During the academic year now drawing to a close, many of us have been participants in or witnesses to discussions concerning collective bargaining by faculty members in higher education. Some of us have taken positions on the matter, some seem interested but uncommitted, others apparently could hardly care less.

Most of the people I've talked with are not as well informed as they would like to be, despite a number of articles, meetings and Faculty Forum Papers on the subject. It is for that reason that I offer, with some reticence, my third Faculty Forum Paper of the year. I write, not as an advocate or opponent of bargaining, but as chairman this year of a joint AAUP-OSEA committee which has made a continuing study of the collective bargaining situation in American higher education. For the information of interested faculty members, I'll mention briefly what we've done and then try to summarize what we've learned.

We have read everything we could find on collective bargaining in higher education: law, opinion, research reports, news items, copies of negotiated agreements. We have met with colleagues, researchers, public officials, and representatives of would-be bargaining agents. We have attended interinstitutional conferences on the subject. We hosted a small interinstitutional meeting of our own. We have discussed our findings among ourselves and informally with others. We make no claim to expertise, but we have made a sincere effort to discover the who, what, how and why of collective bargaining in higher education today.

Occasionally we have spoken to faculty members who thought the committee was formed to organize the campus. They thought we intended to pass out leaflets, call meetings, give speeches, circulate petitions, and generally raise hell. This, of course, never was the case. We were a study group, and our sole mission was to study and report.

Well, what have we learned? We've learned that there is a growing interest in collective bargaining on campuses across the nation. It is a bottom-up movement, with community colleges following the lead of primary and secondary schools, and with four-year institutions following behind the community colleges. It is an East-to-West movement, with most of the action to date being in the states of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. There also has been activity at four-year colleges and universities in Michigan, Wisconsin, Nebraska and Hawaii.

At the beginning of this academic year, about 6% (50,000) of the nation's 836,000 higher education faculty members were employed under the terms of collective bargaining agreements. In terms of campuses, about
180 of 2,700 were organized. The great majority of these were community colleges or technical institutes; only six of some 1,800 four-year colleges and universities had contracts at that time (Southeastern Massachusetts University, Central Michigan University, Rutgers University, City University of New York, Long Island University, and the University of Wisconsin—in the latter for Teaching Assistants only).

Since then, bargaining elections have been held, or are about to be held, at such diverse four-year institutions as the University of Rhode Island, the 26-unit campus of the State University of New York, the 13-unit college system in the state of Pennsylvania, Wayne State University, Eastern Michigan University, Adelphi College, Boston State College, the Nebraska State College system, Oakland University, the New Jersey State College system, St. John's University, the U. S. Merchant Marine Academy, Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, and the University of Hawaii. Note that I am referring only to four-year institutions; many additional two-year institutions have been organized.

Professor Joseph W. Garbarino of the University of California (Berkeley), the leading researcher in this field, estimated at a recent conference that bargaining elections have been held at about 35 four-year institutions and/or systems thus far. No one can state the exact number of faculty members involved, as a year-end survey had not yet been made. It is quite evident, however, that a number of campuses have moved at least as far as holding bargaining elections during the current year. Perhaps eight or ten contracts have been negotiated and signed.

The bargaining agents selected by faculties thus far include the American Association of University Professors, the National Education Association, state employee associations, independent faculty groups, and the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO). As one would expect, the philosophies and bargaining styles of these organizations vary considerably. Elections to date have tended to be fairly close, with runoffs not uncommon. Normally the bargaining agent is elected by a simple majority of those voting; almost always this is a minority of the total faculty. It is still too early to say how successful the elected agencies will be in developing broad-based faculty support.

Bargaining objectives to date can be classified roughly as defensive and offensive. Defensive bargaining aims at preventing erosion of faculty rights and benefits or at recovering those which have been lost. The focus often is on procedures and due process. Offensive bargaining seeks to obtain new concessions. Its emphasis often is on economic concessions, but it may involve non-economic issues as well.

As many negotiations include both defensive and offensive issues, it might be helpful to think in terms of a bargaining continuum. Bargaining such as that at Boston State College recently, in which the main objective was simply to put existing governance procedures into contract form, would be near the defensive end of the continuum. The bargaining at CCNY last year, with its heavy emphasis on economic concessions, would be near the offensive end.
The emerging pattern, as I see it, is one in which a bargaining agent is chosen primarily in terms of its bargaining philosophy vis-à-vis the issues in a given situation. This is not to deny the effects of other factors, such as the forces of personality or organizing skill, but I think the basic criterion is as indicated. It therefore would appear that as long as issue packages continue to vary, each of the bargaining agencies will be able to find a place in the competitive market.

We were not able to identify a definitive set of conditions necessary and sufficient to bring collective bargaining to a university or a university system. We doubt that anyone has such information at the present time. Given that situation, let me take the risk of comparing higher education with American industry. Obviously, bargaining is not universal in industry. Most large organizations are unionized, but many smaller ones are not. Key elements of the labor force are organized, but a majority of workers are not. Yet, all parts of an industry are affected by the presence of bargaining anywhere in the system. I suspect that bargaining in higher education eventually will develop along similar lines.

Our committee has learned how to call for a collective bargaining election should the need arise at OSU. We have met with representatives of four bargaining agencies (AAUP, OSEA, AFT, NEA) which conceivably could represent OSU faculty members in bargaining. We have tried to evaluate each of those organizations in terms of its bargaining philosophy and capability. We have considered the pros and cons of coalition bargaining, along with the prospects for creating a completely new bargaining agency. We have considered the matter of appropriate bargaining units and the question of who, really, is our employer for bargaining purposes. We have been briefed on the law by experts. We may not have touched all the bases, but we have tried.

It has become obvious to the committee that interest in bargaining varies from campus to campus throughout the Oregon State System of Higher Education. While no one would claim, for example, that there is a surging demand for bargaining at OSU, responsible colleagues from the University of Oregon tell us that we can expect a vigorous push for collective bargaining on that campus in the near future. A combination of factors, including repercussions from the current fiscal emergency, has brought this about. You may well hear the rumbles before this paper arrives.

What kinds of events could lead the OSU faculty to collective bargaining? I've come to believe that any of several things might do it. In the short run, it could be triggered by any serious threat to faculty security. Emasculation of the tenure system could do it; violation of faculty rights during an emergency could do it; continued austerity coupled with inequitable allocation of merit pay increases could do it; even a general accumulation of miscellaneous grievances might do it.

In the medium run, I could see the OSU faculty being forced into bargaining by happenings elsewhere. Imagine a state university system with three units, A, B and C. At some point, one of the units, B, organizes for collective bargaining, while A and C remain unorganized.
B exerts pressure upon the management of the system and gains concessions.
What will happen at units A and C if they are not granted similar concessions?

To intensify the illustration, assume that the concessions gained by B are financial. Assume further that management is unable to expand the system's total pool of financial resources, and that the concessions won by B must be extracted from allocations normally given to A and C. Now what happens at the latter two institutions?

The third situation in which we might move into collective bargaining could develop over a longer run. It could come in response to the gradual emergence of professional managers in academic administration. I think we need to face the fact that increasingly, universities actually are going to be managed. In many cases they are going to be managed by people who are not, and never have been, academics. Some faculty members will not be terribly fond of the new managerial approaches to decision-making, and I can see this leading to collective bargaining in certain situations.

Collective bargaining could bring the faculty some advantages. The advantages usually sought include job security, economic benefits, a greater voice in policy formulation, and dependable, well-defined procedures for handling grievances. There also would be costs. In addition to the financial costs of bargaining, we could expect to lose something by way of flexibility in handling problems, recognition of individual differences, and perhaps in faculty-administration rapport. As we weigh the pros and cons of bargaining, the decisive factor will likely prove to be the quality of management at our institution.

So much for the thoughts and activities of this year's collective bargaining committee (Fred Harris, Lafe Harter, John Keltner, Helen McHugh and myself). Whether or not the local chapters of AAUP and OSEA will support a similar committee next year remains to be seen. I rather suspect they will. Although the composition of the committee may change, it will be good to know that at least one faculty group is keeping in touch with developments in bargaining and is prepared with facts and knowhow should a need for bargaining arise.

Jack L. Rettig
Business Administration
April 24, 1972
SOME REFLECTIONS ON GOOD TEACHING

It should be axiomatic that anyone who is a good teacher desires to teach the truth. Once a good teacher gets five minutes beyond definitions and simple historical reviews of the subject matter of his lectures, he soon gains the impression that he is not certain whether or not he is telling the truth. In general, he finds that he does not know what the truth should be. Most individuals are so disturbed by questions of what they should teach that sooner or later they start seeking for information that will more closely approximate the truth. Since the definition of truth is elusive, their search usually ends by eliminating and replacing the more erroneous facets of standard or textbook information. The man engaged in research to provide better materials and techniques is also a good teacher.

Basically the 7,000,000 or more students, to whom Jesse Bone refers in his Faculty Forum article, do not come to colleges and universities year after year for one to eight years with the continual realization they are not learning anything useful. The vast majority must feel they have gained something at a university, for if they really felt that university attendance was futile, they would look for the nearest job and leave the university as soon as one was found.

The students may not learn to shine shoes or to sweep floors, but they have accumulated some information, useful or not. They have learned to accumulate information (slowly or rapidly) and thus are trained to pick up some of the additional information they may need. The vast majority leave college and fit very well into the square world in which they were delivered.

Because of the teacher driven to research by the inadequacy of his subject matter, year by year the textbooks and lectures contain better and better information. And it is hard to see how even a few college students find these gains useless. It is more likely that a few of the poorer college students are unaware of the changing world and why it is changing.

For whatever reasons students go to college, most find their lives easier, pleasanter and more productive and profitable than they would have been without college, and some could have developed themselves equally well, and, frequently better if they had not gone to college.

The trust of university education had always been toward better and better teaching through research. Without research, teaching would remain standard and stereotyped. The only other possibility for teaching without improvements through research would be a vague wandering in the darkness.
That universities can be improved there is no doubt; that it is possible easily to tamper gainfully with a university, I doubt; but that the universities are not meeting the demands of the public, because of too much emphasis and greater rewards for research, is belied by the fact that annually the public sends its children to the colleges and universities in untold numbers. And 90% or more of these subsequently fit well into a world whose directions are not easily defined.

Hugo Krueger
Fisheries and Wildlife
April, 1972
Recruitment of Minority Groups

At intervals someone in the faculty reminds us that we do not have a fair representation of minority groups on our faculty. I am sure that the administration is reminded of this fact by either representatives of minority groups from off campus or by officials from the federal government. It is also true that most departments have investigated in their fields and find no candidates. At least I know this is true in my own.

This is a predicament, and while it may be an excuse at present, I don't think we can go on forever in this situation. For our own selfish interests, as well as for the good of these peoples, I believe that we should make a serious effort to recruit promising students in the minority groups. This appears to me a practical way to remedy this inequity.

It is perfectly clear that some minority groups are able to make substantial headway in our society, while others do not. I have no wish to downgrade the efforts of any group, but it appears to me that little or nothing has been done to help the native American Indians of this state and yet this group represents a substantial minority. I believe that some of our recruiting efforts might well be directed toward the Indian reservations in this state.

26 April 1972

Myron G. Cropsey