

PRO BONO

Newsletter of the Law and Society Division of
the Society for the Study of Social Problems

Winter 2007
Volume 13 Number 1



Chair: Lloyd Klein, Criminal Justice Department, Grambling State University, Grambling, LA 71245. E-mail: kleinl@gram.edu

Editor: Jen Girgen, PhD student, School of Criminology & Criminal Justice, Florida State University, The Hecht House, 634 W. Call St., Tallahassee, FL 32306. E-mail: jkg0344@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Notes from the Chair

Belated New Year's greetings from Grambling State University, home of former football coach Eddie Robinson's Grambling Tigers and the famous Grambling Tiger Marching Band (the band performed at the 2007 Rose Bowl Parade). It is a pleasure to guide the Law and Society Division over the next two years. Our Vice-Chair Cary Federman and newsletter editor Jen Girgen join me in welcoming you. My thanks to Otis Grant and Kimberly Richman for their superb job in guiding this division during the past two years.

We have a busy program planned for the upcoming 2007 SSSP Meeting. The Law and Society Division will organize three sessions and co-sponsor another fourteen sessions. The full list of sessions and session organizers is printed elsewhere in this newsletter. Please consider submitting an abstract or paper for one of our many sessions. The final submission deadline is January 31. We really need your support for the viability of our part of the conference program.

We will conduct the Lindesmith Graduate Student Paper Competition. Graduate students and untenured faculty can submit a paper written within the last year. The winner will receive a banquet ticket and a plaque. This newsletter contains an announcement with all the details.

I want to call your attention to some features contained in this issue of the newsletter. Besides the aforementioned call

for papers and Lindesmith competition announcement, we have two interesting essays. Tom Guild offers an interesting perspective on academic freedom and academia. Tom is Emeritus Professor of Law from the University of Central Oklahoma and current law professor at Oklahoma City University. In addition, Emily Horowitz, criminal justice professor at St. Francis College, has contributed an essay on same sex marriages. We also have announcements for a criminal justice position, information on how to contribute toward the Justice 21 Project, and an invitation for contributions to an ASA Teaching Resources product.

I need your help on an important matter. Back in 1997, the SSSP published a document with statements from each division and a suggested reading list of books best representing research in that division's social problems area. We are asked to provide an update on this material. Please read the full announcement printed in this newsletter and respond with suggestions for the division statement and suggested bibliography. We need the information by early February.

Essays, announcements, and other materials are welcome for future issues of the Law and Society Division newsletter. Send me any announcements or suggestions for prospective essays or other newsletters features. This is your newsletter and we want your input. Deadline for submissions to the Spring newsletter is April 10.

Lloyd Klein
Division Chair

2007 Annual Meeting

Law and Society Division Sponsored Sessions

Session 1: Community Responses to 9/11: A Practitioner View

Organizer: Charles Trent
W: 212-960-0822; trent@ymail.yu.edu

Session 2: Race, Police and the Law -
THEMATIC

Organizer: Suzanne Lea
W: 202-448-7184; suzanne.lea@gallaudet.edu

Session 3: History, Sociology and the Law

Organizer: Adam Jacobs
W: 608-262-2921; ajacobs@ssc.wisc.edu

The deadline for submission of papers/abstracts to session organizers or the Program Committee Chair is **January 31, 2007.**

Law and Society Division Co-Sponsored Sessions

Session 8: Drug, Crime and Punishment -
THEMATIC (Crime and Juvenile Delinquency;
Drinking and Drugs; and Law and Society)

Organizer: Paul D. Steele
W: 606-783-2254; pd.steele@morehead-st.edu

Session 11: Crime and the Environment:
Activists on the Frontline Speak Out (Crime
and Juvenile Delinquency; Environment and
Technology; and Law and Society)

Organizer: Steve Lang
W: 718-482-6090; slang@lagcc.cuny.edu

Session 13: 9/11: Police and Police Response
(Crime and Juvenile Delinquency and Law and
Society)

Organizer: Lloyd Klein
W: 318-274-3309; kleinl@gram.edu

Session 14: Crime, Justice and Incarceration
(Crime and Juvenile Delinquency and Law and
Society)

Organizer: Jodie Lawston
W: 760-750-4623; jlawston@csusm.edu

Session 15: Prisoner Reentry (Crime and
Juvenile Delinquency and Law and Society)

Organizer: Kris Paap
W: 315-792-7437; kris.paap@sunyit.edu

Session 16: Terrorism and Public Policy: The
Aftermath of 9/11 (Crime and Juvenile
Delinquency and Law and Society)

Organizer: Charles Trent
W: 212-960-0822; trent@ymail.yu.edu

Session 17: Violent Offenders, Victims, and
Community/ Organizational Responses (Crime
and Juvenile Delinquency and Law and
Society)

Organizer: Stephen J. Morewitz
W: 415-252-0569; morewitz@earthlink.net

Session 18: NYC, Race, and Crime (Crime and
Juvenile Delinquency; Law and Society; and
Racial and Ethnic Minorities)

Organizer: Cary Federman
W: 973-655-7897;
federmanc@mail.montclair.edu

Session 19: Law and Sexuality (Crime and
Juvenile Delinquency; Law and Society; and
Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities)

Organizer: Lloyd Klein
W: 318-274-3309; kleinl@gram.edu

(continued on following page)

Session 20: Sex Offenders and the Legal System (Crime and Juvenile Delinquency; Law and Society; and Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities)

Organizer: Lloyd Klein

W: 318-274-3309; kleinl@gram.edu

Session 32: Environmental Law, Policy and Practice: Insights on Environmental Decision Making (Environment and Technology and Law and Society)

Organizer: Tamara Mix

W: 405-744-6125; tamara.mix@okstate.edu

Session 34: Same-Sex Marriage Across Borders (Family and Law and Society)

Organizer: Melanie Heath

W: 713-348-5516; melanieheath@rice.edu

Session 35: Camouflaging Sexual Behavior and Families (Family; Law and Society; and Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities)

Organizer: Cheryl Boudreaux

W: 616-331-2164; boudreac@gvsu.edu

Session 51: Teaching Social Policy - THEMATIC (Law and Society and Teaching Social Problems)

Organizer: Otis Grant

W: 574-520-4157; ogrant@iusb.edu

Alfred R. Lindesmith Award

The Alfred R. Lindesmith Award is annually given to the best paper presented at the previous year's (2006) SSSP annual meeting that is law-related and written by one or more untenured faculty and/or graduate students(s) and has not been accepted for publication prior to presentation at the SSSP meeting. If your paper or that of a friend meets these criteria, please submit it via hard copy and e-mail to: Cary Federman, Vice Chair, SSSP Law and Society Division, Department of Justice Studies, 350 Dickson Hall, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ 07043, federmanc@mail.montclair.edu. The winner will receive a plaque and a ticket to the SSSP awards banquet.

The deadline to apply for the Alfred R. Lindesmith Award is **April 1, 2007**.

2007 PROGRAM PARTICIPATION SCHEDULE	
Deadline for submission of papers/abstracts to session organizers or the Program Committee Chair	January 31, 2007
Participants must be notified by the session organizer of acceptance or referral of paper/proposal	February 19, 2007
Session/paper titles and contact information for each author must be in the Executive Office	March 1, 2007
Preliminary programs will be mailed to all current members	May 15, 2007
2007 Annual Meeting, Roosevelt Hotel, New York, NY	August 10-12, 2007
Deadline for names of session organizers for the 2008 Annual Meeting	September 17, 2007

Essays

The Range and Extent of Academic Freedom and Tenure for Faculty Members in the Academy*

Thomas Guild, Visiting Professor of Management
Oklahoma City University
tguild@okcu.edu
(405) 208-5532

We hear a lot about academic freedom and tenure in and out of the academy. However, there are quite a few misconceptions about their purpose and about what they do and do not cover. Therefore, I provide answers to some commonly asked questions and discuss the role of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in promoting and protecting academic freedom and tenure. Answers to these questions are supplied by referring to selected portions of the Ninth Edition of the *Policy Documents & Reports of the American Association of University Professors* published in 2001 and distributed by The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Does tenure protect academicians from dismissal when they have done something wrong? No, anyone can be dismissed for adequate cause (p. 4).
- Do academic freedom and tenure support faculty members' right to show pornographic pictures and paintings or engage in lewd or nude play on campus? Government imposition on artistic expression because of propriety, ideology or religion is an act of censorship (p. 36). However, if a work taken as a whole is legally obscene as defined by the U.S. Supreme Court it loses its first amendment free speech protection (*Miller v. California*, 1973).
- Don't the legislature and the governor have a right to determine what universities do? No. It is an intrusion on academic freedom (p. 297).
- Isn't it true that faculty should not speak in ways that seriously offend the public and the politicians? No. It is better for students to think about heresies than not to think at all (p. 299).
- Can the campus chapter of the KKK or another provocative group hold a rally on campus? Yes. On a campus that is free and open, no idea can be banned or forbidden. No viewpoint or message may be deemed so hateful or disturbing that it may not be expressed (p. 37).
- Recently administrators at some colleges have changed grades for certain students. Is this appropriate? No. Under no circumstances should administrative officers on their own authority substitute their judgment for that of the faculty concerning the assignment of a grade (p. 114).
- Can a college or university delimit what a faculty member can say about education generally or about the operations of their own institution? No. The right of a faculty member to speak on general educational questions or about the administration and operations of the individual's own institution is a part of that person's right as a citizen and should not be abridged by the institution (p. 219).
- Who has the greatest influence in teaching and learning in an institution? Since the faculty has primary responsibility for the teaching and research done in the institution, the faculty's voice on matters having to do with teaching and research should be given the greatest weight (p. 225).

Institutions of higher education are for the common good. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition. Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Tenure is a means to certain ends; i.e., academic freedom and economic security. Hence, tenure is indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society (p. 3).

The faculty member has a right to speak and write as a citizen, free from institutional censorship or discipline. However, the faculty member has a special obligation to be accurate, to exercise appropriate restraint, to show respect for the opinions of others, and to make every effort to indicate that he is not speaking for the institution (p. 32)

The AAUP asserts that you cannot adequately prepare students in an environment where the faculty members have no agency and control. The AAUP statement on Government of Colleges and Universities in 1966 is meant to establish a balance of powers to protect the institutional structure against improper intrusions (p. 215).

The local AAUP Chapter provides recommended policy and a forum for members. Also, it collects pertinent data, disseminates information, and challenges the status quo when it threatens to undermine the ability of the academy to carry out its responsibilities. This can be done through regularly scheduled meetings of the chapter and events planned by the chapter. The chapter can collect data by doing an evaluation of administrators and releasing the results or by providing grievance information. The chapter can disseminate information through press releases and a chapter newsletter and web site. The chapter can challenge the status quo by helping to get AAUP recommendations institutionalized and press releases.

Additional AAUP recommended policies are as follows:

The faculty should have the primary responsibility to determine the curriculum and procedures or the general educational policy for student instruction

The faculty should be involved in the internal operations of the institution and frame and help execute long-range plans, such as decisions regarding the use of resources such as buildings and facilities. The faculty should be involved in the budget process by choosing short and long-range priorities and by receiving reports on current budgets and expenditures. Faculty should have input on presidential selection and the deans and other chief academic officers should be selected with appropriate faculty advice. The president should have the confidence of the faculty (p. 221). Faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases (p. 234).

Department chairs should be selected in conformity with the department members' judgments. The chair should not have tenure in office but a stated fixed term (p. 222). Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty. Affective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication. There is a distinction between communication and decision-making responsibility.

Faculty responsibilities include curriculum, subject matter, methods of research, faculty status and aspects of student life related to the education process are primarily faculty responsibilities (p. 221). Faculty should teach undergraduates no more than 12 hours per week and graduates no more than 9 hours per week.

The source of academic freedom is from Germany in the 19th century. The three basic rights are to write and teach with neither censorship nor an imposed curriculum (p. 3); the right of the student to pursue knowledge according to personal taste and method within university holding no authority save that of specifying qualifications for degrees; and the right of the university to be dissociated from state control and to be self governing.

In America, populism set much of the background for debates about the liberty of inquiry. Teachers should have the right to free speech without the fear of losing their jobs and to express views which should be acceptable if they would not otherwise constitute a transgression of the

rules of civil society. Academic freedom includes the full freedom to conduct research and to publish the results of one's research; freedom in the classroom to discuss their subject and freedom as a citizen from institutional censorship or discipline. A faculty member's expression of opinion as a citizen cannot constitute grounds for dismissal unless it clearly demonstrates the faculty member's unfitness for the position (p. 32).

Academic freedom is a right protected by the first amendment. Academic freedom is essential because it is fundamental to the advancement of truth; to the rights of the teacher in teaching; and to the rights of the student in learning. Academic freedom allows for the examination of controversial issues, questioning assumptions, pushing the envelope; taking unpopular stands (p. 5); and taking part in the political process consistent with effective service as teachers and scholars (p. 33). It is the responsibility of a scholar to not intrude material not related to the topic of the course (p. 3); present the course material as it was advertised in the catalogue and the syllabus; respect the academic rights of others; and to not condone abuses of the academic freedom of others. Because faculty members occupy a special position in the community and the public may judge their profession and institution by their utterances they must be accurate at all times, exercise appropriate restraint and indicate that they are not speaking for the institution (p. 32).

Tenure is held in the institution and not in one's department of specialty. The terms of tenure should be specified in writing in the offer letter before appointment (p. 4). A faculty member should not serve more than seven years on probation (p. 4). Tenure provides economic security (p. 3) that is needed to exercise free speech and is necessary to provide economic security. Non-tenure track appointments do damage to academic freedom by providing little protection or incentive to take risks, which creates an insecure class of faculty whose employment status is inferior. Proponents argue that tenure is needed to assure academic freedom in teaching and research and that tenure is similar to insurance in that academicians accept a lower salary in exchange for "insurance" against wrongful discharge (Metzger and Smith, 1998).

Professors at private institutions have no legally enforceable right to academic freedom unless it can be found in the professors' employment contracts (Byrne, 1994). Several U.S. Supreme Court cases have found that the first amendment protects college professors' academic freedom at state institutions (*Keyishian v. Board of Regents*, 1967). To adequately protect academic freedom at private institutions would require both tenure and an explicit guarantee of academic freedom in professors' contracts or in an enforceable document such as a faculty handbook which is incorporated by reference in the professors' contracts. During the McCarthy era and the Vietnam War tenure was seen by many as necessary to protect faculty members from retaliation for their political beliefs and activities. By 1998 things had calmed down and the necessity of protecting academic freedom through a system of tenure was less obvious (Chermerinsky, 1998). However since September 11 of 2001 it has once again become readily apparent that with the emotions and strains of fighting the war on terrorism that academic freedom needs to be protected and may be the most useful tool for protecting academic freedom is tenure.

Reappointment and tenure processes should be based on defined criteria in writing and a decision made by faculty (p. 16). If non-reappointment is recommended by the faculty it should include a written statement indicating why the recommendation was made. Tenure and promotion are intended to attract, retain and reward those faculty members who demonstrate excellence. The general criteria should include excellent performance in teaching, a record of scholarship and a record of service. Tenure is the highest honor bestowed on a faculty member. Tenure should not be granted unless the faculty member has demonstrated by consistent performance that the university will benefit from making a career-long commitment to the faculty member. Unsuccessful candidates for tenure should be given a chance to respond to a negative review within three working days of notification of such review.

Due process mandates that grievance procedures must provide a fair forum for all faculty

members and insure that all faculty members have a voice in determining how their institution is governed (p. 29). Due process starts with a personal conference with an administrator. A faculty committee elected by the faculty should render advice and may recommend formal proceedings. The grievance committee hears testimony, may request written briefs and should provide a decision in writing. Any faculty member can be terminated for cause. Grounds for such dismissal generally include moral turpitude, incompetence, conduct unbecoming a professional and other grounds. A termination for cause must be approved by a faculty committee and the governing board. A suspension that is not followed by reappointment or a hearing is a due process violation.

It is clear that academic freedom and tenure are essential to the proper functioning of colleges and universities. These principles have helped the United States to be regarded by many as having the finest system of higher education in the world! Get to work and make sure that you do everything that you can to ensure these principles on your campus and in your institution.

References

American Association of University Professors. (2001). *Policy Documents & Reports Ninth Edition*, Distributed by The Johns Hopkins University Press, cited by page number throughout the article).

Byrne, J. P. (1994). Academic Freedom Without Tenure? New Pathways: Faculty Careers and Employment for the 21st Century. AAHE New Pathways Working Paper Series.

Chermerinksy, E. (1998). Is Tenure Necessary to Protect Academic Freedom? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41, 638-651.

Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 385 U.S. 589 (1967)

Metzger, M.R. and Smith, P.A., Elimination of Tenure in Higher Education: Impact on Supply and Mix of Faculty (1998)

Miller v. California, 413 U.S. 15 (1973)

* The preceding is based upon a presentation entitled "The Importance of Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Academy" made at the 2006 SSSP annual conference held in Montréal, Canada.

Manufacturing Fear: Civil Commitment Laws for Sex Offenders

Emily Horowitz, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice
St. Francis College
Brooklyn, New York
ehorowitz@stfranciscollege.edu
(718) 489-5446

At the annual SSSP 2006 meeting in Montreal, the Law and Society section voted unanimously to pass a resolution opposing civil commitment legislation for sex offenders. As sociologists concerned with the relationship between law and society, these new laws must be viewed critically. These policies allow the state to confine sex offenders after the end of their prison sentence if an evaluation determines that they are at-risk to re-offend. Since 1990, 17 state legislatures have passed civil commitment laws and they are currently pending in a number of other states, including New York. These policies are prompted by emotions, moral panic, and politics, and are disconnected from substantive criminal justice or mental health research and

data. Additionally, it does not take a particularly in-depth legal analysis to recognize that the very notion of post-prison detention undermines democratic principles and basic civil rights.

Civil commitment laws are expensive, not cost-effective, and legally and constitutionally problematic. Most troublingly, there is no evidence that they increase public safety or decrease sex offenses. Sex offenders usually know their victims (over 90% of the time), and thus the key issue is not preventing stranger abductions (only about 115 of these occur a year, yet these terrifying yet extremely rare events receive an astounding amount of media coverage) thus policies aimed at decreasing sex offenses should focus on awareness and education rather than extending punishment for convicted sex offenders. Sex offenders have lower recidivism rates than almost any other group, and research shows that treatment, therapy, and post-release monitoring can decrease recidivism rates even further. In fact, some argue that sex offenders have the lowest recidivism rates of any criminals because there is such extreme social stigma associated with an arrest for even a minor sex crime. Additionally, sex offenders are a diverse group, and include those who commit non-contact crimes, youthful offenders, consensual sex between minors, and statutory offenders.

Politicians and the media contributes to a sense of fear and panic about sex offenders, by obsessively covering rare cases of violent sex crimes and demonizing judges and others that question the constitutionality and fairness of civil commitment and other excessive sex offender policies. Civil libertarians are currently overwhelmed with a range of issues, including the unlawful detainment of prisoners at Guantánamo, the unauthorized wire-tapping of American citizens, the P.A.T.R.I.O.T. Act's revision of accepted Constitutional limitations, the President's arrogation of new executive privileges, etc. In comparison, the rights of convicted sex offenders, a universally-despised group, are not of great general concern. However, psychiatric detention bears a great similarity to preventive detention and both originate in the flawed idea that we can detect with some degree of confidence the probability that someone will commit a crime in the future. Leaving aside the ethical and legal problems of detaining people for crimes they might commit, there are no reliable methods for determining future criminality. The mainstream media considers sex offenders and suspected terrorists as unworthy of rational response or individual consideration, and both are similarly subject to violations of due process and civil rights. Those defending the rights of either are often dismissed as traitors, perverts, un-American, and anti-family; yet protecting the rights of the accused is in fact the very basis of the constitution and the rule of law.

The question of public safety, or what appears to be a question of public safety, must not be used to overwhelm the right to due process. Most importantly, the very act of examining policies aimed at sex offenders must not elicit rage, hysteria, and condemnation. Only through research, examination, analysis, and debate can sound criminal justice policy emerge. Fear is an effective and dangerous tool used by the media and politicians to win viewers and votes, yet researchers and analysts must attempt to ask and answer research questions without fear of retribution. If the goal is to stop sex offenses, social scientists must continue to study what works and what does not work, and to make policy recommendations based on sound data. Civil commitment laws represent a disturbing trend to use laws to limit and undermine human and constitutional rights under the manipulative and false pretense that they will protect society.

Announcements

Call for Papers, *Agenda for Social Justice—2008*

Dear SSSP Member:

In 2004, the SSSP and the Justice 21 Committee published the first *Agenda for Social Justice—2004*. That report contained chapters on poverty, education, unemployment, environmental health risks, global economic change, capital punishment, surveillance technologies, civil unions, domestic violence, cosmetic genital surgery, and domestic security and the Patriot Act.

We are now beginning our work on the second publication—*Agenda for Social Justice—2008*. This publication is designed to inform the public-at-large about the nation's most pressing social problems and to propose a public policy response to those problems. This project affirms the commitment of SSSP to social justice, and enables the members of the association to speak on public issues with the sponsorship of the corporate body. Every four years, coinciding with the national presidential elections, SSSP will issue a report on the nation's social ills. This report will be an "agenda for social justice," in that it will contain recommendations for action by elected officials, policy makers, and the public. The report will be distributed to national progressive organizations, policy centers, national labor organizations, members of Congress, state governors, mayors of large cities, national newspapers, and political journals.

The quadrennial report will be a product of the most valid and reliable knowledge we have about social problems and it will be a joint effort of the members and Divisions of SSSP. We invite you to consider preparing a "chapter" for the 2008 publication. We ask you, individually or with colleagues, to consider submitting a brief proposal (1-2 pp)

identifying a problem of concern to members of SSSP, and respond to the questions: *What do we know? How do we know it? What is to be done?* As the coordinating committee for *Justice 21*, we will consider all the proposals and invite members to prepare a draft statement, following specific guidelines, for inclusion in the 2008 publication.

Please submit a copy of your 1-2 page proposals to each of the members of the committee by May 30, 2007, and contact us if you have questions or would like additional information.

Sincerely,

Robert Perrucci (chair),
perruccir@purdue.edu
Kathleen Ferraro,
Kathleen.ferraro@asu.edu
Jo Ann Miller,
jlmiller@purdue.edu
Glen Muschert,
muscwegw@muohio.edu
Paula Rodriguez Rust,
paularust@world.oberlin.edu
Charles Trent,
trent@ymail.yu.edu

P.S. For an expanded discussion of *Justice 21* see the May 2001 issue of *Social Problems* ("Inventing Social Justice"). To see the 2004 publication, check the SSSP website (<http://www.ssp1.org>).

Call for Submissions, *ASA Instructor's Resource Guide on Social Problems*

Walter F. Carroll (Bridgewater State College) and Lutz Kaelber (University of Vermont) are compiling the fourth edition of the *ASA Instructor's Resource Guide on Social Problems*. They welcome course syllabi, class exercises and assignments, online resources,

examinations and evaluation instruments, computer software and film reviews, and essays on pedagogical challenges and opportunities involved in teaching Social Problems courses. Please send pertinent materials, as attachments in MS Word format, to Walter Carroll at wcarroll@bridgew.edu.

Assistance Request, Law and Society Division

The SSSP is compiling a publication consisting of background information submitted by each division. The Law and Society Division needs to supply information on the basic focus of the research conducted by our members and a listing of books and articles representative of work done within this social problems area. Any suggestions or ideas for this summary can be sent to Lloyd Klein at kleinl@gram.edu. Thanks in advance for any assistance in completing this necessary project.

Faculty Position Announcement

The University of North Carolina Wilmington Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice invites applications for a full-time tenure track assistant professor position beginning August, 2007. The department has over 20 full-time faculty members, roughly 350 majors, and offers bachelor's degrees in sociology, criminal justice, and a growing concentration in public sociology. Planning is underway for an MA program in Criminology and Public Sociology which will begin in fall 2007. Specialty area is open with preference given to candidates with specialization in criminology. Candidates must have the Ph.D. in sociology by time of appointment. Located on a beautiful 640-acre campus in an historic port city five miles from the Atlantic Ocean, UNCW is a growing comprehensive university committed to teaching, scholarship, and service. The university currently enrolls over 12,000 undergraduate and graduate students. For more information on the department, please see our website,

<http://www.uncw.edu/soccrj>. Review of applications will begin February 15, 2007 and the position will remain open until filled. To apply, complete the online application process available on the web at <http://consensus.uncw.edu>. A letter of application addressed to Dr. Diane Levy, Chair Sociology Search Committee, curriculum vita and contact information (including e-mail address) for three current professional references should be attached to the online application - not e-mailed or mailed. Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF attachments are specifically preferred. Letters of reference will be required for highly ranked candidates. For questions regarding the online application process, contact Sandie Ward at 910-962-3339. Under North Carolina law, applications and related materials are confidential personnel documents and are not subject to public release. Criminal background checks will be conducted on finalists prior to offers of employment. UNCW is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. Women and minorities are especially encouraged to apply.

New NIDA report on Drug Treatment in the Criminal Justice System

The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) has released a new report titled *Principles of Drug Abuse Treatment for Criminal Justice Populations*. According to Kellyn Hickey, Health Communications Specialist with IQ Solutions, "NIDA has released a landmark scientific report showing that effective treatment of drug abuse and addiction can save communities money and reduce crime. *Principles of Drug Abuse Treatment for Criminal Justice Populations* outlines some of the proven components for successful treatment of drug abusers who have entered the criminal justice system, leading to lower rates of drug abuse and criminal activity."

To order *Principles of Drug Abuse Treatment for Criminal Justice Populations* (NCADI# BKD 550) visit NIDA's Web site at

www.drugabuse.gov or call the National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information (NCADI) at 1-800-729-6686 to order the free publications. If you wish to order bulk publications, contact Kellyn Hickey.

The Institute is also releasing a companion art card for the new criminal justice publication, titled Treatment is the key (NCADI# NIDACRD

25). To order free copies of this art card, you can also visit www.drugabuse.gov.

For more information, contact:
Kellyn Hickey
Health Communications Specialist
IQ Solutions
11300 Rockville Pike, Suite 901
Rockville, MD 20852
khickey@iqsolutions.com

Please send submissions for future newsletters to Lloyd Klein or Jen Girgen. Contact information is provided at the top of page 1. The deadline for submissions for the upcoming newsletter is April 10.