AAUP NEWS

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS - INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON

Vol. 5, No. 1, August, 1981

THE YEAR AFTER A "BANNER" YEAR

William Burgan
President, AAUP-IUB

Data on university salaries for 1980-81, presented at the AAUP's national meeting in June and scheduled for publication in Academe this month, shed a harsh light on I.U.-Bloomington's prospects as an employer seeking to hire and retain first-rate faculty in 1981-82. The special action of the state legislature in 1980 made possible a modest advance for I.U., shown in the tables on page three of this newsletter. Measured against their counterparts at other Big Ten schools, full professors moved from tenth to eighth place, associates from tenth to ninth. Assistants remained in tenth. In terms of total compensation, full professors rose from ninth to seventh place, associates from ninth to eighth; assistants dropped from ninth to tenth. I.U. finished last in overall ranking for salaries, slightly behind Wisconsin, but averaged a few hundred dollars more than Wisconsin in total compensation. No one expects a year of concern to cancel a decade of indifference. The real question is whether the good year marks a change of policy or a passing uneasiness, and in this instance the answer is plain enough. The 1980-81 higher-education budget for the state at large showed an 11.8% increase over the year before. The corresponding figure for 1981-82 is 5%.

It is against the background of this return to tight-fistedness in government that we must judge the stunning fee increase approved by the trustees in June. Students now feeling the full impact of that event are unlikely to find much comfort in the thought that at best their extra dollars may keep I.U. from regaining exclusive rights to the basement. But it is important to counter any suggestion from Indianapolis that the fee hike is a simple, unscrupulous device for solving the problem of faculty salaries at student expense. The problem is a long way from being solved, and there are other bills to be paid. The phone bill and the energy bill have risen so high that the legislators found themselves obliged to assume fee increases of 12% (in-state) and 17% (out-of-state) even while projecting average faculty raises of 4%. The university budget for the coming year depends heavily on cuts in supplies and equipment for every department. And in any case the average faculty member does not receive an average raise. Promotions, equity adjustments, and a small number of negotiated salaries boost the numerical average to a figure between 7% and 7.5%, whereas a majority of faculty are receiving something in the neighborhood of 5%. Forced by the legislature to decide between sub-standard salaries, and sub-sub-standard ones, the administration chose the former, driving fees up 15% for in-state students, 19% for out-of-state, and causing Senator Borst, Chairperson of the Senate Finance Committee, to breathe flame.

To countenance the fee hike as an emergency measure is not to hail it as a promising new substitute for adequate state funding. There are limits to how much the University can charge without losing so many students that the method begins to cost more than it earns. What is worse, every additional dollar marks a further

continued on page 2

THE YEAR AFTER A "BANNER" YEAR
continued from page 1

retreat from the obligation to offer quality education at prices everyone can afford. It is not at all difficult to imagine a future in which fees continue to rise, real earnings continue to decline against inflation, and I.U. ends up selling poorer services at higher cost than at any earlier time in its history.

The need to show gains while absorbing cuts has already led the administration into some questionable targeting of particular groups for preference or abuse. The sudden favor bestowed on associate professors seems oddly arbitrary. Why associates? Why not assistants? And it is hard to see any merit at all in the opposite, Scrooge-like behavior of reducing by 25% the increases requested for administrative, professional, counseling, and other academic positions. The University would be better off foregoing whatever advantages it obtains--for faculty or anyone else--by gouging personnel who are poorly paid to begin with, and who as a group are probably the most vulnerable employees on campus.

Fairer, more consistent, more openly explained policies for distributing the available funds would be especially welcome in lean years like this one. But the available funds are going to be minimal until some changes occur in the way the University and its mission are perceived in Indianapolis. Ironically, a more productive mode of dealing with the legislature may arise out of Senator Borst's assault on the "absolutely unconscionable" fee increases, followed by his startling disclosure that "I never knew the money you spent had anything to do with the quality of education. I always thought it was the individuals (faculty) that mattered." The senator's anger may jolt this academic community into a keener sense of its common problems and of the incentive for cooperation among faculty, administration, and trustees in dealing with them. Proposals for involving the trustees more actively in presenting the University's needs were a salient feature of their recent meeting on this campus; and there is reason to hope that the administration singled out in Borst's clumsy rebuke for its efforts in behalf of faculty will now make greater use of faculty in assembling and arguing its case--dropping all diplomatic pretense of trust in the depth of legislative insight and good will, refusing to look on the bright side, and detailing hard facts about gaps, shortfalls, lost opportunities, phased-out programs and departing or non-arriving talent with relentless clarity.

Beyond the problem of dealing directly with legislators lies that of reaching them through their constituents. At present, no machinery exists for insuring that faculty have a share in setting goals for public relations with parents and alumni. A committee for this purpose, preferably including student members, could help focus attention on the specifics of the University's situation. Specifics are essential. Generalities about the importance of education, the greatness of I.U., and so on, are only too compatible with the view that such glories have nothing to do with money.

Table 1
AVERAGE SALARIES: BIG TEN UNIVERSITIES*

Overall Ranking**	University	Professor		Assoc. Prof.		Asst. Prof.	
		Salary	Ranking	Salary	Ranking	Salary	Ranking
			1979-80				
1-2	Michigan	33,800	2	24,100	1	19,200	4
1-2	Ohio State	32,100	4	23,900	2	19,800	1
3	Northwestern	34,400	1	23,400	3	18,900	5
4	Illinois	32,700	3	22,900	7-8	19,500	2
5-6	Michigan State	29,900	9	23,100	5-6	19,300	3
5-6	Minnesota	31,400	6	23,100	5-6	18,800	6
7	Iowa	30,500	8	23,300	4	18,300	8-9
8	Purdue	31,800	5	22,900	7-8	18,300	8-9
9	Wisconsin	30,600	7	22,300	9	18,700	7
10	Indiana	29,600	10	21,900	10	17,900	10
			1980-81				
1	Northwestern	37,900	1	25,700	4	21,400	2
2-3	Michigan	36,900	2	27,100	1	21,000	5
2-3	Ohio State	34,900	5	26,000	2	21,800	1
4	Purdue	35,600	3	25,900	3	20,600	6
5	Illinois	35,500	4	24,700	7	21,300	3-4
6	Michigan State	32,500	10	25,200	5	21,300	3-4
7	Minnesota	33,500	6	24,500	8	20,400	7
8	Iowa	32,900	7	24,900	6	20,300	8-9
9	Wisconsin	32,800	8-9	23,900	10	20,300	8-9
10	Indiana	32,800	8-9	24,100	9	19,800	10

*From Academe, September, 1980; and AAUP, "Selected Tables from the Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1980-81, Presented at the Sixty-Seventh Annual Meeting." The figures for percentage increases in state appropriations for higher education in Indiana, cited on p. 1, appear in The Chronicle of Higher Education, August 3, 1981, p. 6.

**Order obtained by averaging rankings for professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. An averaging of amounts for each category would yield a different overall ranking, but would not affect I.U.'s position on the list. These rankings are not a feature of the publications from which the data are drawn.

AAUP MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

I wish to enter my membership in the American Association of University Professors.

NAME_________________________________ Department_________________________

Preferred Mailing Address:____

National Dues ($47.00) $__________

Optional Indiana Conference Dues ($5.00) $__________

Optional Bloomington Chapter Dues ($5.00) $__________

Total: $__________

My check for $_________(payable to AAUP) is enclosed:___________

Please charge $________to VISA:_______ Master Charge:________

Card number_______________________ Expiration Date_____/_______

Signature___________________________

Dues are for the calendar year. Faculty joining in September will receive 16 months of membership (covering September 1981 through December 1982) for the price of one year's dues. Dues are tax deductible and include a subscription to Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP, published six times a year. Please mail this form to William Burgan, President, AAUP-IUB, Department of English, Ballantine Hall 442.

AAUP NEWS

VOLUME 5, NO. 1, AUGUST, 1981