Rationale for Women's Studies

It may be shocking to some that any mention of sex should intrude upon our sacred intellectual quest. Yet women do encounter locked doors in the halls of learning. Women's Studies is one means of opening those doors. Women's Studies also provides opportunity to improve education for all our students. Perhaps this forum will help answer some of the many questions we are often asked.

Oregon State now provides equal educational opportunity for women and minorities. It is not enough to make this declaration, however, and expect it to become a reality for women without Women's Studies. Women still perceive their intellectual and economic roles very narrowly. Women as professors in the classroom and women administrators help to broaden women students' horizons and strengthen their aspirations.

Women are largely invisible in the traditional university curriculum. The answer to the question, why not Men's Studies? is that we already spend millions of dollars on Men's Studies under the guise of the traditional disciplines. As a matter of fact, it is possible for a student to graduate in many areas and know nothing about the role of women in their particular discipline.

Women's Studies is that realm of interdisciplinary knowledge which explores the nature of women, their role and contributions through the various disciplines. Courses therefore must be generated and offered within departments. A Women's Studies course, for example, might be called Images of Women in Literature and be offered by the English department. The only specific Women's Studies courses which may be offered are an introductory course and an occasional Women's Studies seminar. F.T.E. generated by the program thereby would go to participating departments. At the same time, responsibility for maintaining academic rigor and integrity rests quite properly within the specific discipline involved. At least this is the approach we would prefer campus.
There were 17 Women's Studies courses taught in the United States in 1969. Today there are 2700. Even though universities represent only 12 percent of America's higher education, 42 percent of these 2700 courses are taught in the universities.

Oregon State has already assumed a position of leadership in Women's Studies among Oregon's universities. One of our primary goals is to restore to civilization the lost knowledge about women. Much corrective scholarship is needed so that students can be provided with the rich heritage of women and not just that of man's world. We no longer want curriculum to be sexually stereotyped so that students can begin to learn about women, their past and their future.

We are rapidly approaching the time when we need not sex label people but can learn to appreciate each other's individual differences. Women's choices should be dictated by their qualifications, interests and personal goals not by patriarchal traditions that put women down as inferior in the name of mankind's progress. Oregon State University is dedicated to serving the needs of Oregon's people. We believe we'll meet those needs of 52 percent of our population better with a Women's Studies program.

November 5, 1973

Jeanne/Dost
Director
Office of Women's Studies
SALVAGING WHAT WE CAN THROUGH COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

While many of our colleagues are eager to embrace collective bargaining, a number hold back. They ask, "We, bargain with the University? Preposterous! We are the University!"

Behind the idea that we are the center of the University is the claim that we are professionals. We know our specialties better than any outsiders. No one else can judge the qualification of the people we hire and retain as well as we can. Consequently, our basic unit is the department, the members of which share a common discipline.

As professionals, we believe that we should be self-governing. At least we should share the responsibilities of governance with administrators. We assume that we and they are men and women of goodwill and reason. Our community of interest is sufficient that decisions are determined more by reason than by the exercise of authority. Our ideal is that decisions emerge from a consensus.

Our concept of University does not minimize the role of the administrator. Instead, we conceive of him as a leader and not a manager. He provides stimulation, wise counsel, and resources. Knowing his people intimately, he seeks to learn of their hopes and ambitions. When he uncovers sources of initiative which can lead to better programs, he answers, "Why not?" He sifts through the various opportunities in order to nurture the development of his organization. How he allocates the resources at his disposal determines its direction of growth and its success. Even if he can give little but his personal encouragement, he stimulates those who take initiative.

His most important task is in aiding his colleagues in the recruitment of new faculty with the highest possible qualifications. Any institution with a high concentration of highly competent people will be a strong one. It will fulfill its mission with distinction and provide excellent opportunities for its faculties to advance professionally. Under such conditions, leadership becomes a channeling of initiatives, rather than the creation of programs by administrators.

While this ideal is seldom reached, the pursuit of it has led some of America's colleges and universities to provide a higher educational system admired the world over. Many of the best minds in the world have flocked to our shores to join our institutions both as students and scholars. In the process, we have created the greatest concentration of quality scholars and scientists in the world. We have also trained vast numbers of people who sustain our leadership in technological developments.
At least by some standards American colleges and universities have been highly successful. We think our decentralized professional organizational structure has been partly responsible. Yet that structure makes no sense to outsiders. When they cannot fit our structure onto a tidy line and staff organizational chart, they cannot see how anything but chaos can result. During the student uprising of a few years ago, the public demanded to know "Who is in charge?" and no recitation of committees, councils, and senates could satisfy them.

When state after state faced financial difficulties, political leaders demanded to know exactly what was the public getting for its money. They hurled the term "accountability" at educators as a challenge. All of the successes of higher education could be written off as accidents unless educators could explain, evaluate and measure what they were doing. In other words, administrators should use management tools to govern their faculties.

Students also demanded accountability from faculty members. They insisted upon rating teachers and upon having a voice in the retention and promotion of professors. Within a short time, student rating of teachers became another management tool.

When legislatures failed to produce the resources, administrators could no longer operate in the old style. Instead of encouraging initiative by providing resources, administrators began taking resources away. They were forced to act as though professors were employees to be discarded when no longer needed.

So far the tenure system has survived the attacks on it. It is obvious to us that students, the general public, and even some administrators are not happy with it. They see it as a barrier to the efficient management of employees. The Board members insist that a significant number of us are lazy, incompetent or even senile. They think that once we have tenure, we no longer have sufficient incentives to do our jobs. Obviously, they view us as employees stuck in dull jobs instead of professionals with rewarding careers.

Fortunately, the Board members know that if they lead the nation in striking down our tenure, they may endanger all of our Oregon universities and colleges. Consequently, they have developed a new set of policies to fulfill their objectives. Promotions and tenure under them will be more difficult to achieve. We will be subjected to numerous written evaluations. These will be useful when the important decisions are made by stranger administrators, instead of by peer group colleagues. They can also be used to build cases to support discharges. On peril of losing our jobs and being forced to change careers, we will have the incentives required to force us to do our jobs. If we fail to measure up, the administration is to "humanly but firmly" terminate us.
We are to have a career development program for all of us whether in our early years, mid-years, or late years. It may be that the program will provide opportunities or it may be another attack on academic freedom. Traditionally, as professionals, we have followed our own intellectual interests consistent with our abilities. In maximizing our own professional careers, we have believed that we were making our departments and universities stronger. Now in the age of grants and accountability, we may be required to subordinate our interests in order to maximize the interests of an administrator, a department or a university.

While many of us fight the idea of collective bargaining, we find the legislature included us in a collective bargaining law. When we complain about their treatment of us, legislators tell us we should use their law. They see us as employees. In fact, everyone does, except us.

If our universities were among those who compete for the best minds at considerable expense, we would have the dignity and respect we crave. But, the fact is, those who are over us cannot understand our concept of a university. It is time we stop living in a dream world of first class universities. We must salvage what we can by collective bargaining. At least some of our collegial system may yet be saved.

Lafe Harter
Department of Economics
November, 1973
AAUP'S NINE-MONTH FACULTY RETIREMENT PLAN

Professor Maxine Warnath's Report on OSBHE, to Oregon Federation of AAUP, dated November 1, 1973, elaborates on the Nine-Month Faculty Retirement Plan mentioned earlier in the AAUP Federation Newsletter.

Off hand, the proposal appears to have merit but it may ultimately be more harmful than helpful. Its objective is to obtain determination of the PERS pension on the basis of annual salary rate instead of actual salary received during the period of employment. So far so good. The important point that is missed is that teachers or faculty on 9-month appointments currently get credit for a full year in the formula or 33% more time than they actually work! A request for a change from actual salary to salary rate could be counteracted by a reduction in credit from a full-year to actual time served, 9 months or 0.75 basis in the formula, for persons on 9 month appointments.

Interestingly, OSU Chapter 72 of OSEA introduced a resolution, to both the 1972 and the 1973 sessions of the OSEA General Council, that would have allowed gradual instead of abrupt retirement by computing the PERS pension benefit on the basis of salary rate. However, the computation would have deducted time not served. For example, a faculty member who began service at age 35 could have elected at age 61 to reduce his service by 20% each year of his remaining years before 65. If he were allowed to incorporate in the formula his salary on a rate basis, say $15,000., as the average of his best three years in the last ten, with an average of .50 service after 60, his pension would have been computed as follows:

\[
27.5 \text{ years of PERS membership (from age 35 to 60 at full-time and on average of half-time from 61 till 65)}
\]
\[
\times \frac{15,000}{2} \text{ (average yearly salary rate of best three years in last ten)}
\]
\[
\times 1.0\% = $4125.00 \text{ yearly pension.}
\]

This would compare to $4500.00 for retirement after full-time service to age 65.

The AAUP proposal is much more generous than the OSU Chapter 72 proposal since it would compute the pension incorporating the salary rate but without reduction for time actually served. The result of the proposal would be a boost of 22% in pension benefits solely from consideration of salary rate instead of salary actually received.

This proposal is unrealistic and politically naive as it does not take into account the danger of losing credit for time actually not served by teachers and faculty on 9-month appointments.

The full scope of the problem is probably best understood if we ask: "Where will the money come from?". Employer contributions are determined on the basis of total payroll and then are invested as judiciously as possible to maximize earnings. The contributions and the earnings over a period of time, the longer the better, are than actuarially used to project what formula pension can be paid out equally to all participants irrespective of factors that could justify unequal payments. Already, the pension computation ignores sex which actuarially should give males a higher pension than females because males do not live as long. Another recent discrepancy is that participants with 25 years of service at age 62 or with 30 years of service at age 60 can
now receive pensions that are not actuarially reduced and this means windfalls of 24% and 40% higher pensions respectively than would otherwise prevail. Who pays for such actual and potential windfalls or true instances of discrimination? In the case of the unisex pension the male participants do, since they would be entitled to higher pensions on the basis of their lower life expectancy. The windfalls to early retirees who meet the unique requirements, of 25 years of service at age 62 and 30 years of service at age 60, are paid out of funds that could otherwise be distributed equally to all participants.

The AAUP proposal for computation of the formula benefit on the basis of salary rate without reduction for time not served would result in a pension 63% higher than it should be when equitably computed and 22% higher than currently computed. The additional 63% in pension benefits would really not be paid by the employer but more truly skimmed from all other participants on 12-month appointments.

I would also ask how would the 12-month appointees and those who get summer term appointments be treated equitably? There is a serious matter of equity in this whole question. I therefore urge my colleagues to fully examine the impact of this AAUP proposal before promoting it much further. I feel concerned that it could ultimately result in reduction of time of service for persons on 9-month appointments in the computation of pension benefits.

Paul E. Bernier

November 15, 1973

PEB:mmb
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING:
A PROBLEM OF DISCRIMINATION

I agree with the principle of Professor Anton's recent Faculty Forum paper calling for collective bargaining. As one in an almost identical situation to Professor Anton -- in rank for five or six years and only now having struggled to the first salary step of my rank -- the appeal of unionization is compelling. I, too, feel that the system has failed me. So long as I must compete with other members of my department for a fixed amount of meagre salary funds each year, the chances of my ever reaching an "average" salary for my rank are virtually non-existent. I want to be judged on my own merits without the attendant guilt feelings that if I receive an extra $100, someone else in my department must receive $100 less than he/she might have received. I want to be freed from the collective faculty suspicion that we are second class citizens because there always seems to be a shortage in the money available to us while "they" -- the administrators -- somehow leap forward with inevitable regularity by amounts few of us can ever hope for. And so, collective bargaining presents a strong attraction.

At the same time, I feel that attempts to rally support for OSEA because it is allegedly the only organization actively pursuing collective bargaining is not only simplistic but factually incorrect. I am no more willing to buy the first organization whose leadership talks about collective bargaining than I am to buy the first house shown me by a salesman because it is raining and I need shelter...I figure that I would have to live with both for some time. To support an organization simply because it talks about action without examining its effectiveness in achieving desirable results for academic personnel or assessing its commitment to the values in higher education is to abandon rationality under the pressure of an emotional reaction to a very real grievance.

It is important, therefore, that the organization which represents faculty in collective bargaining be both knowledgeable about and sensitive to the priorities of faculty concerns over and beyond the financial returns issue, important as that may be. The ability to negotiate on matters of coffee breaks, playground coverage and seniority in the typing pool does not necessarily assure that a bargaining agent will know the first thing about how much to give and how strongly to stand fast in bargaining on issues of college faculty working conditions. Faculty members have entered their jobs with certain expectations about work conditions for faculty on a college campus and the types of satisfactions and rewards they want to receive. I suspect that these expectations are different both quantitatively and qualitatively from those of school teachers and clerical staff. This is not to say that the expectations of college professors are better or more desirable -- simply that they are different with a different priority level of components. Collective bargaining is just that: a bargaining arrangement between two parties who exchange concessions during negotiations toward an enforceable contract. You give something to get something. One does not simply become a union member, sit back and wait
for larger pay checks to arrive. Centers of influence shift — sometimes subtly, sometimes dramatically. Relaxed and informal relationships may become structured around requirements and regulations... Some individuals gain and others lose control over parts of their environment.

I do not believe, as some members of the leadership of OSEA do, that the welfare of the faculty is enhanced by pooling the membership lists of faculty and classified staff. The potential disadvantages of this arrangement seem obvious. Any proposal to improve the direct or fringe benefits for faculty may have to be modified or eliminated unless its gain could be measured against some gain equally desirable to classified staff. Any bargaining agent which represents both groups might be expected to place high priority on comparability of gains for both groups, paralleling the types of demands and concessions made by faculty with those of classified staff.

Faculty should be aware that they have had organizational representation in the informal bargaining which has already been going on. To the extent of its resources and the limitations imposed by massive faculty indifference, the State Federation of AAUP has been representing the faculty at the highest academic decision-making levels. In addition to its informal inputs at the monthly meetings of the State Board, it has engaged in numerous hours of negotiation through the past year with administrators at the Chancellor's office over work rules and provisions of the tenure guidelines. The accomplishments of the AAUP State Federation representatives in eliminating the quota system, including part-time faculty in tenure lines, clarifying and delimiting the fixed term tenure category, and making other contributions to the tenure guidelines are detailed on P. 3 of the October issue of the AAUP State Federation Newsletter which each faculty member should have received. This service has been a tremendous bargain for most faculty since relatively few have been willing to invest even a small amount of their financial or energy resources in an organization attempting to represent their particular needs.

The needs of faculty, however, are much too varied and numerous to be adequately served by any group or organization on an informal basis, no matter how dedicated those who do its work may be. We do seem to be moving inexorably toward formal collective bargaining. The organization which faculty choose to represent them will make a significant difference in the lives of all of us. No matter who writes the contract, faculty will have to give up some things in order to get some other things of greater importance to them... What we get and what we give up will in large measure be determined by the sensitivity of the bargaining agent to those things which are most and least important to the majority of its constituency.

It is critically important that faculty learn as much as possible about bargaining procedures generally and, most importantly, what critical issues for faculty the possible bargaining agents are willing to support. All will press for increased salary — but the formulas by which salaries are determined can vary widely as an examination of contracts already ratified in higher education will quickly reveal. Beyond the purely economic matters built into a contract, the whole range of working conditions will be up for negotiation. Unless you know what the negotiating priorities of the possible bargaining agents are, when it comes time to vote, you may saddle yourself with an agent which has exhausted its resources after financial...
matters have been settled and which simply considers issues such as tenure or individual initiative to be of little consequence -- or even antithetical to collective bargaining.... The AFT, for instance, did bargain away tenure at the University of Hawaii. You should be clear about the advantages and disadvantages of local and statewide bargaining, keeping in mind that local control of contract details are lost when one agent is representing several diverse units and negotiations must reflect compromises between the priorities of the different units.

During the period of time we have left to us before a decision will be made, faculty members would do well to apply their research and analytic skills to the practical problem of collective bargaining. When an election is called, as seems certain, we will have only ourselves to blame if our vote reflects an emotional response to one issue or our apathy toward the informational efforts of the potential bargaining organizations and we end up with an agent which doesn't understand the full range of faculty needs or must balance our demands against those of some non-faculty groups which it represents.

Charles Warnath
Psychology

11-26-73
OSEA and Medical Insurance

I would like to refute the inference made by Robert Jones in last month's Faculty Forum that OSEA threw him into "a state-wide employee group I now pay, in addition to state contributions, twice as much as I did before for practically the same medical coverage."

OSEA had nothing to do with the termination of the TIAA major medical insurance plan at OSU. OSEA has consistently lobbied for State participation in health-medical insurance programs. The Legislature finally chose to implement the request in 1971 by creating the Oregon Employees Benefits Board and allocating $10 per month per employee. This contribution was increased to $15 per month by the last Legislature. The OEBB chose four plans: basic, major, combination, and health maintenance. Unfortunately, the state law disallowed participation in any other ongoing plan by simply denying payroll deduction for other than its four plans.

Contrary to your opinion and that of a number of your colleagues, OSEA itself would have benefited if the insurance contributions had been made to existing programs since it had medical insurance programs in operation and these attracted and kept its own members in the association.

You have assumed that because the TIAA major medical program cost less than the OEBB major medical plan that it meant an extra expense to the TIAA insured. Your assumption, according to Professor Lester Strickler, Professor of Insurance at OSU, is incorrect because the two plans differ substantially. There is a great deal more coverage in the present plans and careful study of the plans will show this. Also, you must take into account the spiraling cost of medical care that has occurred in recent years.

Myron C. Cropsey, Agricultural Engineering Department
November 1973
In assuming a more active leadership role in developing faculty personnel policy statements preparatory to collective bargaining, the executive board of A.A.U.P. has addressed itself to several current issues this term. One specific issue which involves all faculty and which is to be resolved this year whether or not collective bargaining is implemented later is the issue of your individual position description. This first individual position description is of critical importance and it should accurately reflect your current university responsibilities.

On July 23, 1973 the State Board of Higher Education passed AR 41.010 Section 5 which stated that yearly notices of appointment shall include:

"b. Description of position offered (including reference to any unusual duties)"

On August 22, 1973 the members of the OSU Academic Staff received a copy of these revisions in the Administrative Rules from D.B. Nicodemus, Dean of Faculty. The following notation regarding individual position descriptions was made:

"Provision 5b is new. In the time available, the preparation of an individual position description for each academic staff member and its inclusion on the Notice of Appointment did not seem feasible. Therefore, this fall, on an interim basis and subject to later modification after consultation with the appropriate faculty bodies, item 5b will be implemented in a much simpler manner using available information in our computerized personnel data system."

The question that is uppermost in many minds is through what process(es) is the individual position description to be written for each faculty member already employed by the University? What later modification will be made and by whom? Which are the "appropriate faculty bodies" to write your position description ---- or mine?

We must assume that AR 41.010 Provision 5b will be implemented by July 1, 1974. We must also assume that plans must be made for this implementation. The vital question is to what degree will we as faculty members be allowed or encouraged to develop our own position description? Surely those of us who have been here for several years must have some idea of the professional jobs we have been paid to perform!

I propose that we explore the idea that has already been implemented in at least two schools. I propose that faculty members employed prior to implementation of 5b actively participate in the writing of his/her individual position. As a guide, the faculty member would define his/her position in terms of:
1. Recent reports of service to the institution.
   a. Instructional responsibilities.
   b. Research accomplishments and other scholarly achievements,
      or where relevant, other creative or artistic achievements.
   c. Professionally-related public service.
   d. Institutional service, which includes but is not limited to
      the contributions made through departmental, school or
      institutional governance, service to students and student
      groups.
3. Other criteria which the faculty member wishes to employ.

   After this description of previously accepted professional performance
   is completed, the following steps would be taken:
   1. The faculty member and the department head (heads in joint
      appointments) discuss the description in terms of present and
      future staffing plans.
   2. In situations where there is substantial agreement between the
      discussants, the position description is forwarded to the
      appropriate administrative officer.
   3. Where there is substantial disagreement in the perceived position
      due to future staffing plans or for other reasons, the school or
      departmental elected salary, promotion and tenure committee shall
      facilitate an agreement.

   Of course, in the defining of a position description, certain campus
   inequities in teaching, advising, research loads, and other professional
   expectations become glaringly evident. This topic must be resolved another
   day and perhaps, in another way.

   As the individual faculty member participates in the preparation of his/
   her own position description, we begin to approach one of the tenets of A.A.
   U.P.; faculty participation in determining his or her own future. And more
   importantly, we take one small step towards humanizing this unwieldy mech­
   anistic power structure known as Oregon State University.

   Margaret Lumpkin
   November 30, 1973

   N.B.

   This proposal, in the form of a motion, has been presented to the execu­
   tive committee of the Faculty Senate. The motion was subsequently forwarded
   to the Faculty Status Committee; Allen Scott, Chairman. Let your views be
   known to the committee - with a copy to me, if possible.
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