

AAUP NEWS

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS - INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON CHAPTER

Vol. 3, No. 6 October, 1979

ACADEMIC FUNDING SHOULD BE THE MAJOR "UNAVOIDABLE" ITEM IN THE UNIVERSITY'S BUDGET

by J. Gus Liebenow
President, Local AAUP Chapter

We sometimes fall into the psychological trap of assuming that a local situation of despair must be endured because it is part of a broader national trend. Indeed, the crisis of leadership, the shrinking value of our salaries and fringe benefits, the obstacles to innovative ideas and programs, and the confusion of priorities that we currently witness on the local scene do have their parallels within the larger American society.

If you reflect upon it, however, we in higher education are in a particularly vulnerable position during this period of multiple national crises. First of all, we often manifest self-effacing timidity in making the same bold priority claims on national and state funding that are made by those who wrap themselves in the flag of national defense or those who relate their services to the latest national crisis—such as the energy shortage. Ironically, too, some of the competition for limited government funding is of our own making. Without expressing any regrets, we must recognize that moral and intellectual considerations led the academic community to assist in the politicization of women, members of minority groups, the environmentalists, the prison reformists, the mental health advocates and other previously disenfranchized groups.

We are, moreover, among the few in the middle to upper-middle income skill group who currently lack the means to advance our own economic destinies. Doctors, lawyers, and other professionals with training comparable to ours can keep raising their fees to meet inflation. Labor leaders in many fields of employment can negotiate salary-escalating clauses and expanded fringe benefit packages for electricians, mechanics, and both primary and secondary school teachers. Retail merchants merely have to paste new price labels on their existing inventory as soon as a wholesale price raise is passed along to them. And yet, the aversion of many of our colleagues to the concept of collective bargaining has left university professors completely at the mercy of other forces in determining the worth of our skills and expertise to this society. Like my predecessor in this office, Al Ruesink, I long

LIEBENOW REPORT
continued from pg. 1

preferred to think that we could have resolved many of our differences within the university through the fuller sharing of information and through more frank discussion between the faculty and the administration which represents us to the outside world. I preferred to think that we all would have profited, both in terms of final results and in terms of public credibility, if the administration had been able to act with the earned-support of the faculty in presenting the university's case for funding to the legislature. Progress in that direction, however, has come but slowly. There is still the distinct feeling that the administration prefers to keep the faculty at arms-length both in dealing with the legislature and in making internal allocations once the money has been voted. Our faith that the historic model of faculty-administrative relations will reassert itself has been increasingly undermined. Indeed, to those in our midst who reluctantly view collective bargaining as the umbrella that we should keep in our closet for a rainy day, I would suggest that we look around us. It's pouring!

Things need not have been that way at I.U. I recall that over a decade ago President Clark Kerr of the University of California was honored at a luncheon in the Federal Room. He said he had been eager to come to I.U. for two reasons. First, he wanted to witness personally what had attracted so many of his own faculty from Berkeley and other campuses to come to Bloomington. Secondly, he wanted find out why it was so difficult to pry faculty away once they had made their career decisions to teach and do research at Indiana University.

How times have changed! And how true have become the Cassandra-like predictions of one of our distinguished professors who was publicly challenged a few years ago for lamenting the erosion of our faculty strength. One department and school after another--many of them enjoying top national rankings in their fields--have witnessed the relative ease with which other institutions have picked off some of our most vital faculty members. This includes not only persons with international reputations holding distinguished rank. Of equal importance is the loss of some of our most promising associate professors and younger full professors. These are the individuals who are the backbone of our current graduate programs and who offer the best hope of our maintaining national rankings in the future. Certainly their departures have made the departments concerned less attractive for the students and remaining colleagues, as well as reducing our prospects of recruiting top-notch replacements. Quality deterioration is the inevitable consequence of the unwritten administration policy of either (1) leaving a faculty line vacant and reckoning the unspent salary as a "savings" or (2) replacing the distinguished professor with a yet untried assistant professor. Thus we have been suffering both a quantitative and a qualitative diminution of faculty strength.

Far from having the waste that the President of our Board of Trustees suggested recently when he recommended that we get rid of "those who are not carrying their load;" most departments and school programs are already pared to the bone. During the period of expanded federal government and foundation funding in the 1960's and 1970's, we at I.U. followed the fiscally sound policy of not giving extended faculty appoint-

LIEBENOW REPORT

continued from pg. 2

ments to individuals on soft money. We began earlier than most institutions, moreover, in making tough tenure decisions. Thus, we began the period of fiscal retrenchment with already depleted ranks. This has meant that the amount of time which must be spent by the remaining faculty in counselling, faculty governance, and other needed service activities has cut heavily into the quality of both research and teaching at this university.

Why has the situation at I.U. changed so dramatically since President Kerr's visit over a decade ago? It is not always easy to identify the causes. In some instances a peculiar set of circumstances seems to provide a plausible explanation: an offer of a named chair; the existence of a research endowment; the opportunity to serve in an administrative role; and other sui generis factors. Only seldom do we admit that the move has had anything remotely to do with money, particularly when the university has made the belated effort to match or surpass the outside salary offer. Yet, it would be a gross oversight to rule out of consideration the diminished funding for academic (as opposed to non-academic) purposes as one of the keys to the problem. Aside from the customary raise in salary accompanying promotion in rank, all too frequently substantial salary recognition comes to promising researcher or teachers only when he or she courts an outside offer or when he or she sets aside full-time teaching and research to enter administration. Our diminishing salary status within the Big Ten over the past decade, moreover, cannot give the upwardly mobile scholar any great hopes for himself personally or for the fate of those who will remain as his colleagues at Indiana University. Other factors emerge as well. Although appearing to maintain the status quo, the funding

for the research collection in the library threatens the success of faculty research and many of our graduate programs. The support for graduate education is a case of spreading a diminished fund of money over an increasingly small pool of distinguished applicants. While our newly staffed Research office has demonstrated great vigor and innovation, we still lag behind our peer institutions in terms of both internal and external funding which is ashamedly labelled as "research."

Despite all the rhetoric of the administration that faculty salaries are the first priority in each new budget, other areas of the budget seem to make greater percentage claims on new funding. If only increases in faculty salaries could be considered "unavoidables" in the same way that key administrators designate as "unavoidables" the phone bill, the coal pile, and other things required to keep the doors of the university open! Time after time, moreover, in reallocating the so-called "savings" at the end of the year, an undue share of the funding goes to non-academic purposes such as new parking signs, astro-turf, extras for the golf course, and the renovation of idle property--such as the new "Instant Stonehenge Park" on the corner of 3rd and Jordan. Beauty does have its place in our priorities, but not at the expense of those things that make a difference to I.U. as a university. I want an environment that is beautiful, comfortable, and friendly; but even more I want a university which is an intellectually stimulating and career-rewarding place for both students and faculty.

There are many areas where faculty-administrative relations can be improved. But I don't think this will come about unless the faculty convinces the administration that we are serious about our interests. And our interests

LIEBENOW REPORT
continued from pg. 3

include as an unsurrenderable minimum our traditional rights, privileges, and responsibilities with respect to curricular matters, determining degree requirements, evaluating our colleagues for promotion and tenure, participating in faculty governance, playing a major role in maintaining the high quality of student life, and being responsible for maintaining an open campus with respect to research, teaching, and public expression. Increasingly, however, AAUP insists that it must play a major role in helping shape our economic status as well. AAUP can only do this with the support of our faculty colleagues--through dues and through a willingness to participate in our activities and programs. As a united faculty group we can make a more effective case for self-determination rather than pursuing the administrative posture of "auntie knows best."

If there was one thing that stood out during my attendance last June at the national AAUP meeting in Houston, it was the impression that an increasing number of institutions are experiencing a more positive relationship between faculty and administrators on financial matters. Admittedly, this situation in many cases was the consequence of the imposition--or the threat of imposition--of collective bargaining. At many institutions administrators are now sharing with faculty representatives the rudimentary financial data on which crucial decisions are being made. And this information is being shared both readily and in a timely fashion so that the faculty initiative or response can be meaningful instead of merely a post hoc or pro forma reaction. In more cases than was true in the past, faculty are now setting priorities on personnel as well as long range programs for their universities. This has meant not only a sharing in the "joy" of distributing the largesse. It has

meant, as well, that the faculty have had to share the heat in the making of tough and unpopular decisions. Those decisions, however, are more often correct ones since they have been made by people who know intimately the nature of the problems being faced. And what impressed me the most last June in Houston was the more prestigious the institution, the more that collaboration in decision-making seemed to be genuine rather than being a charade. With faculty support of the AAUP chapter on this campus, it would ensure that Indiana University-Bloomington would rejoin the ranks of our prestigious peers.

*** ***** ***

FACULTY SALARY RAISES:
MUCH CONFUSION---LITTLE MONEY

(Editor's note: This report was written by John Sinclair, Sheila Lindenbaum, Richard Hake, Morton Lowengrub, and Paul Strohm.)

The spring and summer brought us in 1979-80 the familiar bad news that the Faculty will experience a loss in real income. They also brought us the additional problem of sorting out a series of widely discrepant estimates of just how much the Faculty as a whole has lost.

At different points, administrative offices have placed available faculty increments at 5.5%, 5.6%, 6.1%, 6.9%, and--most recently--at 7.4%. A figure of around 7% is finally no great mystery. We all know that the legislature appropriated 6.1% to be used for increasing faculty salaries in 1979-80. We also know that the Legislature expected the University to add about .7% or .8% to that amount from unfilled lines, replacement of high salaried retirees with less expensive appointments, and other sources. In addition, different schools and units of the University also dug deep, and added what they

continued on page 5

FACULTY SALARY CONFUSION
continued from pg. 4

could from unfilled lines, capital expenses, supplies and expenses, and so on. In the cases of some schools, the final figure available for faculty salaries might finally have reached something like the announced 7.4%.

The mystery is less about the final figure, than about why the Faculty was not kept more accurately informed. Why, for instance, was the actual figure available for increases withheld from the Faculty throughout the process of 1979-80 salary determination, and then announced without appropriate explanation to external constituencies, in articles in the Herald-Telephone and the IDS? If the point of all this secrecy was a certain understandable restraint about the fact that we had slightly exceeded the 6.9% or 7.0% which the Legislature had in mind for us, then broadly external publication of our 7.4% increase hardly makes sense. In fact, the people who were really kept systemically in the dark were the internal constituency most directly affected: the Faculty once again.

The Administration need not be so wary about giving us bad news, because we already get the bad news once a month in our paychecks. Supposing the final figure available for salary increases was close to 7.4%; once a handful of larger increases was given to faculty members susceptible to outside offers, the greatest number of our faculty received 1979-80 increases of approximately 5%-6%. If the rate of inflation for 1979-80 ends up at or near the present 14%, even those few faculty members receiving 7.4% will lose over 6% in real income. Faculty members receiving only 5% will lose 9%. If the present trend is allowed to continue, we will soon

face a situation where a newly-promoted full professor will be drawing less real income than when he or she began as an untried assistant professor.

We can take no consolation from the national situation. The September issue of the AAUP Bulletin shows that twenty selected occupational groups all lost real income this year, but that the academic profession lost most of all. Academic faculty throughout the U.S. have lost 2.4% in real income in the last six years, and the most lost by any other group was 1.9%--with .87% as the norm. Neither can we take consolation from the situation of our colleagues at other institutions. Since IUB during the same period dropped from third place to tenth place in salary in the Big Ten, our loss has surely been disproportionately large even within a disadvantaged category.

Most people agree we have already entered a recession, and this distressing trend will continue, if not accelerate. If we are to survive this period without irreparable damage to our ability to serve public educational and research needs, then we must develop a more coherent Faculty-based response to the problem. In the long run, collective bargaining offers a framework within which such problems can be addressed, and the national AAUP is firmly committed to collective bargaining as a powerful tool to bolster Faculty economic strength. In the meantime, our AAUP chapter can join with other concerned groups to make strong representations to the Board of Trustees, IHEC, and the Legislature. To do that requires a kind of political credibility that can only be gained from membership numbers.

NATIONAL AAUP COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING COMMITTEE REPORTS
ACTIVE YEAR

by Sheila Lindenbaum

National Committee N (Collective Bargaining) of the AAUP reports an active and productive year in 1978-79. In the most notable of six AAUP election victories, the Association of Pennsylvania State Colleges and University Faculty, 3800 members strong, voted to affiliate with the AAUP. In California, the AAUP is taking an active part in a coalition, the Congress of Faculty Associations, which will bring 5,000 new members into the AAUP on January 1, 1980; and Faculty Associations with AAUP support are the sole organizations seeking election as bargaining agent at the University of Berkeley and UCLA.

In the most widely publicized action of the year, the AAUP at Boston University, led by former IU-Bloomington Professor of History Fritz Ringer, gained the support of clerical workers, librarians, business faculty, and student groups. Despite vigorous opposition by President John Silber, the Boston University chapter finally achieved a contract protecting the faculty's right to tenure and academic due process.

The official report of Committee N begins by noting that "inflation, threats of retrenchment, and the prospect of collective bargaining legislation in several states have stimulated a new surge of interest in collective bargaining by college and university fac-

ulty. Each year, according to studies of faculty opinion, a larger percentage of the profession regards collective bargaining as an acceptable, perhaps the only, method of contending successfully with threats to shared authority, tenure, academic freedom, due process, and compensation."

The report makes the point that "Collective bargaining has proved to be one of the most effective methods for promoting and protecting the traditional goals of the association. There is also a growing realization that bargaining and collegiality are not mutually exclusive and that in certain instances, true collegiality, which implies a certain degree of equality between faculty and administration, has actually been established through bargaining. There is little doubt that bargaining, at least by AAUP chapters, has increased and/or protected the role to the faculty in the governance of their institutions, especially when important financial decisions are made."

Fifty-two AAUP chapters or affiliates, representing 27 percent of the Association's membership, are now formally engaged in collective bargaining. Samples of AAUP bargaining agreements and the AAUP Collective Bargaining Newsletter can be obtained from the national office, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

ANNUAL AAUP MEETING IN HOUSTON

by Sheila Lindenbaum

At the Annual Meeting in Houston, June 6 and 7, representatives to the Assembly of State Conferences gathered to report on the increasingly active role taken by the Conferences in legislative affairs. A number of Conferences had been successful in representing AAUP views when the issues of tenure, higher education budgets, and retrenchment were debated in the state legislatures.

In the Texas legislature, for instance, a strong move to abolish tenure was successfully opposed by the state's AAUP Conference. The New York Conference helped defeat the Bureau of Budget's efforts to establish faculty rank distribution ratios. Following the Idaho version of proposition 13, the Idaho AAUP was able to see that AAUP policies and procedures were incorporated into the Reduction of Force and Financial Exigency policies adopted by the state's Board of Regents.

In Illinois, Washington, Texas and other states, AAUP government liaison committees, have been monitoring key hearings, appearing before legislative committees, and organizing meetings with legislators and state agencies. Legislative dinners and seminars have been successful in many states, most notably New York, where the AAUP Conference has received a Ford Foundation grant to support seminars for faculty, trustees, and legislators.

Representatives of the Indiana Conference of the AAUP attended the Houston meeting in order to benefit from the practical experience of other state officers in legislative affairs.

This year the AAUP will again be representing the Associations's views to the Indiana Higher Education Commission and the Indiana General Assembly. AAUP members on the Bloomington campus who would like to work on government-related activities are urged to get in touch with Sheila Lindenbaum, Department of English (phones: 337-1855, 336-8255).

LEGISLATORS ENDORSE FACULTY ACTION
IN AAUP OPEN FORUM

Sen. Patrick Carroll (Democrat) defended the Higher Education Commission, saying it limits big fluctuations and "wild swings" in university fundings by the legislature.

Rep. Marilyn Schultz (Democrat) eloquently argued that increased funding for education was possible, saying the Republican policy of underestimating state tax revenues hampers the appropriation process.

Rep. Jerry Bales (Republican) bluntly insisted that no group

on the public payroll will keep up with inflation.

The roughly 30 I.U. faculty attending AAUP's open forum with area legislators on September 25 heard these and many other points argued in a lively session widely covered by the local press. While many of their comments reflected party lines, the legislators seemed to agree on one point: the faculty should work harder to take its case for salaries directly to the people of the state and the legislature.

MEMBERS OF AAUP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Henry Hofstetter (Optometry)
Kent Honeycutt (Astronomy)
Oleg Kudryk (Library)
Gus Liebenow, President (Pol. Science)
Sheila Lindenbaum (English)
Morton Lowengrub (Math)
Jerome Mintz (Anthropology)

Betty Rose Nagle (Classical Studies)
Al Ruesink (Biology)
John Sinclair (Biology)
Sarita Soni (Optometry)
Paul Strohm (English)
Hans Tischler (Music)
Cleve Wilhoit (Journalism)
Jerry Zinnes (Psychology)

AAUP NEWS

Volume 3, No. 6 October, 1979

This
Mailing
Sponsored
By
A.A.U.P.

INSIDE INSIDE INSIDE INSIDE INSIDE INSIDE

Report from AAUP President -----Page 1
Faculty Salary Confusion-----Page 4
Bargaining Committee Reports-----Page 6
Meeting in Houston-----Page 7

INSIDE INSIDE INSIDE INSIDE INSIDE INSIDE