

**AAUP**

**news**

THE SILENT THREAT TO TENURE\*

At Michigan State and Sonoma State and elsewhere, administrations have used allegations of financial emergency to launch well-publicized attacks on the institution of tenure. The AAUP has been effective in resisting such attacks; time after time, its insistence on rigorous standards of proof for exigency and faculty involvement in decisions on exigency have carried the day. Our own Faculty Council and Campus Administration have recently approved contingency safeguards against illegitimate declarations of exigency which incorporate AAUP policy and which should provide a measure of security in the trying years to come. Even as we win the well-publicized struggles, though, the institution of tenure is being eroded in a less dramatic but even more ominous way.

The "silent" threat to tenure is posed by wholesale conversion of entry-level tenure track positions to non-tenureable or part-time positions. So rapidly has this practice spread in recent years than it remains essentially undocumented, but here are some hints of its magnitude:

- 470,000 of the faculty members in the United States are full-time, and 220,000 are part-time. If 75 percent of the full-time faculty members are tenured or tenure-eligible (a generous estimate), then barely 50 percent of college faculty enjoy the security of full-time, tenure-eligible employment. (1982 Digest of Education Statistics)
- In the period 1980-83, only half the new positions in the humanities have been tenure-eligible. (MLA Job Information List; Chronicle of Higher Education)
- Of full-time faculty in the California State University System, one-third or 4,500 are non-tenure-eligible. (PERB Unit Determination)
- In 1982, the New York State Board of Regents eliminated as unduly restrictive a rule that 50 percent of the faculty in a given unit should be full-time. (Chronicle of Higher Education)

\* This is an abridgement of an address given by Paul Strohm, as First Vice President of the AAUP, to the fall meeting of the Indiana State Conference.

Administrators have generally supported conversion of tenured to non-tenure-eligible lines, on grounds of economy and fiscal "flexibility." Less clear is the reasoning of faculties which acquiesce in such strategies. As guardians of educational quality, we can hardly support the notion that more and more teaching should be done by those with less and less institutional support. As champions of the profession, we can hardly support the denial to our younger colleagues of those professional prerogatives which we have enjoyed. Perhaps some of us have accepted the mistaken view that tenure is implicated in the present job shortage, and that elimination of tenure would somehow generate additional openings. The fact, of course, is that refusal of tenure eligibility to those entering the profession generates no new jobs at all--it merely further downgrades the professional circumstances of those young teachers already forced by adverse economic conditions to accept jobs on whatever basis they are proffered.

We have some reason to hope that an expanding population of college-age students will lead to a revitalization of higher education in the 1990's. We must ask ourselves, however, what kinds of traditions we expect to be perpetuated when the renewal of higher education does occur. Surely, we do not want to be remembered as the "James Watt generation" of college teachers, so concerned for our own well being that we were indifferent to that of our posterity. Yet if we continue to undermine the institution of tenure, then the expansion of higher education in the 1990's may simply be an expansion of contract classroom labor, rather than a true enlargement and renewal of the profession. In the hard decade to come, we must insist on the benefits of the tenure system for younger colleagues entering college teaching--not just for their individual sakes (though that would be reason enough), but in order to preserve our traditions of professionalism for subsequent generations.

At many universities, including our own, decisions on non-tenure-eligible appointments are made jointly by the Campus (in our case, the Dean of Faculties), the school, and the department. Because our Dean of Faculties office has not encouraged such appointments, they have generally occurred only with strong departmental support. This is, in short, a "grassroots" issue, over which individual faculty exercise a great deal of influence. For the long-term health of our profession, we must hope that those faculty who grapple with this issue in their own departments and disciplines will not deny to their successors those professional protections which they have themselves enjoyed.

#### COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The AAUP-IUB chapter has received several inquiries in regard to the AFT-IUB statement on collective bargaining issued to the faculty last month. In commenting on a revision of the AAUP Statement on Collective Bargaining, the AFT-IUB newsletter stated that "the adoption of the Statement on Collective Bargaining by AAUP nationally will encourage cooperation between and merger of AAUP and AFT local chapters around the country." It is important

(cont. on page 3)

for readers of this newsletter to know that the AAUP Statement does not encourage or even mention merger between AAUP chapters and other organizations interested in collective bargaining, and that neither at the national, state, nor local level of AAUP is there any action contemplated that would lead to a merger with AFT. The text of the AAUP Statement on Collective Bargaining is published in Academe, September-October 1983, and reprinted in the most recent issue of the AFT-IUB newsletter.

#### SALARY POLICY PROPOSALS

In a paper presented at a forum on faculty salaries sponsored by AFT on November 22, 1983, Gene Weinberg, AAUP-IUB chapter president, made the following proposals:

- (1) Because the gap between Indiana University and Purdue University faculty salaries continues to widen and because the reasons for the gap are not known, that a subcommittee of the BFC Budgetary Affairs Committee be constituted as a task force to ascertain the reasons and, as well, to propose methods for closing the gap.
- (2) Because comparative salary-compensation data for the U.S. professoriate, published annually by the national office of AAUP in Academe, is so useful, that the national office be asked to collect and publish salary-compensation data for U.S. university administrators on a regular basis.
- (3) Because the principle of merit in faculty salary determinations appears to have been eroded, that annual evaluation of each faculty member be made by peers in the academic unit (comparable to the present system for promotion and tenure) and that such evaluation be used to assign the person to a salary grade (see #4).
- (4) Because the present salary schedule is so haphazard, that grades be established within each rank and that, in a set of comparable academic units, all persons in a given grade have the same salary.

In the discussion from the floor that followed, a proposal was made that persons whose missions have contracted (for example, reduction in or cessation of administrative service, research productivity, or teaching efficacy--with no corresponding expansion in the other two missions) be considered for reduction in grade.

#### WILL MEMBERS SPEAK OUT?

*In future issues, this Newsletter will feature "editorial" positions by faculty on issues of major concern to this campus and themselves. If you have an idea for such an editorial, or are willing to write one yourself, please contact Sharon Smith at the Learning Skills Center, 316 N. Jordan (335-7313) before the end of February. Contributions should be in the 400-word range. We are particularly interested in hearing from members of the AAUP.*

**AAUP**

MEMBERS OF AAUP-IUB ON BLOOMINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL

Bareikis, Robert (BFC Secretary, Agenda Committee, Faculty Affairs Committee,  
Legislative Liaison Committee, Library Committee)  
Beltran, Ann (Nomination Committee, Budgetary Affairs Committee)  
Bohrnstedt, George  
Boshkoff, Douglas (Budgetary Affairs Committee)  
Burgan, Mary (Affirmative Action Committee, Agenda Committee, Capital Campaign Committee)  
Carr, Richard (Educational Policies Committee)  
Castellan, John (Budgetary Affairs Committee, Educational Policies Committee)  
Franz, Judy (Affirmative Action Committee)  
Gray, Donald (Capital Campaign Committee, Educational Policies Committee, Nomination  
Committee)  
Hendry, Archibald (Educational Policies Committee)  
Jaffee, Bruce (Budgetary Affairs Committee)  
Lohmann, Christoph (Faculty Affairs Committee)  
Neu, Irene (Affirmative Action Committee)  
Newton, Roger (Educational Policies Committee)  
Overly, Norman (Library Committee)  
Patterson, James (Capital Campaign Committee, Legislative Liaison Committee, Nomination  
Committee)  
Patterson, Jeanne (Budgetary Affairs Committee)  
Peters, Dennis (Educational Policies Committee)  
Rabinowitch, Alexander (Faculty Affairs Committee)  
Remley, Mary (Faculty Affairs Committee)  
Smith, Sharon (Student Affairs Committee)  
Terry, Herbert (Educational Policies Committee)  
Wheeler, William (Agenda Committee, Budgetary Affairs Committee, Legislative Liaison  
Committee, Nomination Committee)  
Wittlich, Gary (Associate Instructor Affairs Committee)

Gene Weinberg  
President, AAUP IUB  
Jordan Hall, Room 416  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, IN 47405

