

AAUP NEWS

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS - INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON CHAPTER

Vol. 4, No. 1, September, 1980

AAUP LOOKS AT 1980-81

Sheila Lindenbaum
President, AAUP-IUB

AAUP-IUB opens the academic year with a sense of gains having been made. The collective bargaining seminar we proposed to the Trustees last May has been approved; the Trustees and the Bloomington administration have at least recognized the importance of collective bargaining as a campus issue. We are also encouraged by the success of the AAUP and other faculty groups lobbying at the state legislature last year, and by the sixty faculty members who responded to our spring membership drive by joining the association and in a number of cases agreeing to serve on AAUP committees.

Yet the new academic year has also brought some ominous news, including a further decline in the faculty's real income and the certainty that the universities will be facing a rough year at the legislature. This summer, the Commission for Higher Education asked the IU administration to submit a budgetary plan based on the possibility that funding for 1981-83 might remain at the 1980-81 level. That the HEC should suggest such a possibility in a time of double-digit inflation and steady or increasing enrollment clearly bodes ill for our academic programs.

These developments mean a year of increased activity for AAUP-IUB. Not only must we continue our grievance work, participation in campus governance, and compensation studies, but we must expand our efforts in the areas of collective bargaining and legislative relations. With these goals in mind, our Executive Committee and sub-committees remained active over the summer, working on the following projects and plans:

continued on page 2

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND
UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

Faculty members sometimes wonder what would happen to traditional forms of academic governance under collective bargaining. While faculty promotion committees and policy committees and the Faculty Council itself have not solved all our problems, they do represent hard-won gains in our professional status which should not be treated lightly. AAUP-negotiated contracts recognize the importance of such bodies, leaving them in place while using contract provisions as a way of restating and strengthening their powers.

Most contracts have a "past practices" section which provides for continuing existing governance arrangements, except in particular instances where they are modified by the bargaining agreement. The AAUP Temple contract is typical in its provision that nothing in the contract should "deny or diminish the existing rights . . . of faculty members to participate directly in the formation and recommendation of educational policy within the University and its schools and colleges, as these rights, privileges, and responsibilities are described under the appropriate constitutions of the various parts of the University."

Faculty councils and senates are invariably protected. The University of Cincinnati contract is typical in affirming the Faculty Senate and its by-laws, and in stating that "With respect to faculty priorities in those areas not specifically dealt with through the collective bargaining process both parties to this Agreement recognize the Faculty Senate as the primary governance body representing the faculty which shall have

continued on page 3

AAUP LOOKS AT 1980-81
continued from page 1

Legislative Relations: In recent years, AAUP-IUB has sponsored a series of productive meetings between the Bloomington faculty and state legislators. We will be organizing similar meetings this year prior to the legislative session, and we will continue to make presentations at the budget hearings of the HEC, the State Budget Agency, and the finance committees of the legislature.

This year, we are also preparing a report, written from the faculty's point of view, on the effects of low budgets on Bloomington's academic programs. This will be distributed to legislators and discussed with them as they consider the higher education budget.

In our legislative efforts, we have the support of the Indiana Conference of the AAUP (ICAAUP), whose lobbyist represents AAUP concerns at the state house. The lobbyist is Chet Eisinger, a former ICAAUP president who still teaches part-time at Purdue as Professor of American Studies. Chet's faculty status gives him a special credibility with legislators, and he was very effective in reaching key members of the finance committees last year.

Officers of both the state conference and the Bloomington chapter have been keeping in close touch with our national lobby in Washington and with AAUP officers in states like Connecticut, Michigan, and Texas, where the association has developed a strong presence at the legislature. While attending seminars on legislative relations at the national AAUP meeting in Washington this June, we lobbied Indiana's members of Congress (including John Myers) in support of the Higher Education Reauthorization Act and other measures.

Collective Bargaining: Following up our May proposal for a collective bargaining seminar, AAUP-IUB recommended specific guidelines for this event at the August meeting of the Trustees' Faculty Relations Committee. (Noting that current plans envisage instead a series of debates on general issues, we have urged a return to the original aim of the seminar, which was not to arrange a duel of position papers but to bring faculty groups--AAUP, AFT, and Faculty Council--together with

Trustees to discuss the potential impact of collective bargaining on the Bloomington campus.)

In August, AAUP-IUB also submitted to the Trustees a Proposal for a Pre-Election Agreement, prepared with the help of the AAUP's national director of collective bargaining. This document lays out the groundrules on which the Trustees and Faculty should agree before a collective bargaining election can be held. Among other suggested things, it provides for an election unit composed of all faculty members eligible to vote for the Bloomington Faculty Council elections, with the exception of administrators at or above the level of associate deans.

To help the Bloomington faculty become better informed, AAUP-IUB is continuing its series of articles on collective bargaining topics. Last spring, we published "What's in an AAUP Contract" and "The AAUP in Collective Bargaining." "Collective Bargaining and Faculty Government" appears in this newsletter. In future issues we will consider the bargaining process as such, the effect on salaries and benefits, the effect on legislative relations, and system-wide versus campus-specific bargaining.

Economic Status: Figures recently released by the national AAUP show that our 1979-80 salaries were once again the lowest in the Big Ten. We may have improved slightly in 1980-81, but we still need to study our long-term decline in relation to other institutions and the distribution of salary funds. To show the distribution, AAUP-IUB has asked the Bloomington administration for the data needed to complete a salary report for 1979-80 and 1980-81, with listings by department, rank, and years in service.

We hope that after reviewing these activities you will want to join an AAUP committee that interests you. Please get in touch with me or members of our committees (listed on p. 4 of this newsletter) to volunteer suggestions or help. We hope that you will also contact us if the chapter can help with a problem. As always, we depend on your calling our attention to matters of AAUP concern, and we look forward to hearing your comments on campus priorities in the coming year.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
continued from page 1

the right to advise the President." A further provision which notably enhances the position of the Senate is that "Upon written request the Faculty Senate shall have access to financial information which is relevant and necessary and can reasonably be made available, including monthly budget summaries."

Many contracts follow the Cincinnati example by detailing the faculty role in institutional governance. Some reach beyond their own faculty handbooks to incorporate relevant policy statements. The AAUP St. John's contract, for example, includes by reference the AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure and the Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities.

Bargaining teams have the option of pressing for new specifications in areas where past practices have been inadequate. The St. John's agreement specifies the faculty role in search-and-screen procedures in a section on "Selection of Deans." Most contracts include guidelines spelling out faculty rights in situations which could lead to layoffs or program reductions. Cincinnati has a model clause in this area, which compels the administration to prove alleged financial exigency, prohibits mechanical across-the-board cuts by demanding careful study of programs prior to cutbacks, and provides for full faculty participation in the entire process. Last year at Temple, such provisions saved the jobs of 21 tenured faculty members who had been served termination notices by the administration. The Temple contract thus ensured an effective system of checks and balances in university planning, for while the administration was assuming a \$3-5 million shortfall, Temple actually had a surplus of over half a million dollars which made the reductions unnecessary.

Here at IU, a contract could reaffirm the rights of such bodies as the school curriculum and personnel committees. It could also supplement the mandates of bodies which need support--situating the Faculty Board of Review as the first step in a process leading to arbitration, or spelling out the right of the Faculty Council to participate in decisions on

university structure. It could affirm the Budgetary Affairs Committee's right of access to presently-confidential materials, such as the auxiliary enterprises budget, or it could provide for a faculty review of the completed campus budget before it is submitted to the Trustees. It could link administrative reviews with the expiration of set terms of office, so that these would become reappointment reviews. Finally, it could be an occasion for creating additional governance mechanisms to guarantee a full faculty vote in such areas as campus planning or possible program reduction.

The advantage in such specificity is obvious; once a given procedural standard is incorporated into a bargaining agreement, then administrative neglect of the standard can become a grievance. An individual (or in most contracts an AAUP chapter or other faculty representative) can file a grievance and insist on the benefit of all grievance procedures, including the right to arbitration as specified in the contract. Thus, a well-drafted contract can act as a check against administrative inclination to override a faculty personnel recommendation without giving reasons, to phase out a program without consulting the faculty of the school in which it is located, or to rearrange the interrelationship of campus units without the prior approval of the campus Faculty Councils.

Collective bargaining is sometimes denounced by its opponents as "anti-collegial," presumably on the assumption that its effectiveness in strengthening the faculty role can create a power imbalance on those campuses where it operates. Study of AAUP contracts at Rutgers, Connecticut, and elsewhere will indicate, however, that the main effect of collective bargaining is simply to secure for the faculty those rights to participation in decision-making which the faculty has always theoretically enjoyed. The result of an effective contract in the sphere of governance is what trustees, administrators, and faculty have always claimed to seek: a fair sharing of authority among different components of the institution, including representative faculty bodies with clearly delineated powers.

AAUP-IUB COMMITTEES, 1980-81

Executive Committee - Sheila Lindenbaum, President (English) 7-1855; William Burgan, Vice President and President-Elect (English); Frances Decker (Germanic Languages); Henry Hofstetter (Optometry); R. Kent Honeycutt (Astronomy); Bruce Jaffee (Business); Oleg Kudryk, Treasurer (Library); Douglas Leadenham (Library); Don Lichtenberg (Physics); J. Gus Liebenow (Political Science); Morton Lowengrub (Mathematics); Betty Rose Nagle (Classical Studies); Albert Ruesink (Biology); Ronald Smith (Folklore); P. Sarita Soni (Optometry); Paul Strohm (English); Hans Tischler, Recording Secretary (Music); Cleve Wilhoit (Journalism).

Economic Status - Bruce Jaffee, Chairperson (Business) 7-9219
Cynthia Brown (Computer Science); Archibald Hendry (Physics); Morton Lowengrub (Mathematics).

Collective Bargaining - Paul Strohm, Chairperson (English) 7-8224
Malcolm Brown (Music); Polly Grimshaw (Library); Don Lichtenberg (Physics); Sheila Lindenbaum (English); Edwin Ramage (Classical Studies).

Legislative Relations - Maurice Garnier, Chairperson (Sociology) 7-2479
James Christoph (Political Science); Douglas Leadenham (Library); Marilyn Sternglass (English).

Academic Freedom and Tenure - Jessie Lovano-Kerr, Chairperson (Education) 7-0371
J. Robert Dodd (Geology); Edwin Greenebaum (Law); Anthony Mahowald (Biology); Ronald Smith (Folklore).

AAUP ANNUAL DUES ARE \$47.00, PLUS OPTIONAL STATE AND CHAPTER DUES OF \$5.00 EACH. IF YOU WOULD LIKE AN APPLICATION FORM, JUST MAIL THIS PAGE TO SHEILA LINDENBAUM, DEPT. OF ENGLISH, BALLANTINE HALL 442.

AAUP NEWS

VOLUME 4, NO. 1, SEPTEMBER, 1980