

Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 08:05:03 +1100
From: Doug Cornford <dougcc@uow.edu.au>
X-Accept-Language: en
To: griffd@uow.edu.au
CC: grando@uow.edu.au, all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au,
all_general_staff@uow.edu.au, henrij@uow.edu.au, nteu@uow.edu.au
Subject: Re: Electronic enrolment (Cont.d)
Sender: owner-nteu@uow.edu.au
Lines: 94
Status:

David,

I think the 'us vs them' view might be reinforced by the front page of today's Sydney Morning Herald.

See what you think,
Doug

David Griffiths wrote:

>

>I strongly acknowledge the seriousness of problems such as that alluded to by Gaetano.

>But I do contrast his experience with my own with MATH122 in Norway. That subject was adopted there in close consultation with my Faculty and me as subject coordinator. I have been in regular email (and other) contact with the lecturer and with the course coordinator in Norway. We have in place quality audit procedures that are satisfactory, but we are intent on making them better and linking them with the process of peer review of the teaching of this subject in Wollongong. Incidentally, the subject is also taught in Dubai, where we are establishing the same sorts of processes. And in common with Gaetano, I have to say that this also takes quite a few person-hours.

>

>Too often we get the impression of an us vs them view of academics and administration. I think there are individuals 'on both sides' (an expression I would rather avoid, because of its connotations) who contribute to a climate in which such views may form. But I also hope, and know from personal experience, that the vast majority of administrative and academic staff would rather work together to constructively avoid and resolve such problems. As one of very few academics who have both joined picket lines and served on most major University committees (Council being an obvious exception) at some time during the past 13 years, I feel I know a bit about this place and the people who work here.

>

>David Griffiths

>

>Gaetano Rando wrote:

>>

>>In case anyone is interested another example of administrative bypass was the enrolment of 20 off-shore students in Norway in ELS151 (session 2 / 2000) without any consultation whatsoever with Modern Languages or the Faculty of Arts. When it was noticed that these students weren't coming to class and the matter was investigated it also transpired that the subject they were studying in Norway was by no means equivalent to ELS151. Quite a few person-hours were spent in resolving the matter.

>>

>>Gaetano Rando

>>

>>Henri Jeanjean wrote:

>>

>>>Dear all,

>>>

>>>It appears that, from the responses I received, the problems are still with us and were not rectified. There are even some new developments.

>>>

>>>Some time ago I wrote about the VC's policy of building more buildings and replace people by computers :

>>>« It was decided to build more buildings and upgrade those already existing while, at the same time, getting rid of all the people who were still clinging to their desks, thus wiping out all problems in one go! How marvellously clever!

>>>

>>>Flexible delivery is the buzz word. All those new buildings will be filled with computers which will send the information, automatically mark the work and will even deal with student phone enquiries: If you have understood the lesson press one, if you want a repeat press 2.... »

>>>

>>>Well it seems that we are moving much faster in that direction than expected.

>>>Already academics have been superseded by computers at the enrolment stage ? and I have already received complaints regarding enrolment for this coming session ? but now it would seem that the Academic Registrar Division (ARD) is stepping up the ante: They no longer need academics for the end of the year results.

>>>

>>>I was told that the ARD managed to obtain students, results from the SMP and put them in the Consolidated Results before those marks had been seen by the Heads of Programs or gone to the Exams Committees. Oh, well, there is nothing new in Admin by-passing or disregarding the stipulated procedures.

>>>But what are procedures for ? Senior administrators may multiply them to make life of academics and general staff miserable but they do not feel bound to follow them. We all agree that they are so far above them !

>>>

>>>Coming back after a few months away, it is nice to see that some things do not change and the determination that some senior administrators have to wreck our University is certainly one of them.

>>>

>>>Cheers

>>>

>>>Henri

>>>

>>>PS Please feel free to pass this on to non members and continue to provide me with information!!

Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 09:03:10 +1100

From: Gerard Sutton <gerard@uow.edu.au>

Organization: University of Wollongong

X-Accept-Language: en

To: all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au, all_general_staff@uow.edu.au Subject: Associate Professor Ted Steele

Sender: owner-all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au Lines: 66

Status:

Following is a statement released to the media in response to their enquiries:

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Wollongong, Professor Gerard Sutton, today (26 February 2001) confirmed that Associate Professor Ted Steele, whose claims that he had been instructed to upgrade the honours assessments of two students, has been dismissed from the University.

Professor Sutton said he greatly regretted having to take such action but it was necessary in the light of Associate Professor Steele,s knowingly false allegations undermining the essential fabric of the employment relationship and puts at serious risk the good name of the University.

The University of Wollongong, the first University in the country to win successive Australian University of the Year Awards, has had its reputation placed at a serious and imminent risk as a result of Associate Professor Steele,s claims, the Vice-Chancellor said.

Professor Sutton said Associate Professor Steele,s portrayal in the media as a „whistleblower%00 who has dared to speak out was totally unwarranted as at no time was Associate Professor Steele instructed or directed in any way to upgrade the honours assessments of the two students in question.

The NSW Ombudsman,s Office, recently announced that on the evidence supplied to its Office it ascertained that there had been „no actual instruction and no basis for a perception of being instructed. Further, there was no evidence that the normal honours examining procedure was not followed%00.

At a special meeting of the School of Biological Sciences held on 18 January 2001, 13 of the staff (that is, all except Associate Professor Steele) reaffirmed the process that the school has developed for allocation of honours marks. They confirmed that this process was correctly applied in the cases of the two students.

The Vice-Chancellor stressed that the University administration supports robust debate taking place on issues.

However, Associate Professor Steele's knowingly false allegations, putting at serious risk the good name of the University, are an entirely different matter and go to the heart of the employer/employee relationship.

Associate Professor Steele's dismissal takes effect immediately and is based on clause 59 of the University's Enterprise Bargaining Agreement covering academics.

Issued by: Bernie Goldie, Media Unit, University of Wollongong, (02) 4221 5942.

--

Professor Gerard Sutton
Vice-Chancellor
University of Wollongong
Ph: 61 2 42213932
Fax: 61 2 42271771

Good Universities Guides

AUSTRALIA'S UNIVERSITY OF THE YEAR

2000-2001 Joint Winner - Preparing Graduates for the e-World 1999-2000 Joint

Winner - Outstanding R&D Partnerships X-Sender: bmartin@pop.uow.edu.au

Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 11:23:05 +1100

To: Forums and Debates <forums_and_debates@uow.edu.au> From: Brian Martin
<bmartin@uow.edu.au>

Subject: Ted Steele's dismissal

Sender: owner-forums_and_debates@uow.edu.au Lines: 77

Status:

27 February 2001

*** Comments re the dismissal of Ted Steele ***

In an intellectual community, the accepted way to respond to contrary views is with evidence and arguments. This holds even when the contrary views are widely rejected as false. Free speech means little unless it includes the right to be incorrect.

From what I know about the case, I believe Ted Steele's claims about upgrading of marks in the Department of Biological Sciences are wrong or at least seriously misleading. Indeed, the department's procedures might stand as a model of rigour for others to emulate. Ted's continued comments no doubt have damaged the reputation of the department and the university. Nevertheless, I believe the most appropriate way to respond is for department members (and others) to present their case in full and forceful terms, as indeed they have done.

In short, in a free society the response to false and damaging speech should be more speech.

Unfortunately, Ted's sudden dismissal will give the appearance that commercial concerns are more important than free speech and that the university is more a commercial entity than an intellectual community. Ironically, this is precisely the point that Ted was making.

The best way to change this situation is for more university staff and students to speak out on issues of social significance.

Brian Martin

X-Sender: rg03@pop.uow.edu.au

Date: Tue, 27 Feb 2001 13:34:16 -0800

To: Brian Martin <bmartin@uow.edu.au>

From: rg03@uow.edu.au

Subject: "Very Courageous"

Lines: 56

Status:

Brian,

As Sir Humphrey said to his Minister, "that's very courageous of you".

Do you think the VC might be trying to head off complaints to the forthcoming Senate inquiry with a ruthless example? "Strike Ted down while we've got the Ombudsman on side, and it will terrify the rest of them into silence".

I agree with what you say. Ted was a spent force anyway once the Ombudsman ruled against him. Now they've made him a martyr and by firing a "whistleblower" they've probably done more damage to the university's reputation than he did.

As I said, very courageous Brian.

By the way. Would you be willing to be a referee for me on a postdoc application to UTS? I'm putting the proposal together now. If you're willing, I'll send you the proposal as soon as I've finished it.

Richard

*** Comments re the dismissal of Ted Steele ***

In an intellectual community, the accepted way to respond to contrary views is with evidence and arguments. This holds even when the contrary views are widely rejected as false. Free speech means little unless it includes the right to be incorrect.

From what I know about the case, I believe Ted Steele's claims about upgrading of marks in the Department of Biological Sciences are wrong or at least seriously misleading. Indeed, the department's procedures might stand as a model of rigour for others to emulate. Ted's continued comments no doubt have damaged the reputation of the department and the university. Nevertheless, I believe the most appropriate way to respond is for department members (and others) to present their case in full and forceful terms, as indeed they have done.

In short, in a free society the response to false and damaging speech should be more speech.

Unfortunately, Ted's sudden dismissal will give the appearance that commercial concerns are more important than free speech and that the university is more a commercial entity than an intellectual community. Ironically, this is precisely the point that Ted was making.

The best way to change this situation is for more university staff and students to speak out on issues of social significance.

Brian Martin

Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 11:12:24 +1100

From: David Edelman <davide@uow.edu.au>

Organization: University of Wollongong

X-Accept-Language: en,pdf

To: all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au

Subject: FYI (Reminder)

Sender: owner-all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au Lines: 13

Status:

Enterprise Agreement 2001-2003

17.1 The parties to this Agreement are committed to the protection and promotion of intellectual freedom within the University. Staff members have a right to:

c. participate in public debates and express opinions, including unpopular or controversial opinions about issues and ideas;

without fear of harassment, intimidation or unfair treatment.X-Sender:

mrw@pop.uow.edu.au

Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 12:22:51 +1100

To: aashbolt@uow.edu.au

From: mrw@uow.edu.au (Mark Wilson)

Subject: Re: Managerial fascism

Cc: all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au
Sender: owner-all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au Lines: 65
Status:

Anthony,

It was predicable that there would be at least one email of this type in the wake of the Steele dismissal. I don't think you will find too many on this campus who will argue with the right of all to "have their say" and with the value of "freedom of speech", "academic freedom", "expression of views", etc. It is a given that these are vital aspects of life within this organisation that we must all support and defend. However, and this is the crunch, with these freedoms comes an associated responsibility. The responsibility to, above all else, maintain a credible link with the truth of the matter, whatever it is. To hoist the banner of academic freedom over ANY statement that might be made by a member of this University, regardless of whether it is based on fact, is to do the cause of "freedom of speech" here (or anywhere) a serious disservice.

At this time, I think it is critical that if people are to form judgements of what has happened here at UoW, that they take the time to be informed of the detail of what was said (and its relationship to the truth) before making any assumptions.

Mark Wilson

>Colleagues,

>As our Vice Chancellor acts like a fascist dictator (and I am not using that term loosely), we academic staff remain curiously silent. The precedent established in the Steele case is appalling. It sends a clear signal out to us that if we dare speak up in a way which might bring this University into disrepute (whatever that means) our jobs are on the line. This raises severe questions about the nature of academic freedom today. It is an issue which must be confronted. And ultimately it is an issue of managerial fascism which is infecting universities throughout Australia. If we are silent witnesses to the erosion of academic freedom and the concomitant growth of managerial fascism, we are complicit in a great crime. Not only that but we are fools because the security of all our jobs is in question. As James Baldwin wrote so eloquently in a letter to Angela Davis thirty years ago : "If we know, and do nothing, we are worse than the murderers hired in our name...For, if they take you in the morning, they will be coming for us that night". regards

>Anthony Ashbolt

>History & Politics

>

><!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en"> <html>

>Colleagues,

>
As our Vice Chancellor acts like a fascist dictator (and I am not using that term loosely), we academic staff remain curiously silent. The precedent established in the Steele case is appalling. It sends a clear signal out to us that if we dare speak up in a way which might bring this University into disrepute (whatever that means) our jobs are on the line. This raises severe questions about the nature of

academic freedom today. It is an issue which must be confronted. And ultimately it is an issue of managerial fascism which is infecting universities throughout Australia. If we are silent witnesses to the erosion of academic freedom and the concomitant growth of managerial fascism, we are complicit in a great crime. Not only that but we are fools because the security of all our jobs is in question. As James Baldwin wrote so eloquently in a letter to Angela Davis thirty years ago : "If we know, and do nothing, we are worse than the murderers hired in our name...For, if they take you in the morning, they will be coming for us that night".
regards

>
Anthony Ashbolt
History & Politics</html>

Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 11:59:31 +1000

From: Anthony Ashbolt <Anthoiny_Ashbolt@uow.edu.au> Reply-To:

aashbolt@uow.edu.au

Organization: University of Wollongong

X-Accept-Language: en

To: all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au

Subject: Managerial fascism

Sender: owner-all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au Lines: 53

Status:

Colleagues,

As our Vice Chancellor acts like a fascist dictator (and I am not using that term loosely), we academic staff remain curiously silent. The precedent established in the Steele case is appalling. It sends a clear signal out to us that if we dare speak up in a way which might bring this University into disrepute (whatever that means) our jobs are on the line. This raises severe questions about the nature of academic freedom today. It is an issue which must be confronted. And ultimately it is an issue of managerial fascism which is infecting universities throughout Australia. If we are silent witnesses to the erosion of academic freedom and the concomitant growth of managerial fascism, we are complicit in a great crime. Not only that but we are fools because the security of all our jobs is in question. As James Baldwin wrote so eloquently in a letter to Angela Davis thirty years ago : "If we know, and do nothing, we are worse than the murderers hired in our name...For, if they take you in the morning, they will be coming for us that night". regards

Anthony Ashbolt

History & PoliticsDate: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 13:35:58 +1100

From: Robert Jones <rjones@uow.edu.au>

X-Accept-Language: en

To: all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au

Subject: Our University's Reputation

Sender: owner-all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au Lines: 17

Status:

Dear Colleagues

People get sacked at this University for behaviour which tarnishes the reputation of the institution.

Over the past 24 hours I have read media headlines and reports which refer to our university using terms such as "sacking a whistleblower", "suppressing dissent", and acting like an "Eastern European dictatorship".

Who should bear the responsibility for this latest instance of tarnishing the reputation of our university?

Should they be sacked?

Bob JonesX-Sender: bmartin@pop.uow.edu.au
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 14:50:39 +1100
To: Forums and Debates <forums_and_debates@uow.edu.au> From: Brian Martin <bmartin@uow.edu.au>
Subject: Ted Steele dismissal
Sender: owner-forums_and_debates@uow.edu.au Lines: 110
Status:

28 February 2001

*** More comments on dismissal of Ted Steele ***

Should a university be a place where diverse views are tolerated, even if they are uncomfortable, and debated? It is easy to answer "yes" in the abstract, but in practice it is a challenge to tolerate extremely awkward people.

In his statement about Ted Steele's dismissal, the Vice-Chancellor says that Ted made "knowingly false allegations". How can anyone but Ted determine whether Ted's allegations were made "knowingly"?

We do know that all his colleagues in Biological Sciences rejected Ted's claims about upgrading of marks and that the Deputy Ombudsman, in declining to investigate further, found no evidence of procedural flaws in determining the honours marks. This is powerful testimony that Ted was wrong in his claims. Nevertheless, it is still quite possible that Ted has always been quite sincere in making his allegations.

I commented in an earlier email (18 January) that Ted appears to approach the issues using a different mind set from his colleagues. He seems to think that the mark given by the external, "expert" marker should be definitive, and that averaging in marks by others, not to mention coursework components of the honours course, amounts to "upgrading". This mode of thinking can be explained if Ted believes he has direct access to the truth about a student's ability, a truth that should solely determine the honours mark.

The position taken by all other academic staff in Biological Sciences is consistent with a belief that the procedures themselves are the means for determining a student's honours performance and that no one has special access to truth about ability (as

contrasted with performance). Furthermore, a student could legitimately complain if formal procedures were not followed.

Ted seems to be obstinate in refusing to accept his colleagues' perspective. But this need not be interpreted as knowingly making false allegations. An alternative interpretation is that Ted sees the world with a different set of assumptions than most others.

I happen to disagree with Ted's way of thinking in this case. But that does not mean he should be fair game for sacking.

Brian Martin

Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 15:35:41 +1100

From: Henry Collier <collier@uow.edu.au> Organization: University of Wollongong

X-Accept-Language: en,pdf

To: Mark Wilson <mrw@uow.edu.au>

CC: aashbolt@uow.edu.au, all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au Subject: Re: Managerial fascism

Sender: owner-all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au Lines: 19

Status:

One might question the independence of Associate Professor Mark Wilson of the Department of Biological Sciences in these important matters.

It would appear to me that there are two issues forming as a result of the actions of UOW administration. One is the sacking of A/P Ted Steele, and the second is the examination of 'quality' within the university system.

The personalisation of the 'sacking' draws attention away from the issues of academic freedom, the right to question and debate important issues, and the original issues of integrity and quality in our university. I think that all of us must keep the issues squarely in front of us, and not be led into an individual's rights highly personalised set of debates about the 'truth' of Ted Steele's statements.

With regard

Henry Collier, Sr Lecturer

Department of Accounting and Finance Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 15:43:20 +1100

From: Henry Collier <collier@uow.edu.au> Organization: University of Wollongong

X-Accept-Language: en,pdf

To: Brian Martin <bmartin@uow.edu.au>

Subject: a comment on your analysis ...

Lines: 24

Status:

>We do know that all his colleagues in Biological Sciences rejected Ted's claims about upgrading of marks and that the Deputy Ombudsman, in declining to investigate

further, found no evidence of procedural flaws in determining the honours marks. This is powerful testimony that Ted was wrong in his claims.

i disagree. what i think that the ombudsman's office (oo) found was that there was a procedure and that it was followed. the oo did *NOT* comment on the process itself, only that one existed and appeared to be followed. The oo specifically, i believe, said that they were not about to challenge the judgements of the 'subject matter' experts. What the oo fails to recognise that the faculty members in the department of biological sciences were NOT experts in the student's areas of research. In fact they had to go outside the university to find another 'expert' to review Steele's marks.

there are CLEAR and obvious cases of ungrading marks in almost every class in our department of accounting and finance ... vitrually EVERY mark of 48 is raised to 50 and therefore to passing. there is a systematic ungrading of marks at all levels .. those with 80 someteims are upgraded to HD's, and so on ... 63 become 65 .. and so on ...

henryX-Sender: mrw@pop.uow.edu.au
Date: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 16:13:11 +1100
To: Henry Collier <collier@uow.edu.au>
From: mrw@uow.edu.au (Mark Wilson)
Subject: Re: Managerial fascism
Cc: all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au
Sender: owner-all_academic_staff@uow.edu.au Lines: 38
Status:

Henry,

You are free to "question" my (or anyone else's) "independence" on this or any other issue. However, the assertion (and from you it appears an inference) is being made that this particular sacking is an example of an unjustified restriction of "academic freedom". My comments were directed to this point and stand. Truth, last I looked, was a powerful defense. My comments merely suggested that people consider the facts, not newspaper articles or heresay; this will not require people to rely on my say-so. Freedom brings with it responsibility. Without that responsibility we have only a slanging match and everyone suffers. It would be invalid to side-step this important issue while at the same time citing the Steele case to support an argument of "repression of freedom of expression".

Mark Wilson

>One might question the independence of Associate Professor Mark Wilson of the Department of Biological Sciences in these important matters.

>

>It would appear to me that there are two issues forming as a result of the actions of UOW administration. One is the sacking of A/P Ted Steele, and the second is the examination of 'quality' within the university system.

>

>The personalisation of the 'sacking' draws attention away from the issues of academic freedom, the right to question and debate important issues, and the original issues of integrity and quality in our university. I think that all of us must keep the issues squarely in front of us, and not be led into an individual's rights highly personalised set of debates about the 'truth' of Ted Steele's statements.

>

>With regard

>Henry Collier, Sr Lecturer

>Department of Accounting and FinanceDate: Wed, 28 Feb 2001 19:54:03 +1100

From: Ron Perrin <rperrin@uow.edu.au>

Organization: University of Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia X-Accept-

Language: en

To: nteu <nteu@uow.edu.au>

Subject: Defending our Enterprise Agreement Sender: owner-nteu@uow.edu.au

Lines: 65

Status:

Dear Members

This week the Vice Chancellor has displayed his utter contempt for the provisions of our Enterprise Agreement. Section 61 sets forth a mandatory process to be followed before an employee can be dismissed. You can read it for yourself on the web.

The Vice Chancellor has acted as if those provisions and protections against executive fiat did not exist.

Your Union is taking action at the national, state and branch level to enforce the provisions of the Enterprise Bargain Agreement. While the Vice Chancellor has justified his actions by reference, among other things, to findings by the office of the NSW Ombudsman and damage to the reputation of the university and its academic staff, this cannot in any way whatsoever, absolve him of the responsibility to adhere to a legally binding agreement between the management and academic staff of this University. This branch's campaign must focus on the Vice Chancellor's disregard for the legally binding terms of the enterprise agreement.

We cannot and will not avoid this confrontation - the stakes are so enormously high because if this action by the VC were to become an accepted precedent then notions of enforcing agreements and of job security would be worthless - not just here at Wollongong but nationally throughout the sector.

Lastly, I cannot let the will, determination and sacrifices that you showed in the 2 year struggle to win a fair and equitable enterprise agreement come to nought. I hope that I and your executive can rely upon you when we need help in this matter. Despite the blatant and unconscionable breach of the enterprise agreement, we are still headed for some very difficult times in enforcing our rights so let's stick together.

Ron Perrin

NTEU Branch President

Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii;

name="ronald_perrin.vcf"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Description: Card for Ron Perrin Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="ronald_perrin.vcf"

Attachment converted: Macintosh HD:ronald_perrin.vcf (TEXT/MSWD)

(00047CA8)Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 13:35:06 +1100

From: Greg Melleuish <gmelleui@uow.edu.au> Reply-To: gmelleui@uow.edu.au

Organization: University of Wollongong

X-Accept-Language: en

To: "arts_all@uow.edu.au" <arts_all@uow.edu.au> Subject: Faculty of Science report

Sender: owner-Arts_All@uow.edu.au

Lines: 28

Status:

Dear Arts all,

I attended the 1st Faculty of Science meeting of 2001 last friday 2 March. It was their 1st meeting since august 2000. Of interest were the following:

Enrolments for 2001 were not brilliant and the faculty had an enrolment of 170 out of a quota of 240. However the Dean did not seem all that concerned and stated that around 200 would be OK for the faculty. Lower enrolments were blamed on recent bad publicity. The faculty was running a deficit of around \$200,000. Again the Dean did not seem overly concerned as this was an improvement on the \$400,000 that had been mooted and there were apparently some 'salary savings' about to be made.

The faculty was involved in an arrangement with Caringbah High whereby it would offer extension courses for the talented senior students. This is seen as a way of attracting good quality science students to Wollongong. Overall Science is much more involved in the schools than Arts as it seeks to incese its numbers.

Greg Melleuish

--

Dr Gregory Melleuish,
Associate Professor,
History and Politics Program,
University of Wollongong.

2522, NSW, Australia.

+61 242 214395

fax +61 242 214837

webpage <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/staff/gmelleuish/index.html>X-Sender:

bmartin@pop.uow.edu.au

Date: Mon, 5 Mar 2001 15:05:03 +1100

To: Forums and Debates <forums_and_debates@uow.edu.au> From: Brian Martin

<bmartin@uow.edu.au>

Subject: Learning lessons from academic disputes Sender: owner-
forums_and_debates@uow.edu.au Lines: 144
Status:

5 March 2001

Will the dismissal of Ted Steele become one of the most well known academic disputes in Australian history? Time will tell. In any case, it can be useful to study some other cases in order to gain insights. Here are a few of national or local prominence with which I'm familiar and for which considerable documentation is available.

* Professor Sydney Orr, dismissed from the University of Tasmania in 1956. See W. H. C. Eddy, *Orr* (Brisbane: Jacaranda Press, 1961); John Polya and Robert Solomon, *Dreyfus in Australia* (Australia: The authors, 1996); Cassandra Pybus, *Gross Moral Turpitude: The Orr Case Reconsidered* (Melbourne: William Heinemann Australia, 1993).

* Professor Clyde Manwell, attempted dismissal from the University of Adelaide beginning in 1971. See Brian Martin et al. (eds.), *Intellectual Suppression: Australian Case Histories, Analysis and Responses* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1986), pp. 87-122.

* Dr Jeremy Evans, attempted tenure denial at the Australian National University beginning in 1979. See Brian Martin, *Suppression Stories* (Wollongong: Fund for Intellectual Dissent, 1997), chapter 1, <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/dissent/documents/ss/>.

* Dr Michael Spautz, dismissed from the University of Newcastle in 1980. See Brian Martin, "Disruption and due process: the dismissal of Dr. Spautz from the University of Newcastle", *Vestes*, Vol. 26, No. 1, 1983, pp. 3-9; "Plagiarism and responsibility", *Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration*, Vol. 6, No. 2, October 1984, pp. 183-190.

* Dr David Rindos, denied tenure at the University of Western Australia in 1993. See <http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~hjarvis/rindos.html>.

Here are a few of the many points that arise from these cases.

* Some (but not all) of the individuals concerned were "difficult personalities". Of course, a great many who gain tenure and are not dismissed also fit this category. It is a constant risk to reduce the issues to matters of personality. I know from experience that it is much easier to get a grip on the issues of principle involved if one is at a distance from the personality dynamics.

* Procedural issues played a major role in the disputes.

* The cases lasted many years and had a large impact on many people, in terms of both emotion and time involved.

* Whatever the rights and wrongs of the decisions made, the cases had a damaging effect on the institutions involved, both internally and externally.

Can we expect that university administrators will study these and other academic disputes so that they can avoid the mistakes of the past?

Brian Martin

Date: Mon, 05 Mar 2001 19:57:25 +1100

From: Henry Collier <collier@uow.edu.au> Organization: University of Wollongong

X-Accept-Language: en, pdf

To: Brian Martin <bmartin@uow.edu.au>, forums_and_debates@uow.edu.au Subject:

Re: Learning lessons from academic disputes Lines: 91

Status:

yeah, well brian KNOWS the consequences of the Rindos inquiries ... Rindos is dead ... administrative incompetence and lack of management ability creates hassles. The make work filling in the forms, the denial of access to public documents, and the brutality of the administration of UWA (let alone their incredible ability to create the 'truth') are lessons never learned by the Hitler's and the despots of the halls of academia. The rules of law do not apply here, only the power of the guards ... this is an issue of obedience, not of integrity ...

there is more than a little chest puffing here ... silence the messengers and all will be well ... crap! ... admin has been trying to get rid of ted steele for YEARS now, and they finally sacked him ... for what you say? for telling the truth? for exposing the weak underbelly of the selling of credentials? for reporting on declining academic standards? for spite?

for the glory of the flag? what price glory?

cheers,
henry

cheers
henry

Brian Martin wrote:

>

>5 March 2001

>

>Will the dismissal of Ted Steele become one of the most well known academic disputes in Australian history? Time will tell. In any case, it can be useful to study some other cases in order to gain insights. Here are a few of national or local prominence with which I'm familiar and for which considerable documentation is available.

>

>*****

>

>* Professor Sydney Orr, dismissed from the University of Tasmania in 1956. See W. H. C. Eddy, Orr (Brisbane: Jacaranda Press, 1961); John Polya and Robert Solomon, Dreyfus in Australia (Australia: The authors, 1996); Cassandra Pybus, Gross Moral Turpitude: The Orr Case Reconsidered (Melbourne: William Heinemann Australia, 1993).

>

>* Professor Clyde Manwell, attempted dismissal from the University of Adelaide beginning in 1971. See Brian Martin et al. (eds.), Intellectual Suppression: Australian Case Histories, Analysis and Responses (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1986), pp. 87-122.

>

>* Dr Jeremy Evans, attempted tenure denial at the Australian National University beginning in 1979. See Brian Martin, Suppression Stories (Wollongong: Fund for Intellectual Dissent, 1997), chapter 1, <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/dissent/documents/ss/>.

>

>* Dr Michael Spautz, dismissed from the University of Newcastle in 1980. See Brian Martin, "Disruption and due process: the dismissal of Dr. Spautz from the University of Newcastle", Vestes, Vol. 26, No. 1, 1983, pp. 3-9; "Plagiarism and responsibility", Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration, Vol. 6, No. 2, October 1984, pp. 183-190.

>

>* Dr David Rindos, denied tenure at the University of Western Australia in 1993. See

><http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~hjarvis/rindos.html>.

>

>*****

>

>Here are a few of the many points that arise from these cases.

>

>* Some (but not all) of the individuals concerned were "difficult personalities". Of course, a great many who gain tenure and are not dismissed also fit this category. It is a constant risk to reduce the issues to matters of personality. I know from experience that it is much easier to get a grip on the issues of principle involved if one is at a distance from the personality dynamics.

>

>* Procedural issues played a major role in the disputes.

>

>* The cases lasted many years and had a large impact on many people, in terms of both emotion and time involved.

>

>* Whatever the rights and wrongs of the decisions made, the cases had a damaging effect on the institutions involved, both internally and externally.

>

>*****

>

>Can we expect that university administrators will study these and other academic disputes so that they can avoid the mistakes of the past?

>

>Brian Martin