

**Governance and Meaning**

*The following address was presented to the Tennessee Conference meeting in Chattanooga by Dr. John Hopper, Chair of the Assembly of State Conferences, on April 4, 1998.*

Higher education these days is facing a blizzard of attacks on institutional standards that we in AAUP hold vital to the integrity of the academic process. These storms roll in from every quarter, and more clouds form daily on the horizon. What I'd like to do this morning is 1) give you a sketch of the overall drama itself, 2) postulate on the origin of the problem, and 3) take a look at our connection as AAUP'ers to the solution metaphysically and epistemologically.

**The view from the cockpit.** In the thirty-four months since my election as Chair of the ASC, I've logged in over 100,000 frequent flyer miles somewhere and visited over twenty state conferences. The scene varies in its particulars from state-to-state, but looks the same

once one climbs past the idiosyncrasies of local circumstance. Academic freedom, due process, shared governance, and tenure are widely under assault. Just as this meeting in Chattanooga is focused on how to deal with the inextricable linkages between governance and tenure, I've seen the very same discussions between and among administrators, legislators, and faculty take place at other meetings for over two years. The concern is genuine. Part of these challenges lie past

**Conference Officers, 1998–2000**

These AAUP members have been elected to lead the Tennessee Conference for the next two years. Please contact them to share your ideas about the Conference agenda and to offer your help with the work of the Conference.

**President**

Marius M. Carriere, Jr.  
 Christian Brothers University  
 (901) 321-3366 (w)  
 mcarrier@cbu.edu

**Vice President for Public Institutions**

Norma Cook  
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
 (423) 974-7067 (w)  
 ncook@utk.edu

**Vice President for Private Institutions**

Steve Gadbois  
 Rhodes College  
 (901) 726-3721 (w)  
 gadbois@rhodes.edu

**Secretary-Treasurer**

Gilbert G. Fernández  
 Tennessee Technological University  
 (931) 372-3339 (or -3336) (w)  
 gfernandez@tntech.edu

**From President-Elect Marius Carriere**

I am honored to have been elected by the membership as your new Conference President. Following Bob is not going to be easy. Bob has done an outstanding job and he was particularly helpful to

me as vice-president of private institutions and chapter president at CBU. In order to maintain the quality leadership to which you have become accustomed, I will be calling on many of you to help me with the important work that we face as individuals in academe, as well those challenges that lay before the Conference.

Elsewhere in this Newsletter, you will read about one of those challenges. At the Spring Conference meeting at UTC, those present voted to end our relationship with our Conference lobbyist. The motion to end our relationship passed overwhelmingly and the motion was the result of a very strong recommendation from Jeff Roberts, Chair of Committee R (Government Relations). Jeff argued convincingly that our

membership can be as effective, if not more so, than our lobbyist. His enthusiasm is remarkable, but Jeff will need our help. Jeff's work will have to be done through a committee of hard-working folks and he and I call upon our Conference members to volunteer to assist him in his efforts. If you have an interest in becoming involved with Jeff in our new "relationship" with the legislature, or at least want some additional information

*(continued on p. 4)*

*(continued on p. 6)*

## Fall Meeting Scheduled

Please mark your calendars for the next meeting of the Tennessee Conference, AAUP:

Fall 1998: October 3, Middle Tennessee State Univ.

The speaker at the fall meeting will be Pat Shaw, Director of the Department of Organizing and Services for the national AAUP office.

## Minutes of April Meeting

*These minutes of the April 4, 1998, Conference meeting at UT-Chattanooga were prepared by Gil Fernández, Secretary-Treasurer of the Conference. They will be reviewed at the Fall meeting on October 3.*

The University of Tennessee-Chattanooga was the site of the Spring 1998 meeting of the Tennessee Conference. President Bob Glenn convened the meeting at 10:00 AM. He first introduced Dean Herbert Burhenn of the College of Arts and Sciences at UTC, who welcomed the Conference to the campus at a time when the local AAUP chapter is in a quiescent state and while a proposal for post-tenure review looms in importance. President Glenn acknowledged Carter Pate of UTC for making all the arrangements for the meeting, even though he is semi-retired.

David Lee, Chairperson of the Election Committee, announced the following results of the bi-annual election of officers: President, Marius Carriere; Vice-President for Public Institutions, Norma Cook; Vice-President for Private Institutions, Steve Gadbois; and Secretary-Treasurer, Gilbert Fernández. Glenn announced that President-Elect Carriere would preside at the October 3, 1998 Conference meeting at Middle Tennessee State University.

President Glenn introduced the guest speaker for the meeting, Dr. John Hopper, Chairperson of the Assembly of State Conferences, who is serving his second term and who had participated two years ago at the Leadership Workshop at Rhodes College in Memphis. [*Hopper's address, "Governance and Meaning," is printed above beginning on p. 1.*]

A panel of AAUP members commented on the proposed Post-Tenure Review policy which is being considered by the UT Board of Trustees and is to be voted on in June. David Lee evaluated the proposed policy from the point of view of a department chairperson; Steve Gadbois discussed it from the point of view of Chairperson of Committee A; and Will

Schrader did likewise from the perspective of shared governance. David Lee pointed out that what is being proposed by the Board of Trustees is not clear, and that there is no uniformity regarding procedures among the various campuses in the UT system. It was also noted that the proposed plan would further increase bureaucratization, resulting in massive paper work and considerable time devoted to the process. Steve Gadbois stated that in arriving at a policy, the Board should ideally consult the *Red Book* as its guide, and that it is incumbent upon the professoriate to educate the public and the legislative bodies of professors' involvements in matters other than teaching. Will Schrader remarked that in arriving at this proposal the Board should have consulted the faculty from the beginning. Schrader also said that there is no need for post-tenure review because faculty are reviewed annually, and Schrader recommended strengthening the present system of review already in place. Discussion followed regarding how the UT system's post-tenure review policy was determined at the different UT campuses, and a suggestion was made that the Conference consider sending a resolution to the UT Board of Trustees relative to the issue of post-tenure review. Prior to adjourning for lunch at noon, Bob Glenn recommended that the members consider the wording of a resolution within the guidelines of AAUP.

The Conference resumed its deliberations at 1:05 PM. Richard Gildrie moved and Will Schrader seconded a motion that the Conference send a resolution to the UT Board of Trustees recommending the following two points: 1) that revision of tenure procedures should go through the duly constituted bodies on each campus, and 2) that basic AAUP standards be applied in arriving at a policy of post-tenure review. The second part of the motion stated that a committee be established to work on the wording of said motion. The motion passed. President Glenn asked that Will Schrader and Norma Cook work on the wording of the resolution.

Will Schrader read to the Conference the report of his and Richard Gildrie's participation at a conference on faculty governance sponsored by National AAUP in Washington, D.C., on February 21, 1998. [*Schrader's report is printed in this Newsletter beginning on p. 3.*] Both Schrader and Gildrie were delegates of the Tennessee Conference.

The minutes of the October 4, 1997, State Conference meeting held at Nashville Tech were approved as published in the February 1998 Newsletter. Gil Fernández, Secretary-Treasurer, reported a balance of \$2565.13 in the AAUP banking account.

*(continued on p. 4)*

## Washington Conference on Governance

*The following report was written by Will Schrader, Chair of Committee T and Past President of the Tennessee Conference.*

Dr. Richard Gildrie (History, APSU) and Dr. William Schrader (History, TTU) attended the workshop on Faculty Governance sponsored by national AAUP Committee T at the Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C., on February 21, 1998, as delegates of the Tennessee Conference.

The workshop began at 8:45 AM with a welcome delivered by General Secretary Mary Burgan. This was followed by presentations by Larry Gerber, Chair of Committee T, on the basic AAUP documents concerning governance; by Robert Kreiser and Norma Schulman of the national staff, on how they process issues related to governance at that level; by John Hopper, Chair of the Assembly of State Conferences, and by Estelle Gellman, Chair of the Collective Bargaining Congress, on how these groups could assist in the governance process.

During these presentations, the point was emphasized that participation in decision-making is not a privilege graciously extended to members of the faculty, but a right which devolves from our role as instructors. Who is better qualified to determine the content of curricula than we? Once this basic point is seen, then the details have to be worked out, but this is essential. It was emphasized by all speakers that the most important work on this issue must be done on the individual campuses. Faculty members on the local level have the best knowledge of local conditions and what might work best on that level. The Washington staff is regularly overburdened with a multitude of inquiries and complaints, and cannot possibly devote great time to all of them, although they will try to advise local people on how to proceed. Actual investigations by national Committee T will be carried out in much the same way as national Committee A, viz., when there are egregious violations or when a particular principle is at stake. An extensive, 63-page document prepared by Keetje Ramo entitled *Assessing the Faculty's Role in Shared Governance: Implications of AAUP Standards* was distributed. It draws on all AAUP statements and decisions for a comprehensive look at this issue.

After a short break, the attendees broke up into three discussion groups at 10:30. We were asked to discuss several specific examples in order to determine what AAUP principles were involved and what could be done about the situation. One thing which frequently came up in these discussions was the need for more information. As a result, we realized the

desirability of keeping careful records, and of having information readily available when asking for advice from national.

Lunch was scheduled for noon to 1:15, with the luncheon address given by AAUP President James Perley. He stressed the importance of recruiting new, younger members for AAUP, commenting that "young faculty need to be led by your example, not by your excuses." He invited everyone to visit his web site at [www.wooster.edu/biology/perley](http://www.wooster.edu/biology/perley).

After lunch, William Woodward from Temple University in Philadelphia and Robert Berdahl of the University of Maryland, both members of Committee T, discussed governance issues which had arisen on their campuses in the context of "downsizing" or "restructuring." Several times, and by several people, the point was made that these concepts derive from the world of corporate business, and the analogy between the business world and the academy is a pernicious one, leading to a false understanding of the purposes and functioning of higher education. However, both speakers acknowledged that budgetary issues are real, and we ignore them at our peril. Chapters should seek to put into place procedures to govern such issues before they become critical. This will help to avoid academically unsound decisions and "quick fix" solutions. One issue which is bound to surface is "turn around time," i.e., faculty deliberations take too long for the impatient administrator or politician. All the more reason to have procedures in place *before* a crisis happens, but the basic response to this criticism is that it is better to make sound decisions for the long-range benefit of the institution than quick actions which may have to be altered or rescinded just as quickly. It is also important to remember that not everything is open for discussion. For example, it is sometimes necessary to remind administrators that we do not make recommendations about grades, we assign grades.

Later, there was a panel discussion on the relationship between AAUP chapters and faculty senates, involving representatives of Howard University, the Collective Bargaining Congress, and the Assembly of State Conferences. Points made include stressing that there should be no conflict between these two elements of faculty governance. AAUP can provide leadership within faculty senates. For example, there should be AAUP members who are candidates for any elective office on campus. It is important for faculty senates to have access to governing boards. A device used increasingly to undermine the faculty voice in governance is the appointment of ad hoc committees, where there may be faculty members, but faculty selected by the administration rather than by the faculty themselves. Insisting on the role of representative bodies in any decision-making process

is a valid position for AAUP chapters. It is also important that faculty, through their senates, be represented on search committees for administrative officers, to insure that the candidates chosen have an appreciation for the academic world.

The last session was another round of discussions on how to help strengthen shared governance on our campuses. Much of the discussion involved attracting new members to AAUP chapters. The greatest impediment to shared governance is a combination of apathy, ignorance, fear, and mistrust on the part of faculty. This seems to be a problem regardless of the type or location of the institution. A suggestion was made that, at institutions with graduate programs, we work to incorporate the AAUP ethic as part of the professional preparation of graduate students. Still another idea, which is being looked into by the national office, is to establish collaborative relationships with various professional associations, such as MLA or AHA.

On Sunday morning John Hopper hosted a further, informal discussion on the conference itself, and how it might be improved. While I could not stay for the entire discussion, my impression from what I heard is that there is a consensus that such workshops are valuable, and should be continued, with broad participation and on topics of broad interest.

*(“Minutes of April Meeting,” cont. from p. 2)*

Vice-President for Private Institutions, Marius Carriere, as incoming president requested that all committee chairpersons continue to serve. Carriere had requested information from all private institutions from across the state. Carriere reported on the presidential search taking place at Rhodes College where faculty will have non-voting status and he discussed how a tenure denial case was arbitrarily handled by the administration and board at Christian Brothers University. He also stated that it appears that Knoxville College will be closing down.

Vice-President for Public Institutions, Ken Scherzer, was unable to attend but Rich Moser presented a brief report.

Delegates in attendance from the ten private and public institutions reported on activities taking place and on issues being discussed at their respective institutions.

The ad hoc committee of Will Schrader and Norma Cook presented the text of the resolution to the UT Board of Trustees. The resolution is as follows:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Tennessee Conference of the American Association of University Professors that the Board of Trustees of the University of Tennessee system is considering the adoption of a program of post-tenure review of faculty,

We therefore believe it important to call to the attention of the Board the following principles of AAUP:

- (1) In accordance with the principle of shared governance duly elected representatives of the faculty must be involved in the process of drafting and adopting policies affecting the professional status of faculty; and
- (2) Any policy affecting tenure or post-tenure review must be consistent with basic AAUP standards, as expressed in the 1997 AAUP report, “On Post-Tenure Review.”

*[The 1997 report is published in Academe Sept.–Oct. 1997: 44–51. It is also available at <http://www.igc.org/aaup/postten.htm>. See especially section IV.A., Guidelines for Considering the Establishment of a System for the Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, and section IV.B., Standards for Good Practice in Post-Tenure Review.]*

After moving adoption of the resolution, the Conference unanimously voted approval. President Glenn stated that said resolution will be forwarded to the UT Board of Trustees with the text of appropriate sections of the 1997 report.

**Committee A (Academic Freedom and Tenure): Steve Gadbois**, who replaced Bob Hughes who is on sabbatical, reported that the committee had no business to report.

**Committee F (Membership): Linda and Doyle Hasty**, reported on the problems of getting membership data from the National Office. Ron Sommer moved that a request be made to

Iris Molotsky at the National Office that new or renewing membership application forms have a check-off for those who want to be listed in the national directory. Motion passed.

**Committee R (Government Relations): Jeff Roberts**, recounted the AAUP legislative day on March 17, where AAUP members conferred with fifteen legislators. Roberts then proposed that the Conference discontinue having a lobbyist, citing various reasons for such a proposal. Roberts then moved that the Conference discontinue having a lobbyist and that he be allowed to form a committee made up of members from each chapter to handle legislative affairs. The motion was seconded, and after some discussion, the motion passed.

**Committee T (University Governance): Will Schrader** stated that his report is covered in the narrative he gave earlier to the Conference.

**Committee V (Community Colleges): Tammy Ruff** gave a report on one of the projects of the committee to investigate the use of adjunct faculty on college campuses in Tennessee and to evaluate the findings in light of AAUP guidelines and recommendations. Ruff stated that a preliminary report had been made available to her from the TBR, and efforts are underway to obtain additional information necessary to establish trends in the use of part-time faculty over the last 3–5 year period. She also reported that the committee is in the process of creating parameters for the review in light of available data and will assess objectives during the process to reflect the dynamic and diverse nature of institutional staffing. The committee also hopes to compare its findings with available data on the national level and submit a report within the next academic year. In addition, the committee is considering creating and conducting a needs analysis on the junior/community college level to identify concerns and issues unique to these academic settings.

**Committee W (Status of Women): Norma Cook**, thanked members from UTK, TTU, and Rhodes who had volunteered to serve on Committee W. Cook reported that she is now ready to start networking via e-mail with the various chapters in the state.

Louis Laska asked if anyone could refer to him the names of individuals who would be interested in helping to edit the manuscript of the book he has completed, “The Rights and Duties of College Faculty in Tennessee.” He also informed the Conference that “white enrollment” at TSU had dropped from 28% to 15%.

David Lee reminded the Conference of the Claxton Award and asked members to submit names of those they believe have contributed in a meaningful way to higher education in Tennessee.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to express the gratitude of the Conference to Carter Pate for all he had done to host the meeting at UTC.

The Conference meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM, until it convenes again on October 3, 1998, at Middle Tennessee State University.

Respectfully submitted, Gil Fernández, Secretary-Treasurer.

*(“Governance and Meaning,” cont. from p. 1)*

faculty and administrators in the halls, both elected and voluntary, of the people, themselves. Legislatures, state governing boards, and local boards of regents are highly susceptible to those pressures. The responses you see from regents, governing boards are a more a symptom of the growing vocational, secular pressures mirroring changes in our very culture than its cause. We in AAUP must never lose focus on those causes in our attempts to deal with its pressures and effects.

In over fifteen states now, legislation has been introduced altering or abolishing tenure in public institutions. In Missouri, for example, although we’ve been spared this trouble, anti-faculty legislation is under consideration all around us. Tennessee, of

course, is a peer model in your organizational abilities in legislative efforts. Other conferences take great heart from your example, some of whom work from bases of much smaller strength, but do so effectively such as Arkansas and Oklahoma, each with memberships under 500.

In the private sector, the situation varies depending on your handling of the statistics, but the threat is no less real against both governance and tenure. The Association of Governing Boards estimates that tenure has been significantly altered or abolished at 20% of all private liberal arts institutions—although an insightful study of the same statistics by our own staff indicates that the changes affected only about four per cent of all faculty at such institutions. Ominously, whether in public or private institutions, over half of all sitting administrators, many of whom have come from traditional teaching backgrounds, are expected to be retired and replaced within five years by administrators drawn from what I call the “new managerial mystique mentality” rather than from the liberal arts. Now that’s a mindset shift to ponder ... and to take *very* seriously.

**The cause of it all ...** Why, after a half century of quiet acceptance of tenure, shared governance, and the rest, has this all come to pass? Why do governing boards increasingly buy into this attack on the safeguards to the free functioning of institutions? How is it that boards do so well in their attacks, and faculty do so poorly in their own defense?

There are no easy answers to these questions, but there are some very tempting ones. The secular humanism of the country, the “Greed is Good” philosophy of the 1980s, has come home to roost in the 1990s. Boards are increasingly staffed by non-educators. But the blame extends far beyond boards. Legislators face parents more worried about an institution’s ability to produce jobs which match the affluence of the times than to produce citizens with a sense of their past, their present, and their obligations to the future. Faculty, with ready avenues for publishing and accessibility to soft money grants, have turned their backs on university service and participation in faculty government. Loyalty to career has displaced loyalty to discipline, let alone loyalty to institution or profession. While those directly threatened occasionally cry out, there is precious little sympathy from many who see themselves immune or even beneficiaries of others’ misery. The apathy of the unaffected is as distasteful as it is unethical.

In the public sector, those who most decry the lack of “values” have in reality largely won the battle for values already. The search for truth and the quest for absolutes, abandoned by society at large, the church, and Academe itself, has been supplanted with a “MacJob economy” and a “MacDonald’s ethic” in the secular world and a consumer-oriented relativism in the academic (the student as “customer”). Flexibility, marketability, and the quick fix threaten to drive a value-based humanism and the objective search for truth from the halls of Academe, itself.

**What can we in AAUP do about it?** Ultimately AAUP is about more than responses to governing boards or crises of any kind. The answers to the challenges facing the academy are neither easy *nor* obvious; worse, they may not be there at all. However, AAUP members’ obligations as a fraternity of concerned academics pledged to “maintain and advance the standards of the profession” are visible, if we but choose to look at them. They’re workable if we have the nerve and moral fiber to heed them. In a world where there are few standards apart from the marketplace anymore, AAUP’s role as the conscience of the academy is unique and invaluable. It’s appropriate that we revisit the *raison d’être* of our fraternity before leaving this morning.

At its core, AAUP is about meaning: the meaning of academic freedom, the meaning of a university comity that makes the production of knowledge possible, the meaning of what it is to be a professor. AAUP isn’t for everybody; it’s for principled professionals who care, who have a commitment to the integrity of the

teaching, learning, and research process, who care about the integrity of the academic process. We are the moral center of the academy, the conscience of Academe. What we protect ultimately makes the search for truth possible.

To faculty who aren’t in AAUP, we’re that Great Hope they may never get around to joining but without whom they’re somehow convinced their academic lives would never be the same. And they’re right. In a very real sense, we’re the difference to them between being employees and being in a profession. AAUP is the set of scales that some academic Themis holds aloft as a standard of justice, decency, and dependability for a profession that pays more in the coinage of what it stands for than in the coinage of the realm.

To the longevital academy, (and by that I mean higher education historically as a locus of shared rules and understandings about the best ways to do the academy’s job of pursuing knowledge), AAUP is the vital ontological core of the academy, itself. Without us, there is no permanence, no stability, no moral referent. The phrases that guarantee academic stability and integrity in its pursuit of truth—academic freedom, tenure, due process, and shared academic governance—are the markers of AAUP’s legacy. They’ve become almost involuntary in our language of academic discourse.

Those principles have produced a moral imperative for the longevital academy. It must protect and defend the principles embodied in AAUP statements without which free, unfettered learning is impossible. Our 1940 “Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure”<sup>1</sup> has been endorsed by over 200 academic societies including the American Association of Colleges and Universities and the American Association of Higher Education—the latter an organization of administrators with whom faculty oft’ times find themselves at odds. Our 1966 statement on “Governance of Colleges and Universities”<sup>2</sup> is the benchmark by which boards and faculty of responsible institutions have measured their actions for thirty years. Without these standards and others like them, the academies of Plato’s dream morph into cash-and-carry (or charge-and-pay-later) degree-granting Wal-Marts—obedient to marketplace whims, largely staffed by part-timers, where subordination of individual creativity to company policy is the order of the day.

But tenure isn’t the whole story. Tenure is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition to the free pursuit of truth. Faculty control of the curriculum through shared governance and faculty access to due process—to an academic “jury of one’s peers,” if you will—is no less necessary. Together with tenure, they buttress the autonomy of ideas essential to true scholarship, teaching, and learning. Without tenure, shared governance and due process are prone to become a mockery; without due process and shared governance, tenure itself is a shaky victory. As the old song goes, “You can’t have the one without the other.” This message we must communicate to these boards about which we worry, but we must also communicate it to ourselves. All too many a faculty member has shirked with little pang of conscience the responsibilities of college and university service in favor of individual advancement. Moral laxity by no means resides exclusively in board rooms and administrative power centers.

Ultimately, the moral obligation to protect AAUP principles extends beyond the longevital academy to society at large. And that’s as it should be. Make no mistake about it, society is the ultimate beneficiary of what the professoriate does, not the professors. As Fritz Machlup, an economist from Johns Hopkins University and former president of the Association, put the argument some forty years ago:

Society as a whole has much to gain from academic freedom. Since academic freedom promotes intellectual innovation and, indirectly, material as well as intellectual progress, to safeguard it is in the social interest.... Materially, profes-

sors as a group gain from their freedom only as members of society, and at best in proportion to the gains accruing to society.

Ultimately, then, academic freedom is a right of the people, not a privilege of a few; and this situation is not affected by the fact that most people know little about it. It is the people at large who have a right to learn what scholars may succeed in finding out if they are left free and secure from reprobation. It is the people at large who have a right to the cultural and material benefits that may flow from the teaching and the inquiries of scholars who have nothing to fear when they make honest mistakes.<sup>3</sup>

Put more simply if less eloquently, the academy's task is the pursuit, production, and dissemination of knowledge. Society thrives only if the academy is successful in that pursuit. Truth is best pursued in an open academic environment where the pursuer may go where the search takes, unencumbered by the practicality of the moment, unhindered by the prejudices of the time, unfettered by the whims of constituencies. AAUP principles make such an environment possible. When AAUP principles are upheld, the *ultimate* winner is society. When they are violated, the *ultimate* loser, again, is society. This is the message that we in AAUP must take to governing boards, to legislatures, to the public, and to our faculty brothers and sisters. AAUP is the academy's last, best hope for the survival of free learning in a world that's become captive to itself. The mechanisms we protect—academic freedom, due process, shared governance, tenure—are the four cornerstones whose ultimate purpose extends far past the "straw man" of job security. What we defend makes unfettered research and teaching possible for faculty and open classrooms in which students can freely explore and learn. Only by rediscovering that message for ourselves as professionals and driving that message home to those outside our ranks can we protect this tradition.

And do it we must; our debt to the past and our obligation to the future require that we do no less.

Thank you.

<sup>1</sup>American Association of University Professors, *Policy Documents & Reports*, 1995: 3–10.

<sup>2</sup>*Policy Documents & Reports*: 179–85.

<sup>3</sup>Fritz Machlup, "On Some Misconceptions concerning Academic Freedom," *AAUP Bulletin* Winter 1955: 756–57.

("From President-Elect Marius Carriere," *cont. from p. 1*) about what Jeff needs or expects to do, contact him at: jjroberts@tntech.edu or 931-372-6254.

The Conference may have lost some fine committee chairs as a result of our recent elections. Steve Gadbois, for instance, was only filling in for Bob Hughes as chair of Committee A (Academic Freedom & Tenure) and Steve now steps in as vice-president for private institutions. Norma Cook's work with Committee W (Status of Women) may be too much for her to handle now that she is vice-president for public institutions. I would hope there would be some members who would like to get involved in these two committees. If you are interested please contact me at: mcarrier@cbu.edu .

Finally, if there is someone who would like to become the editor of the Newsletter, contact me at my above e-mail address or 901-321-3366. I remember a few years ago that we did, indeed, have a Newsletter editor who did a very good job and I would like to see the Conference reestablish that position.

As you may be able to tell from my first message, I really intend to get as many members involved in the activity of the Conference. The more members who "buy into" the Conference, the stronger the Conference will be. I also expect to spend some time rounding up help for Jeff Roberts in structuring his committee to effectively "lobby" for our Conference. This new structure will also open up new revenues formally used for our paid lobbyist. I know many of our members will have constructive ideas as to how we can best use that money. More active programs and more publications come to mind. I see the Conference continuing its work in monitoring what the UT Board of Regents and the Tennessee Board of Regents do with the post-tenure review process. I also want to work with Steve Gadbois in strengthening our membership among private institutions.

First things first, however. I will be meeting with Bob Glenn in April and will try to learn more about what needs to be done in these first few months of my presidency before the Fall Conference at Middle Tennessee State University. I welcome any and all suggestions and hope that many members will come forward to offer their time and talents.



141 N. Seneca Road  
Oak Ridge, TN 37830-8409