AAUP Counsel to Speak on Agency-shop challenge

Michael Bailey, Executive Director of the University of Connecticut AAUP, invites all interested colleagues to attend a presentation by Aaron Nisenson, Esq., Senior Counsel, AAUP, on Friedericks v. California Teachers Association, a challenge to public-sector agency-shop provisions.

The complainants in the case contend that current public-sector agency-shop arrangements violate First Amendment protections. According to the website Oyez, two questions specifically are raised:

• Do public-sector agency shop arrangements violate the First Amendment’s protections for freedom of speech and assembly?
• Does the First Amendment prohibit the practice of requiring public employees to affirmatively opt-out of subsidizing nonchargeable speech rather than to affirmatively consent?

The case is now before the Supreme Court. AAUP filed an amicus brief along with the AFT on November 13, 2015. The Supreme Court ruling, when it comes, will have implications for faculty collective-bargaining organizations across the nation. Nisenson will give an update on the case and its implications.

The presentation is scheduled for December 10, 2015, 1:00 p.m., in room 310 of the Student Union at the University of Connecticut. It is open to all interested Connecticut faculty. Those able to attend should contact Michael Bailey at 860-487-0450 for details.

Notes from the Conference Executive Committee

CSC–AAUP Issues Call for Nominations

The 2016 CSC–AAUP Nominating Committee, comprising chair Charles Ross (CSC–AAUP Past President), Jocelyn Boryczka (FWC–AAUP Vice President), and Spencer Pack (Acting President, Connecticut College Chapter AAUP), announces a Call for Officer Nominations.

Nominations are being solicited for President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, and four At-Large Members of CSC–AAUP. Nominees must be AAUP members in good standing.

For information about the terms and duties of each office, please refer to the CSC–AAUP Constitution/Bylaws posted on the CSU web site. To make a nomination, or to self-nominate, please send candidate’s name, discipline, and institutional affiliation to the CSC–AAUP 2016 Nominating Committee c/o Conference Office, P.O. Box 1597, New Milford, CT 06776. Deadline for receipt of nominations: December 14, 2015.

Note: For AAUP’s call for National Election Nominees, see p. 7, ”National News.”

Save the Date…

CSC–AAUP Announces Plans for Spring 2016 Meeting

The Connecticut Conference’s Spring Meeting will take place on Thursday, May 12, 2016, at the Graduate Club in New Haven. Distinguished guest speaker James Sleeper, of Yale University, will address current encroachments on academic freedom and liberal education. Prof. Sleeper is an author and journalist who has also been a lecturer in political science at Yale University. He has taught undergraduate seminars on American national identity, journalism, liberalism, and democracy; he writes on American political culture, racial politics, media, and higher education. His talk is sure to be engaging and timely.

One of his recent publications, “Innocents Abroad?: Liberal Educators in Illiberal Societies,” appeared this summer in the Carnegie Council journal Ethics & International Affairs: http://projects.ethicsandinternationalaffairs.org/liberaleducation.

Mark your Spring calendar now; further information on the event and the talk will be available closer to the date.
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From the President:

In the Spring of 1990, the UB–AAUP negotiating team read, with inter-est and hope, the 1981 Harvard Negotiation Project book by Roger Fisher and William Ury, Getting to YES: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In (now in its second edition, copyright 1991). Contract negotiations can be very constructive, Fisher and Ury argue, enabling the two “sides” to reach agreement not only on terms of employment but also on mission, priorities, and the path ahead. We planned to use some of the ideas in an approach more collaborative than confrontational. After all, we reasoned, the University of Bridgeport’s administration presented the institution as in dire financial straits; the NEASC visiting accreditation team had noted some of the same organizational weaknesses the faculty were concerned about; the administration seemed to lack not only plans but also information as to how to reverse the school’s enrollment and financial declines. Perhaps we could strengthen our contract’s shared-governance and due-process aspects in exchange for considering reasonable financial concessions, we thought: in particular, perhaps we could restore the faculty’s primacy in academic planning.

To make the “yes” technique work, each side has to appreciate what the other side’s values, priorities, and perceived needs are, and both sides have to have the goal of actually reaching agreement, of finding the common ground that will enable that: both sides have to want a contract. When the Administration told us they needed our help in addressing the school’s financial crisis, we thought there might be a way to do something constructive.

For anyone who doesn’t know how all that turned out, you can read about it one step at a time at the blog put together by our UB–AAUP Executive Assistant, Alexander Kulcsar. On that site you’ll also find a link to the administration’s final contract proposal, which they imposed shortly after the strike began. Not having seen our previous contract, you may not notice that their new one began by attacking the contract’s mission statement and hugely expanding the Management Rights clause. Sitting across the table from our team were not the university lawyer and a group of participating administrators, but an outside lawyer with a “union-busting” reputation insisting “You don’t talk to them (the strangely silent gaggle of administrators); you talk to… an outside lawyer.” But what we learned later was that the UB trustees actually did not want a contract: they wanted to impose a contract that in effect eliminated tenure and then they only imposed it after the strike began. Not having seen our proposal, they wanted to impose a contract that in effect eliminated tenure and then go on to get rid of faculty they found troublesome; failing that, they were willing to take a strike and terminate the strikers. In the end, they did both.

Why am I dredging up old news? Because CSU–AAUP and UConn–AAUP faculty described the shock of their administrations’ contract proposals presented this Fall to the faculties of CSU and UConn in terms of an assault—terms almost identical to those we at UB–AAUP used to describe the contract proposals presented to us some 25 years ago. “Rape,” we called it. (The 1990 UB contract makes fascinating reading side by side with the contract proposals presented to us some 25 years ago. “Rape,” we called it. (The 1990 UB contract makes fascinating reading side by side with the contract proposals presented to us some 25 years ago. “Rape,” we called it.)

A publication of the Connecticut State Conference of the American Association of University Professors, Inc., which is distributed to Conference members and others. It is not intended to reflect the positions of National AAUP or any other organization. Articles or letters for publication may be sent to the Conference office. The Editorial Committee reserves the right to edit submissions but will not make substantial changes without consultation with the author. Submissions are always welcome and may be addressed to the Conference office. Permission to reprint articles in not-for-profit publications is granted; however, references must be cited and a sample copy of the publication sent to the Conference office.

Editorial:

Good Sense Good Faith!


From the President:

MOOCs are in the news again. Pieces in the New York Times and the Hartford Courant last Spring reported new and improved versions of the MOOC slogan, “More bang for the buck!” But Kevin Carey, propagandist-in-chief and author of The End of College, seems muddled as to where the buck stops. (See Joe Nocera’s “College for a New Age,” NYT [10 March 15].) Carey rightly ascribes ballooning tuitions to universities’ bankrolling luxurious campuses and bloated sports programs. “If you have to pay for the things you actually need, education doesn’t cost $600,000 a year.” At the same time, however, he lambastes expenditure on libraries and research facilities, since they merely fuel the “insane race for status.” (Labs, libraries, theaters, museums, and concert halls exist, of course, to entice status-seeking “customers.”) Supersizes administrative salaries, alas, go unmentioned.

MOOCs, Carey reassures us, will be known as a transnational education “liberated” from elite institutions (including community colleges, presumably). What’s more, research data and artificial (!) intelligence will allow the new-and-improved university to accommodate individual learning styles so as to raise all intellectual boats, here and abroad.

Last, and not least, Carey’s elec-tronic “University of Everybody” would be masterminded by those best qualified to do so—scientists (technocrats?), venture capitalists, and entrepreneurs. Such re-invention suggests to me “conceivable” teaching by way of MOOCs. Does anyone sniff a logistics problem here?

I do, especially having read elsewhere that the U. of E., pledging to “liberate” education of the MOOC slogan, “More bang for the buck!” But Kevin Carey, propagandist-in-chief and author of The End of College, seems muddled as to where the buck stops. (See Joe Nocera’s “College for a New Age,” NYT [10 March 15].) Carey rightly ascribes ballooning tuitions to universities’ bankrolling luxurious campuses and bloated sports programs. “If you have to pay for the things you actually need, education doesn’t cost $600,000 a year.” At the same time, however, he lambastes expenditure on libraries and research facilities, since they merely fuel the “insane race for status.” (Labs, libraries, theaters, museums, and concert halls exist, of course, to entice status-seeking “customers.”) Supersizes administrative salaries, alas, go unmentioned.

MOOCs, Carey reassures us, will be known as a transnational education “liberated” from elite institutions (including community colleges, presumably). What’s more, research data and artificial (!) intelligence will allow the new-and-improved university to accommodate individual learning styles so as to raise all intellectual boats, here and abroad.

Last, and not least, Carey’s electronic “University of Everybody” would be masterminded by those best qualified to do so—scientists (technocrats?), venture capitalists, and entrepreneurs. Such re-invention suggests to me “conceivable” teaching by way of MOOCs. Does anyone sniff a logistics problem here?

I do, especially having read elsewhere that the U. of E., pledging to “liberate” education of the MOOC slogan, “More bang for the buck!” But Kevin Carey, propagandist-in-chief and author of The End of College, seems muddled as to where the buck stops. (See Joe Nocera’s “College for a New Age,” NYT [10 March 15].) Carey rightly ascribes ballooning tuitions to universities’ bankrolling luxurious campuses and bloated sports programs. “If you have to pay for the things you actually need, education doesn’t cost $600,000 a year.” At the same time, however, he lambastes expenditure on libraries and research facilities, since they merely fuel the “insane race for status.” (Labs, libraries, theaters, museums, and concert halls exist, of course, to entice status-seeking “customers.”) Supersizes administrative salaries, alas, go unmentioned.

MOOCs, Carey reassures us, will be known as a transnational education “liberated” from elite institutions (including community colleges, presumably). What’s more, research data and artificial (!) intelligence will allow the new-and-improved university to accommodate individual learning styles so as to raise all intellectual boats, here and abroad.

Last, and not least, Carey’s electronic “University of Everybody” would be masterminded by those best qualified to do so—scientists (technocrats?), venture capitalists, and entrepreneurs. Such re-invention suggests to me “conceivable” teaching by way of MOOCs. Does anyone sniff a logistics problem here?

I do, especially having read elsewhere that the U. of E., pledging to “liberate” education of the MOOC slogan, “More bang for the buck!” But Kevin Carey, propagandist-in-chief and author of The End of College, seems muddled as to where the buck stops. (See Joe Nocera’s “College for a New Age,” NYT [10 March 15].) Carey rightly ascribes ballooning tuitions to universities’ bankrolling luxurious campuses and bloated sports programs. “If you have to pay for the things you actually need, education doesn’t cost $600,000 a year.” At the same time, however, he lambastes expenditure on libraries and research facilities, since they merely fuel the “insane race for status.” (Labs, libraries, theaters, museums, and concert halls exist, of course, to entice status-seeking “customers.”) Supersizes administrative salaries, alas, go unmentioned.

MOOCs, Carey reassures us, will be known as a transnational education “liberated” from elite institutions (including community colleges, presumably). What’s more, research data and artificial (!) intelligence will allow the new-and-improved university to accommodate individual learning styles so as to raise all intellectual boats, here and abroad.

Last, and not least, Carey’s electronic “University of Everybody” would be masterminded by those best qualified to do so—scientists (technocrats?), venture capitalists, and entrepreneurs. Such re-invention suggests to me “conceivable” teaching by way of MOOCs. Does anyone sniff a logistics problem here?
University of Connecticut

The UConn chapter of the AAUP has been hosting a Fall Lecture Series that has brought academic freedom and the faculty voice to the forefront of collective bargaining, and the faculty voice.

This series is one of many activities across the campus to bring awareness to the AAUP’s negotiations for a successor collective-bargaining agreement. These leaders have been sharing their insights on important campus issues in the academy, and how faculty can take the lead to address them on their campuses.

Three of the four presentations have already taken place:
- Professor Rudy Fichtenbaum (Economics, Wright State University; National President, AAUP) gave a Contract Negotiations Kickoff address on September 10.
- Risa Lieberwitz, Esq. (Industrial & Labor Relations, Cornell University; National AAUP General Counsel), spoke on “Academic Freedom and Civility” on September 30.
- Professor Ellen Schrecker (History, Yeshiva University) spoke October 22 on “The Corporatization of Higher Education and the Role of Collective Bargaining.”

The date for the fourth presentation is yet to be determined, but the speaker will be Professor Howard Bunsis (Accounting, Eastern Michigan University; Chair, National AAUP Collective Bargaining Congress). Inquiries about the lecture series should be directed to Chris Henderson at chenderson@uconnaaup.org.

Connecticut State University

Negotiations for a successor contract began on October 1, when the two sides exchanged contract proposals. The BOR proposals had been expected to involve deep cuts, and as Vipas Nair, Library, Western Connecticut State University, chief negotiator for AAUP, explained, “It is to be expected in such negotiations that the two sides will have very different starting points.” But the BOR proposals presented “truly drastic alterations to our work conditions” that were “alarming” even as starting points.

In the second session a reconstituted BOR team underscored their desire for a fair contract but also their need for “flexibility,” which had driven a number of their proposals.

There have been four sessions as of the end of November. Some of the more drastic BOR proposals have been described as “draconian,” “ludicrous,” “arbitrary,” “erroneous,” and areas of agreement have been identified.

The AAUP team ascribes some of the moderation of the BOR tone to the peremptory and principled reaction of students and the general faculty to the reaction of the BOR to the forceful and principled errors,” and areas of agreement have been identified.

The Mort Tenzer Travel Fund

The Mort Tenzer Travel Fund was established by the Connecticut Conference of the AAUP in 2005 to assist chapters or academic departments in hosting guest speakers in the interests of advancing AAUP principles of academic freedom and free inquiry. The College and University Committee voted to extend the terms of the grant to support travel by full- or part-time faculty for academic purposes. We have received a generous contribution to the Mort Tenzer Travel Fund from an anonymous donor.

The George E. Lang Jr. Award

The George E. Lang Award was established by the Connecticut Conference of the AAUP in 2007 to honor the memory of our colleague by recognizing a faculty member whose work continues David Bedding’s tradition of multi-level service to the principles and responsibilities of AAUP.

The Walter F. Brady Jr. Award

The Walter F. Brady Award for the Advancement of Higher Education in Connecticut was established in 2007 to honor the memory of an individual who has significantly increased the knowledge and understanding of the role of AAUP in the state. To date, recipients have included members of the State government and administrators in higher education.

The CSC–AAUP Award

The CSC–AAUP Award for Outstanding Service to the Profession recognizes a Connecticut faculty member whose work over time represents outstanding personal and professional commitment to the work and principles of the AAUP.

Donations to the Bard, Tenzer, and Lang funds, and to CSC–AAUP, are welcome and may be sent care of Flo Hatcher, Executive Director, CSC–AAUP, 108 0th Street, Hartford, CT. Contributions to CSC–AAUP are tax-deductible to the extent permitted by law.

To apply for a grant from the Bard or Tenzer funds, or to request more information about them, contact Flo Hatcher at the Conference Office, who will be delighted to assist you. Requests made as the need arises. Tenzer Travel Fund applications are reviewed and approved as they arrive but should be submitted at least six weeks before the date of the event.

Connecticut College

Spencer Pack, Acting President, Connecticut College Chapter, AAUP

On November 12 the Connecticut College Chapter of the AAUP hosted Richard Landes, Professor Emeritus of History, Boston University, who spoke at the college on "Threats to Academic Freedom in the Early 21st Century: Case Study of Connecticut College, Spring 2015." He discussed issues relevant to the current BOR contract negotiations and specifically noted the similarities between his previous work at the renowned Pequot Museum and Research Center, and University of Connecticut Anthropology Professor, conducted a tour of the archeology laboratory at the research center. After a Native American inspired lunch at the museum, the members toured a fortification site with Professor Pack and a Mort Tenzer Travel Grant from Connecticut State Conference–AAUP.

Connecticut State University

Negotiations for a successor contract began on October 1, when the two sides exchanged contract proposals. The BOR proposals had been expected to involve deep cuts, and as Vipas Nair, Library, Western Connecticut State University, chief negotiator for AAUP, explained, “It is to be expected in such negotiations that the two sides will have very different starting points.” But the BOR proposals presented “truly drastic alterations to our work conditions” that were “alarming” even as starting points.

In the second session a reconstituted BOR team underscored their desire for a fair contract but also their need for “flexibility,” which had driven a number of their proposals.

There have been four sessions as of the end of November. Some of the more drastic BOR proposals have been described as “draconian,” “ludicrous,” “arbitrary,” “erroneous,” and areas of agreement have been identified.

The AAUP team ascribes some of the moderation of the BOR tone to the peremptory and principled reaction of students and the general faculty to the reaction of the BOR to the forceful and principled errors,” and areas of agreement have been identified.

The Mort Tenzer Travel Fund

The Mort Tenzer Travel Fund was established by the Connecticut Conference of the AAUP in 2005 to assist chapters or academic departments in hosting guest speakers in the interests of advancing AAUP principles of academic freedom and free inquiry. The College and University Committee voted to extend the terms of the grant to support travel by full- or part-time faculty for academic purposes. We have received a generous contribution to the Mort Tenzer Travel Fund from an anonymous donor.

The George E. Lang Jr. Award

The George E. Lang Award was established by the Connecticut Conference of the AAUP in 2007 to honor the memory of our colleague by recognizing a faculty member whose work continues David Bedding’s tradition of multi-level service to the principles and responsibilities of AAUP.

The Walter F. Brady Jr. Award

The Walter F. Brady Award for the Advancement of Higher Education in Connecticut was established in 2007 to honor the memory of an individual who has significantly increased the knowledge and understanding of the role of AAUP in the state. To date, recipients have included members of the State government and administrators in higher education.

The CSC–AAUP Award

The CSC–AAUP Award for Outstanding Service to the Profession recognizes a Connecticut faculty member whose work over time represents outstanding personal and professional commitment to the work and principles of the AAUP.

Donations to the Bard, Tenzer, and Lang funds, and to CSC–AAUP, are welcome and may be sent care of Flo Hatcher, Executive Director, CSC–AAUP, 108 0th Street, Hartford, CT. Contributions to CSC–AAUP are tax-deductible to the extent permitted by law.

To apply for a grant from the Bard or Tenzer funds, or to request more information about them, contact Flo Hatcher at the Conference Office, who will be delighted to assist you. Requests made as the need arises. Tenzer Travel Fund applications are reviewed and approved as they arrive but should be submitted at least six weeks before the date of the event.

To read the Volume 28, Number 1, Fall 2015 issue of the EACT Newsletter and find information on membership, registration forms for all events and meetings, and updates on all the EACT activities, go to the EA website.
Book Review . . .

Reviewed by Joan C. Chrisler, Psychology, Connecticut College

Dear Committee Members is an epistolary novel. Unlike most, which take the form of letters home, letters to a lover, or “dear diary” entries, this clever book consists entirely of letters of recommendation (or LORs, as their author often calls them). The author of the novel, Julie Schumacher, is a professor of English and creative writing at the University of Minnesota, and her bio statement mentions that “she has written more letters of recommendation than she cares to recall.” The novel’s protagonist, Jason (Jay) Fitger, a professor of English and creative writing at Payne University, knows exactly how many LORs he has written because he keeps count; he announces at the start of the book that he has written over 1,300. The name of Jay’s fictional employer provides opportunity for humor: in a letter to the dean Jay refers to the campus as the “World of Payne.” In a letter recommending a student to the medical school, he wonders if the faculty at the Payne School of Medicine find their institution’s name as amusing as do faculty from other parts of campus.

If you decide to pick up a copy of this book, be careful where you read it because it is laugh-out-loud funny. Anyone who has ever written an LOR for someone they did not really want to recommend will be entertained by the way Professor Fitger deals with this situation. For example, in a letter of recommendation for admission to law school, he writes: “I’ve known Ms. deReudla for eleven minutes, ten of which were spent in a fruitless attempt to explain to her that I write letters only for students who have signed up for and completed one of my classes. That may be considered a bit excessive, but it is the policy I’m looking for.” (12). In a recommendation for a student who has applied for a campus work-study job, Jay tells the administrator: “He can read and write; he’s not unsightly; and he doesn’t appear to be addicted to illegal substances prior to 3:00 p.m….Interview Rosenthal. Just ask him to keep his left arm covered, unless you want to be exposed to a flashy panoply of R-rated tattoos.” (61-62).

In a letter in response to the new department chair’s request that he second the nomination of an eccentric and unproductive colleague for an endowed chair, he notes that the colleague must have sent in his own name because “no same person would nominate” him, and then writes: “If you want me to endorse his nomination in order to keep him quiet and away from your office (you will find him as persistent and maddening as a fly), you may except the following sentences and affix my name to them: ‘Professor Franklin Kentrell has a singular mind and a unique approach to the discipline. He is sui generis. The Davidson Chair has never seen his like before’” (8). In a later letter recommending that same colleague for a tenured professorship in English, Jay writes: “Kentrell will never survive round #1 of your deliberations; therefore, secure in the knowledge that this letter will soon join thousands of its brethren in a rolling bin destined for recycling—presumably before it is read—I am comfortable endorsing his application” (119). In a letter to the dean who asked Jay to second the nomination of Kentrell for chair of the university’s curriculum committee, he writes: “If you must allow him to self-nominate his way into a position of authority, please god let it be the faculty senate. There his eccentricities, though they may thrive and increase, are better suited to the position of chairman than of dean. His Tower of Babel, has not reached a decision of any import for a dozen years” (164). A few pages later, we see a ballot for the senate election with Kentrell’s name on it; Jay votes for him.

A letter recommending a student for an assistant editor position at an e-zine breathing in noxious fumes, tripping over extension cords, and worrying about the signs in the hallway that warn about the presence of asbestos. Jay is not tech-savvy. We watch him struggle with online recommendation forms, which are not set up to accommodate his rambling LOR style. His ex-girlfriend exited the English department, Jay writes: “Mr. Duffy Napp has just transmitted a nine-word email asking that I immediately send a letter of reference to your firm on his behalf; his request has summoned from the basement of my heart a star-spangled constellation of joy, so eager am I to see Mr. Napp well established at Maladin IT” (109).

There are so many hilarious nuggets in the letters that it was difficult to choose a sample to highlight in this review. Jay writes: “If you love to read (and what academician doesn’t?), here’s your opportunity to contribute to Vanguard. . . . Why not volunteer today?”

Reviewed by Joan C. Chrisler, Psychology, Connecticut College
SCSU Resolution in Support of Campus Equity Week

William G. Faracasa, Public Health, President, SCSU Faculty Senate

Campus Equity Week (October 26–30 this year) is dedicated to drawing attention to the contributions and working conditions of part-time faculty members, and advocating better working conditions for them. The Southern Connecticut State University Faculty Senate passed the following resolution in support of their part-time colleagues—just in time for Campus Equity Week:

Whereas, Part-time faculty members are teaching in ever greater numbers, to the point where they now constitute the majority of faculty in higher education; and
Whereas, Inadequate compensation and support of the part-time faculty is exploitive; and
Whereas, Part-time faculty members cannot fully participate in shared governance because their employment can be terminated without cause; and
Whereas, Part-time faculty members cannot fully express their academic freedom because their employment can be terminated without cause; and
Whereas, Heavy reliance on the part-time faculty places an undue burden on the tenured and tenure-track faculty as regards academic advising, committee work, and other service activities; and
Whereas, The trend toward cheap, temporary, part-time academic labor is largely a matter of priorities rather than economic necessity; now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Faculty Senate acknowledges the part-time faculty as valued colleagues, who are essential to the university; and
Resolved, That the Faculty Senate acknowledges the vital contributions of part-time faculty to the education of our students; and
Resolved, That the Faculty Senate calls for policies that provide equitable compensation, predictable appointments, opportunities for professional development and appropriate benefits for part-time faculty members; and
Resolved, That the Faculty Senate calls for policies that protect the academic freedom of part-time members and foster their participation in shared governance without fear of risking employment or other reprisal; and
Resolved, That the Faculty Senate supports Campus Equity Week as an important time of reflection that can lead to better working conditions, greater job security, and fuller acknowledgement of the critical role and contributions of our part-time colleagues.

A Matter of Perspective

This letter appeared in the Hartford Courant (Letters, 1 Dec 2015). We reprint it here with the author’s permission. — Ed.

It’s Faculty That Makes A University

The recent editorial honoring Walter Harrison, president of the University of Hartford, celebrated his achievements in the areas of financial management, enrollment management, real estate development, and personal involvement in student theater performances (27 Nov 2015, “An Effective College Leader”). Concerning the last-named achievement, the editorial noted that “Mr. Harrison never forgot that universities are for students.” As a faculty member at the university (and I speak for many of my colleagues here and at other schools), something is amiss here. Namely, a college or university is not “for students” in the consumerist sense, as the editorial’s language implies, if unintentionally.

College, rather, offers students a rare opportunity to learn from a faculty of established scholars, scientists, and artists dedicated to broadening students’ horizons, intellectually and socially. While passing reference was made in the editorial to a professor who started a micro business incubator, the word “faculty” did not appear in the text.

We must remember that it is the faculty of a college that collectively lays the foundation for its students’ educational experiences. So faculty, as an entity, must be duly incorporated into any honest assessment of higher education, its leaders, and its future.

Ira L. Braus, West Hartford

The writer is associate professor of music history at the University of Hartford and president of the Connecticut Conference of AAUP. — Ed.

“CT Higher Education Matters”:
CSU–AAUP Launches New Website

To facilitate communication with and political action by colleagues, the public, and the press, the Connecticut State University chapter of AAUP has established a site called “Connecticut Higher Education Matters.” The name puns nicely on both the issues and events in Connecticut public higher education and the commitment to quality public higher education in Connecticut.

The website’s subtitle is “making sure public education exists for the public good rather than corporate profit.”

A visit to the site’s homepage, http://www.ct-higheredmatters.org/, presents the reader with easy connections to its various pages: Where We Stand, You Decide, Advocacy, Action, Resources, and News. Reasoned discussion of the idea of public higher education (“Where We Stand”) provides a foundation for other Resources such as contact information for individuals in government, higher education, and the press and statements of principle on Academic Freedom and Tenure and other concerns particular to the profession. The Advocacy and Action pages provide concrete advice on ways to make one’s voice heard on the various “matters” in Connecticut higher education in Connecticut.

The website looks as if it will fill a real need for members of the public as well as members of the profession and the student body who want to participate in shaping public higher education in the State.
Editorial... from 2
is well below what the former president used to say was the minimum for operation. The academic pro-
grams are disjointed. Personnel from the Professors
Kappa, the AAUP, and the Future of the Academy,”
by Douglas W. Foard
Excerpt from “A Key Collaboration: Phi Beta
Kappa, the AAUP, and the Future of the Academy,”
by Douglas W. Foard
...For 225 years we have endeavored to place
our chapters only at those American institutions of
higher education that share our commitment to
freedom of inquiry. The process for obtaining a
chapter is fraught with pitfalls and roadblocks. Our
standards are so high that when the council convened
last year, the applications of only seven of the fifty-one
institutions for the 1997–2000 review cycle were
approved.
One of the first things the committee considers in
the chapter application process is the AAUP’s list
of censured administrations. Should an applicant’s
name be found there, the review process for that
institution comes to an immediate halt. The com-
mitee is also interested in such matters as teaching
loads, professional development opportunities for
the faculty, instructional and library facilities, the
role of the faculty in university governance, and
the quality of the student body. The list includes
administration run by the higher education com-
nunity for the well-being of the faculty and students.
Academe blog
While the classroom is an artificially enclosed
arena, it is not electronically enclosed. In a po-
etoy MOOC, multitudes would typically ingest the
wisdom—and occasional folly—of a Nobel Prize
winner who, best intentions aside, could not act as
the divining rod to sketch out the future of the
academy. The classroom, however, is not about
globalizing the academic economy, as Yale
and NYU have learned. It’s about fostering environments
where students are encouraged to think and
revisit aha! moments, the life-changing potential
of education at its simplest best.
...Dear fellow academicians, don’t buy into the
myth of a globalized academic economy, which
is not about globalization of the academic economy,
as Yale and NYU have learned. It’s about fostering
environments that encourage students to think
and revisit aha! moments, the life-changing potential
of education at its simplest best.

Does AAUP Censure Make a Difference?
Academe regularly publishes the list of administrations that, investigation shows, “are
not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure
to contemporary institutions of higher learning, even those that are seeking to establish a
chapter of Phi Beta Kappa.
To read the rest of this excellent article, go to the Academe blog.—Ed.

AAUP List of Censured Administrations: Connecticut
Academe regularly publishes the list of administrations that, investigation shows, “are
not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure
to the American Association of University Professors, the Association of
American Universities, and more than 160 other professional and edu-
cational organizations....Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean
that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty,
but specifically upon its present administration. The term ‘administration’ includes
the administrative officers and the governing board of an institution. The offices
of the Association have often been considered too valuable, in order to indicate their support
of the principles violated, to refrain from accepting appointment to an institution
so long as it remains on the censure list....The Association leaves it to the discretion of
the individual, possessed of the facts, to make the proper decision.

The Connecticut Conference of AAUP decided in 1999 to publish the list of Connecti-
cut institutions.Students have been told to consult with the date of the cure
of any entries. Two Connecticut institutions are on the list:
AAUP list: 
Albertus Magnus College...under censure since June 2000 University of Bridgeport...under censure since 1994

student to elect a MOOC on, say, Albert Einstein as philosopher? (Consider his admonition against
militarizing nuclear energy.) Would the U. of E., even think it “necessary” to offer a course of this type?
What about a poetry MOOC? William Chace, Emeritus Professor of English, Stanford, answers the
decision intuitively.
Once students want to know more, a minor miracle can happen in the classroom: the moment
when one student, then another, much to their surprise but owing to the artificially enclosed arena
in which they find themselves, say something they did not know they had the insight to say—or
the skill or the courage. It may well be something they could never say to their friends or parents. It may
be something unknown even to the student until that moment. It represents an advance from which there
is little likelihood of retreat. It is learning.... That kind of education tells students what their minds
can do, not what their minds contain (“What I Have
Taught—and Learned,” The American Scholar Winter
2015).

As far as what we know is still no trial handbook to outline faculty rights and responsibilities.
Thorsteen Veblen, American economist and sociologist, saw what was coming a hundred years
ago when he wrote The Higher Learning in America (an excellent review and article appeared in Inside Higher Ed last April, when the new Johns Hopkins
Press edition of the book was released). He warned in his book that the academic world was falling into the hands of politicians and businessmen encroached upon and gradually took over American higher education. In
the foreword to the 1998 edition, Veblen criticizes Veblen’s argument thus: “He attacked the ‘boot-
less Merrill’ of governing boards and the ‘skilled malingerers’ of university presidencies that are
appointed. These ‘captains of erudition’ (a play on
the then-current expression ‘captains of industry’) understand the value of a dollar and of publicity, but
not much else. To their way of thinking, good public relations meant ‘tardy, spectacled pageantry and a
straining after showy magnitude.’ And worse, they
misdirected higher education in its own likeness. Rather than taking Veblen’s concerns to heart,
the twentieth century (and now the twenty-first)
marched blithely ahead, seemingly guided by the
miracle of a hospital may be the charge of trustees or
teachers, of taxpayers’ representatives advised by
Admissions committees...Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean
that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty,
but specifically upon its present administration. The term ‘administration’ includes
the administrative officers and the governing board of an institution. The offices
of the Association have often been considered too valuable, in order to indicate their support
of the principles violated, to refrain from accepting appointment to an institution
so long as it remains on the censure list....The Association leaves it to the discretion of
the individual, possessed of the facts, to make the proper decision.

The Connecticut Conference of AAUP decided in 1999 to publish the list of Connecti-
cut institutions.Students have been told to consult with the date of the cure
of any entries. Two Connecticut institutions are on the list:
AAUP list: 
Albertus Magnus College...under censure since June 2000 University of Bridgeport...under censure since 1994
Call for Nominations

The Association’s Nominating Committee seeks nominations for candidates for election to the AAUP’s governing Council in spring 2016. Nominations are due by Monday, December 14, 2015.

The Council is responsible for overseeing the affairs of the AAUP, including setting dues, overseeing finances, establishing standing committees, and promoting the exchange of ideas among the membership, the leadership, and the staff. The Council generally meets in person twice a year in Washington, DC; between meetings, it conducts business via frequent e-mail discussions and conference calls.

Positions open for election

Four officer positions are open for election to 3-year terms:

- President
- First Vice President
- Second Vice President
- Secretary-Treasurer

Fourteen Council positions are open for election:

- Four at-large Council positions
- One Council position in each of these geographical districts:
  - District I (Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah)
  - District II (Alaska, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming)
  - District III (Michigan)
  - District IV (Arkansas, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, Virginia)
  - District V (Alabama, Canada, Florida, Foreign, Georgia, Guam, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Virgin Islands, West Virginia)
  - District VI (Ohio)
  - District VII (New Jersey)
  - District VIII (New York)
  - District IX (Connecticut, New Hampshire, Vermont)
  - District X (Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island)

Nominations procedure

If you wish to nominate yourself as a candidate for an office or Council position or to nominate another eligible member, you must submit the following information to the Nominating Committee by December 14:

1. The position for which the individual is being nominated.
2. The name, institution, and e-mail address of the individual making the nomination (if not self-nominating).
3. The name, institution, and e-mail address of the individual making the nomination (if self-nominating).

In addition, endorsements by letter and/or e-mail message from at least six AAUP members (one of whom may be the nominee) must also be presented to the Nominating Committee by December 14. Endorsements must cite the specific position for which the individual is being endorsed and the name, institution, and e-mail address of the endorser.

Deadline

As noted above, nominations must be submitted to the Nominating Committee by December 14. The Nominating Committee will submit its final report to the Council by December 21. All proposed nominees who meet the eligibility requirements will have their names included on the ballot for the spring 2016 election.

Please send nominations by e-mail message to nominations@aaup.org or by surface mail to:

AAUP Nominating Committee
1133 Nineteenth St. NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036

AAUP Mission

The mission of the AAUP is to advance academic freedom and shared governance; to define fundamental professional values and standards for higher education; to promote the economic security of faculty, academic professionals, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, and all those engaged in research and teaching in higher education; to help the higher education community organize to make our ideals a reality; and to ensure higher education’s contribution to the common good. Visit the AAUP website and Facebook. Follow us on Twitter.

Contact Charlie Baker, Chair, AAUP Nominating Committee

In higher education:
- Recruiting and retaining scholars of color.
- Challenges or opportunities facing minority serving institutions.
- The future of ethnic or labor studies in the academy.

Presentation proposals on all topics of interest to a multidisciplinary higher-education audience are welcome, but special consideration will be given to those that work within this theme. We encourage proposals that raise questions, engage conference participants in discussion, and foster dialogue.

You may propose either a complete session, with two to four participants, or an individual presentation, with one presenter. Individual presentations, if accepted, will be grouped into sessions with other related individual presentations.

Complete sessions may consist of a set of traditional presentations (a panel presentation), followed by Q-and-A, or may be structured as a roundtable discussion, designed to encourage more audience participation.

The AAUP Annual Conference on the State of Higher Education will be held June 15–19, 2016, in conjunction with the AAUP Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. Proposals will be accepted through December 7, 2015. All presentations will be scheduled for Thursday, June 16, or Friday, June 17.

To complete guidelines and to submit a proposal, please visit the 2016 Conference page on the AAUP website. Questions? E-mail proposals@aaup.org.

Gwendolyn Bradley, Director of External Relations

gb Bradley@aaup.org

UIUC Settlement with Prof. Steven Salaita

The headline for November 12 reads "University of Illinois Pays $875,000 to Settle Salaita Case." Steven Salaita, who sued the university after his contract was rescinded over controversial Tweets he had sent, described the settlement endorsed by the University’s Trustees as "a vindication for me, but more importantly… a victory for academic freedom and the First Amendment" and commented further, "The petitions, demonstrations, and investigations, as well as the legal case, have reinforced American higher education as a place of critical thinking and rigorous debate, and I am deeply grateful to all who have spoken out."

To read the press release from Salaita’s attorneys, find a link to more of the story, and add your comments to the discussion, visit AAUP’s Academic Blog. By the way, Columbia Law School’s Katherine Franke, who spoke on the issues in this case at CSC–AAUP’s 2015 Spring Meeting, was part of Prof. Salaita’s legal team.

Call for Proposals:

2016 AAUP Annual Conference Deadline: December 7, 2015

Dear Colleague,

We’ve issued a call for proposals for our 2016 Annual Conference on the State of Higher Education. As we move into our second century, we invite reflection on racial, social, and labor justice in higher education.

For example, presentations might explore:

- Issues of college access for students of color and those from working class families.
- Making sure that AAUP chapters are inclusive of diverse groups of faculty, including scholars of color and faculty in contingent appointments.
- Winning improvements in working conditions for faculty in contingent positions.
- History of the racial or labor justice movements
It’s contract negotiation time again at Connecticut’s four state universities. In my 35 years as a faculty member at Southern Connecticut State University, I have lived through numerous bargaining sessions and the acrimony associated with them. In the end, both sides give a little and work goes on pretty much as usual.

But this time things seem different—dreadfully so.

Last week, the Connecticut Board of Regents for Higher Education, the governing body of the state colleges and universities, fired an opening negotiation salvo that has devastating implications. The regents unleashed a plan to shift key personnel arbitrarily among campuses and to eliminate all funding for faculty professional development, the lifeblood of professors engaged in research projects. And that’s just for starters.

The curious thing is this: As administrative policy, the regents’ proposals have no utility. Instituting them would tear apart the affected universities, a result that no responsible overseer could countenance. Yet tendering these schemes as contract negotiations begins does have a serious intent to bring to heel an independent-minded university faculty unwilling to relinquish its academic freedom. That’s just for starters.

The result has been constant improvement in the level of instruction and student learning. The curriculums of our institutions should be broad and rich, fields of study, encouraged by their university’s policies. Connecticut’s middle class. For this board, cheaper is almost always better. It calls for larger classes, more online courses away from the university, a higher student-teacher ratio, fewer tenured full-time faculty and more dependence on underpaid adjuncts. It has no objection to faculty members pursuing research, as long as they do it on their own time and their own dime.

And they believe that those entrusted to teach should remain active in their fields of study, encouraged by their university’s policies.

The regents have a different idea of the kind of higher education worthy of Connecticut’s middle class. For this board, cheaper is almost always better. It calls for larger classes, more online courses away from the university, a higher student-teacher ratio, fewer tenured full-time faculty and more dependence on underpaid adjuncts. It has no objection to faculty members pursuing research, as long as they do it on their own time and their own dime.

Not surprisingly, the universities’ faculties have resisted attempts to implement the regents’ vision. Earlier this year they forcefully and publicly rejected a vast restructuring plan proffered by departing system President Gregory Gray that would have radically shifted the universities’ priorities. This may explain the regents’ wildly destructive contract proposals of recent days. Unable to have its way through persuasion, the system’s governing body seems to be engaging in a public hissy fit meant to slap back at its unbowed teams of educators. It appears to be saying to the faculty and the Connecticut middle class, in effect, play the game by our rules or we will rip down the structure that we have built together and let the stones fall where they may. That tactic is not likely to lead anywhere good, for anybody.

Will some cooler head, perhaps someone with authority in the governor’s office, prevail on the regents to modify their present course so that the state university system can continue to move forward?