

Professors and instructors

From the LADDER to the REVOLVING DOOR



INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS LIBRARY

MAY 24 1972

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

[University of California]

AMERICAN FEDERATION

of TEACHERS,

[Berkeley, 1972]

The Revolving Door-Threat to Tenure

YOUR JOB IS AT STAKE

Last Spring the University Council—American Federation of Teachers exposed the UC administration's attempt to lay the juridical basis for replacing the ladder concept for non-tenured faculty with the revolving door. The mechanism was the complete overhaul of Section 52 of the Administrative Manual which deals with the appointment and promotion in the professorial series.

The pretext for making changes was the allegation that some junior faculty did not understand the probationary nature of the appointments, though the Administration could not provide the AFT with any hard evidence that such confusion does exist.

SUCKED ORANGE BRIGADE

Under the guise of making only "house-keeping" changes, involving no important substantive or procedural departures, the Administration lulled the Academic Senate into acquiescent negligence in defending faculty interests.

A detailed analysis of the Administration's proposals by the AFT, however, alerted Senate leaders to the dangers, and a meet and confer session between the Union and the Administration raised so many questions that Section 52 was not implemented in July 1971 as intended but withdrawn for revision.

The new version released in October 1971, though an improvement upon the earlier draft by restoring some basic rights to the faculty, in no way alters the purpose of the revision. The Administration remains determined to introduce the "sucked orange brigade" for junior faculty. In fact the pressures to do so have mounted in the past year.

THE FINANCIAL CRUNCH

The Reagan Administration has served notice on the University that it must cut costs. As the time for the 1972-73 budget approaches, the best informed guess in Sacramento is that the forthcoming Reagan budget for the first time will recommend *less* money for UC

than is in the current budget. The new budget will probably call for significant cuts in faculty positions which means that the administration will be under intense pressure to get rid of assistant professors at the same time as it jacks up the workload for the remaining faculty.

The Reagan Administration expects that by keeping down the number of tenured positions, the state can make considerable savings, especially if a permanent revolving pool of low-paid non-tenured faculty is available. This means that instructional departments can no longer count on tenure being granted to assistant professors whose research, teaching, and public service merit promotion in the professional judgment of the faculty.

THE NEW ACADEMIC JOB MARKET

Even before revising Section 52, UC administration was increasing the number of non-ladder appointments. For example, at UCLA ladder appointments (instructor through professor) from 1967 to 1971 increased from 1071 to 1241, about 15 percent. During the same period, non-ladder appointments (associates and lecturers) went from 361 to 757, an increase of about 109 percent for general instruction positions.

Some top UC administrators have in fact been candid about this new policy. On one campus a Vice-Chancellor for academic affairs told AFT representatives last Spring that the University wants the flexibility to get rid of assistant professors regardless of whether they meet UC standards for promotion in order to save money by holding down the number of tenured faculty.

This serious threat to the jobs of UC faculty reflects the conviction of politicians and administrators that a crowded academic job market puts them in the driver's seat and enables them to pay lower salaries and eliminate any necessity to make a commitment to junior faculty that an appointment will lead to tenure upon demonstrated merit. In this way the University may try to solve the problems growing out of diminished financial support and a slower rate of growth. Section 52 provides the administrative mechanism.

How It Is Being Done

Understandably the UC administration sought to avoid appearing to make a sudden, dramatic change in policies or conditions of employment that threaten the faculty. Nothing must be permitted to shatter the illusion that academic employees can rely on the administration to look after their welfare. UC preferred to introduce important changes in an ambiguous way. We are only codifying existing practices, making minor adjustments in procedures to clarify long-established policies and practices, the administration has insisted.

There are several advantages in proceeding with studied ambiguity. Adopting "salami tactics", the University can introduce changes in small stages. Moreover the changes are masked by subtle alterations of language so that the revised Section 52 looks superficially like the present policy, and this fooled many of the Academic Senate leaders at first. Yet it contains extensive changes which are not apparent unless a detailed comparative analysis of the present policy and the revision is made. The UC-AFT has prepared such an analysis which is available from the UC-AFT office.

A SHORT COURSE ON SECTION 52

Here is the essential mechanism for establishing the revolving door if the October draft of Section 52 becomes UC policy.

Reappointments are Separate Personnel Actions

Each appointment or reappointment within the rank of assistant professor is considered a *separate personnel action and terminal*; and there is "no obligation to reappoint or promote, nor to demonstrate that the appointee is unsatisfactory." This policy can be used to break the ladder concept. There is no statement that meritorious performance would lead to reappointment or promotion and, in fact, termination could be for any unspecified reason.

The "No-Funds" Joker

A key new policy is that "promotions may be made only within the limits of available funds." Although it sounds almost platitudinous, in practice it can be the joker in every review procedure. For example, a promotion

could be denied for reasons unrelated to merit, and another person hired at a lower salary.

The Right to Be Reviewed

There is no longer an individual right to a review or *ad hoc* committee evaluation, except at the final review for promotion to tenure. A review committee will be appointed only if the Chancellor or the Budget Committee considers it "desirable." There are, however, no criteria for determining desirability.

At the Pleasure of the Chancellor

The Chancellor will have more latitude to make decisions based on vague or non-existent criteria, and faculty input is downgraded accordingly. At present the Chancellor is required to make appointment or appraisal decisions on the record established by the department recommendations and the reports of the review and budget committees. This is eliminated in the revision. The Chancellor is required to base only the promotion to tenure decision on the evidence and recommendations. But at this point he can still use the "available funds" joker.

The Final Twist

An assistant professor will have no assurance of receiving a promotion even after Regental action. Under present policy, once the Regents give their approval, the promotion is made. But now there is a new twist! When "a promotion is not precluded by Regental action, the President will notify the Chancellor that he is free to extend the offer . . ." The Chancellor will have the option to make the promotion or not, and there are no criteria set forth to justify denying a promotion after Regental action. In fact, this failure to place limits on the Chancellor is a *deliberate* omission because it is asserted that the University "is under no obligation to reappoint or promote, nor to demonstrate that the appointee is unsatisfactory."

At every important point the revisions erode faculty power. The cards are stacked in favor of administration which will be given a relatively free hand to deny promotions and reappointments, or overturn faculty recommendations unencumbered by clear criteria for decisions or concern for due process.

IT'S UP TO YOU — JOIN THE AFT

Recent years have seen a continual attrition of the faculty's power to determine who may teach. Substantial power was lost: in the 1968 Cleaver case involving guest lecturers; in the 1969 case of Angela Davis whom the Regents first prohibited from teaching and then fired; and again when the Regents revoked the Chancellors' authority for promotions to tenure following the controversy over the Marcuse appointment. The intense political heat generated in these cases overshadowed the genuine diminution of faculty autonomy.

Now, the traditional prerogative of the tenured faculty to determine its own composition is being nibbled away again. This time the threat is to the ladder concept and the jobs of non-tenured faculty.

UC administration has revised its first version of Section 52 which downgraded Senate review by limiting the Budget Committee's ability to appoint review committees. But the new version is not any more palatable because the issue of tenure, security of employment and increasing the number of non-ladder faculty positions will not subside even if the revisions of Section 52 are completely withdrawn.

However, it is not enough to maintain the status quo. The present policy looks good only in comparison with the revised Section 52. It is long overdue that non-tenured faculty know the reasons for non-reappointment or promotion, and enjoy full due process in the the right to appeal adverse decisions.

Just as the UC-AFT met and conferred with the Administration last Spring, so now we have notified the University that it is obligated under law to meet and confer in good faith with us before it may implement new policies which jeopardize the job security of UC faculty.

The AFT's ability to represent and defend the interests of faculty, librarians and other academic staff depends on membership.

The name of the game is power. An unorganized faculty is without the strength to defend its interests. A strong AFT, linked with allies in the labor movement, is the faculty's best vehicle to preserve the ladder concept and stop the Administration from introducing the revolving door at the University of California.

MEMBERSHIP CARD

I wish to join the American Federation of Teachers and I agree to pay monthly dues as follows:

Librarians I & II	— \$4	Instructors	— \$5	Assistant Professors	— \$6	Professors	— \$12
Librarians III & IV	— \$6	Lecturers	— \$5	Associate Professors	— \$9		

Dues for other categories will be comparable to those paid by the professorial ranks. Minimum monthly dues for part-time faculty are \$5.00. NOTE: Union Dues are tax deductible.

NAME (PRINT) _____ SOC. SEC. # _____

HOME ADDRESS _____

CAMPUS _____ DEPARTMENT _____

RANK OR OTHER CLASS _____ FULL-TIME _____ PART-TIME _____

I wish to have my monthly dues of \$ _____ billed on the following basis:

Payroll dues deduction ☐ Direct billing ☐

SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____



Postage
Will Be Paid
by
Addressee

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

First Class Permit No. 2383

Berkeley, Ca.

University Council – AFT
2510 Channing Way
Berkeley, California 94704

No
Postage Stamp
Necessary
If Mailed in the
United States

