seemed to advocate elsewhere in his diatribe, which seemed to involve tightening up rules for refugee claimants. I’d be hard pressed to criticize a Critical Thinking student who detected a suppressed bit of reasoning along the lines of “there was a parade of rather brownish faces that showed up on my TV screen after 9-11, and many refugees seem to be rather more brownish than me” at work in this little argument, a bit of reasoning that someone like Stanway could count on not having to make explicit, given his readership. For many of his readers, this little gap in his reasoning was doubtless stepped over without their noticing it. But I think it’s rather out of line to suggest that it’s the people who did notice the gap and thought something foul was probably what was needed to fill it who are out of line and the enemies of rational discussion on campus.

Dave DeVidi
Department of Philosophy

On Scholars and the Involvement of Politics

by Peter C. Chieh
Department of Chemistry

We, the faculty, are a lucky bunch because we are scholars standing at the forefront of research and thinking. For scholarship and for our benefit, the FAUW is ours.

Democratic and dictatorial politicians respect and pay attention to scholars. Scholars living under dictatorship are usually more aware of the political implication of what they do. For example, after becoming Chancellor of Germany in 1933, Hitler became a dictator. Many scholars with ethnic backgrounds other than German felt threatened. Some escaped the Hitler regime and came to the United State of America. Furthermore, scholars from Hungary, Italy, and Austria also sought refuge in the US and elsewhere.

Among the refugee scholars, three Hungarian scientists Leo Szilard, Eugene Wigner, and Edward Teller drafted a letter to the president of the US, Roosevelt, urging him to unite the political power with nuclear power. They requested Einstein to sign the letter, and then deliver it to President Roosevelt. As a result, a lot has happened, including the Manhattan Project, which mobilized many scientists and young men to build the atomic bomb. The consequences need no elaboration.

In my view, the *FAUW Forum* (March 2004) asking a question regarding immigration policy was the right thing to do. However, to do this, the *Forum* should have supplied some background information. The three (reprinted) articles

provided some background information, but they all pointed in one direction. Thus, some people have the right to feel upset, and many of us were unaware of this strong feeling until the General Meeting, April 2, 2004.

During this meeting, the editor reported his view and his work to an audience who were not aware of the fact that some people were upset about the contents in the latest issue. Thus, at what seemed the end of his report, we applauded his work and his spirit, because all these were voluntary. During the discussion, I realized that some people were REALLY upset. I regretted that my applause could be misinterpreted as an approval of the views of the published articles.

Due to our different backgrounds and our desire for truth, each of us has a unique viewpoint and strong personality as scholars do. Naturally, we disagree on many

issues. Years ago, I was a director of the Board and I have negotiated on behalf of the FAUW with the Administration. I realize the importance of a strong united Faculty Association, I felt sad to see us upsetting each other and causing a split among ourselves on issues that are not directly related to FAUW, but of a much more general nature.

Regarding the immigration policy, I have not studied it fully to give any credible opinion. History has showed that the immigration policy had a lot of faults. For us to live in the global-village in harmony, we have to respect each other. I had never taken Chinese New Year as a holiday by refusing to teach, but I allowed students alternate dates for their final exams when they requested it. On the other hand, I appreciate those who appreciate the difficulty I may have, and gave up their holiday privileges on their special days.

Something in the *Forum* Provoked Me

by John Michela

Department of Psychology

To “provoke” is to “aggravate,” “irritate,” or “inflammate.” Something in the *FAUW Forum* provoked me in these senses. However, I am not talking about the recent set of articles on immigration articles that I will not consider here. It was a piece about leadership and leadership development in the university context, which appeared a couple of years ago.

My field, Industrial/Organizational Psychology, is one of the fields on our campus that claims expertise in leadership, training, and development. A proposed *Forum* article was circulated in advance to Psychology, and I understood that article to be suggesting that “leadership” was a lot of hooy, and leadership development programs, a boondoggle. I felt offended, even distressed, much as some readers of the articles on immigration may have felt. If this comparison seems strained, consider this: something fundamental to my professional *raison d’être* was under attack. I could have overlooked it, I could have protested, I could have counter-attacked, but I chose a different response.

To “provoke” is also to “rouse,” and I was roused to write a reply. I saw an opportunity to involve some graduate students in my department in trying to articulate, to a skeptical audience, the nature of leadership and the prospects for leadership development. I also saw an opportunity to inform the broader university community about this aspect of our scholarship and practice as it relates to the university context.

This reply was published in the *Forum*. I doubt it was a watershed event for anyone. But I think it was worth the effort, because hashing out this disagreement over a feature of university life probably led someone to learn something.

Immigration is a feature of university life. Gender and cultural disparities are features of university life, as are many other contentious matters. Professors have an obligation to work things out among themselves so that they are able to talk about such matters. This obligation exists because a *raison d’être* of the university is to be an institution that provides opportunity for unpopular positions to be presented in society. Indeed, the university is unique within society in this respect, and therefore functions in society as an organ devoted (in part) to contrariness. Evidently the FAUW leadership and its most active members generally agree with this view, given the tone at the most recent general meeting when discussing a libel suit that may be a silencing ploy aimed at a political science professor at another university.

It was in this same meeting where disagreement was evident on the question of whether the *Forum* should have reprinted and invited comment on others’ articles about immigration policies. Some people appeared to have been “provoked” by that reprinting, in at least some senses of the word.

The *Forum* belongs to its members, and the members, operating through their elected board, have the option of changing editorial policy with the goal of avoiding contentious matters. It could be argued that if this change were to occur, the community of professors would have an obligation to maintain some alternative organ within the university that is devoted in part to contrariness. But my purpose here has not been to advance this argument. It has been to illustrate the good that can arise from open exchange of views on contentious matters.

People can learn things from open exchange. In particular they can learn facts and concepts, though they can learn many other things, including where other people stand on issues. Replies to provocative communications can be especially instructive, as by showing how “facts” are readily misinterpreted, for example, if the contextual forces surrounding those facts are overlooked. I certainly would like to read a reply to the past *Forum’s* reprinted articles that include analysis of this kind.

Is there any reason *not* to promote open exchange of contentious matters? Certainly if harm to others is advocated, the discussion must stop (and never should have taken place). Sometimes it is contended that a message should not be communicated because it will mislead or have influences that are detrimental to others – not in the sense of advocating overt harm, but by promoting beliefs or attitudes that could lead to prejudice, at least. It is in relation to this contention where one’s position on open communication in a democratic society, and academic freedom itself, are tested. It is usually a matter of debate whether a particular communication is prejudicial or otherwise illegitimate, and the very criteria for legitimacy are debatable. For example, the reprinting of articles pertinent to immigration policy in the *Forum* might be judged as legitimate because such policy decisions are necessary in our society, and citizens

should be informed so they can participate meaningfully in these decisions. Or it might be judged as illegitimate for various reasons.

Although truly open exchange of ideas either within the university or in the society of large may at times have detrimental effects for less powerful or otherwise out-of-favour people, it can have benefits for these people as well. For one thing, it ensures that laws, policies, or other rules, at least, allow less powerful people to communicate their positions. When a society or other social group places limits on speech, who is more likely than the less powerful to be silenced?

When discussion is closed off, some group or other is necessarily favoured. This could be powerful people or others, such as whoever holds the “politically correct” views of the day. Norms for open communication – to respond to provocation by presenting a reasoned reply – can promote not only wisdom, through acquisition of knowledge of many points of view and facts, but also justice, through sharing of the power that lies in the pen (which, as everyone knows, is mightier than the sword).

This article from the telegraph.co.uk online has been reprinted at the suggestion of Robert Macdonald (Mechanical Engineering) “to gauge opinion”.

Funding ‘wasted on third-class universities’

*by Liz Lightfoot, Education Correspondent, Daily Telegraph, UK
(Filed: 12/03/2004)*

The head of a London university has accused the Government of a “bums on seats” higher education policy which wastes money on “third class” universities such as Luton.

Resources are being switched from world-renowned universities to weak “new” universities to meet the Government’s “draining” policy of getting 50 per cent of young people into higher education, said Sir Richard Sykes, the rector of Imperial College.

He urged the Government to scrap its funding which gives more money to universities admitting students with lower A-level grades, who need more support.

“We are diverting resources to the universities that are having to bring kids up to speed with what they should have learned in primary and secondary schools. And that’s why you’re moving money away from places like this to your third-class institutions because it costs more to teach those kids because they have never been properly taught in the first place.”

Sir Richard, the former chairman and chief executive of GlaxoSmithKline, asked why Imperial, one of the Russell Group of leading research-led universities, was given less than Luton, a former polytechnic, for each student.

“For a maths student coming to Imperial College, we get less than the maths student going to Luton. So is that the way the economy should be spending its money? Because a penny spent here is a hell of a lot better for the economy than a penny spent at Luton.”

The Government’s “bums on seat” policy of increasing the proportion of under-30s in higher education from its present 43 per cent to 50 per cent by 2010 must be abandoned, he said. Instead money should be concentrated on improving schools and supporting world-class universities.

He suggests giving universities the freedom to raise private income by restricting state support to half of home

undergraduates with the rest paying full fees.

Local and regional universities had a role to play but, said Sir Richard: "They are not national treasures. They are not international treasures. So let's accept it and deal with it and stop behaving as if everybody's the same because that's just a lot of nonsense."

Prof Les Ebdon, vice-chancellor of Luton University, said that, taking research funding into account, Imperial got far more cash per student. "It's an absolutely extraordinary comment to make, not least because we don't do a maths degree at Luton. So he didn't quite get his facts right."

"Luton was ranked 14th out of more than 130 institutions for teaching quality based on inspections," he said.

"Charles Clarke, the education secretary, said we were 'bloody brilliant' at teaching and everybody knew it," said

Prof Ebdon.

"We have different missions. We aim to be an access university offering the highest quality teaching. Imperial College has a mission to be a world-class research university and it succeeds at that."

Lack of applicants for single subject degrees at Luton and a high drop-out rate has led to them being scrapped in maths and other traditional areas. More fashionable degrees such as media studies, design and sport science have been substituted.

This year Luton lost £825,407 in teaching grant because it failed to meet recruitment targets for two years running.

© Copyright of Telegraph Group Limited 2004.

FORUM EDITORIAL BOARD

Edward Vrscaj
Applied Mathematics
Editor

Paul Fieguth
Systems Design Engineering

Paul Malone
Germanic & Slavic Studies

Jeffrey Shallit
Computer Science

David Williams
Optometry

Catherine Schryer
English Language & Literature
ex officio

Pat Moore
Faculty Association Office
Production

FAUW Office

Pat Moore, Administrator

Sandy Rung, Assistant

Room 4002, Mathematics & Computer Building

Phone: 888-4567, ext. 3787

Fax: 888-4307

E-mail: facassoc@uwaterloo.ca

Website: <http://www.uwfacass.uwaterloo.ca>

FAUW FORUM

The FAUW Forum is a service for the UW faculty sponsored by the Association. It seeks to promote the exchange of ideas, foster open debate on issues, publish a wide and balanced spectrum of views, and inform members about current Association matters. Opinions expressed in the Forum are those of the authors, and ought not to be perceived as representing the views of the Association, its Board of Directors, or of the Editorial Board of the Forum, unless so specified. Members are invited to submit letters, news items and brief articles.

If you do not wish to receive the Forum, please contact the Faculty Association Office and your name will be removed from the mailing list.

ISSN 0840-7320