President’s Message
Michael Harkins
President, Illinois AAUP

Last April, our Spring Conference at St. Augustine College in Chicago covered a number of important issues. Marty Kich of Wright State presented Corporatization and Online Education. Our current Board members noted the process of AAUP investigations and academic censure through a panel presentation. Marty Chair and members participated in this Conference. The response from our members attending the Conference was positive.

Over the next few months, we will consider re-offering the sessions to local Chapters or at regional meetings. This November the Officers and Board will meet to discuss and plan our Spring 2016 Conference. Since our last meeting the Officers, Board and Committees have been active in supporting higher education faculty in Illinois. Issues of shared governance, academic freedom and tenure continue to confront us at both public and private institutions.

I encourage faculty throughout the state to form AAUP Chapters at your institutions if one does not exist. For those with existing Chapters consider inviting state and national leaders to your campuses to discuss the issues we all face. Together as a collective our voices will be heard and contributions valued. Later this year and also next Spring, the Illinois Conference will offer a series of workshops for new and current Chapter leaders. These will be offered at different locations in Illinois. Alan Hilff of North Park University will be coordinating these workshops with the help of the current Board. Information about these workshops will be added to our website in the next few weeks.

In closing, I want to thank our Officers, Board, Committee A and all the members who participated in this Conference. The response from our members was positive.
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Hans-Joerg Tiede, a professor of computer science at Illinois Wesleyan University who will be joining the AAUP staff next year, has written a new book about the early history of the AAUP, University Reform: The Founding of the American Association of University Professors (Johns Hopkins University Press). John K. Wilson interviewed Tiede via email about his new book.

Illinois Academic: You found a fascinating quote from Arthur Lovejoy, arguably the most important founder of the AAUP, stating in his earliest exchange about the group in 1912 that he wanted the AAUP to be a “trade union” using a “big stick” militantly, but that goal needed to be secondary to prevent “excellent men” from being avoided. Was the early focus of the AAUP on academic freedom really an accident or just a secret scheme by Lovejoy? Or is it a mistake to try to understand the purpose of the AAUP from the sometimes contradictory and changing ideas of Lovejoy?

Hans-Joerg Tiede: There is no doubt that Lovejoy had a strong interest in the defense of academic freedom and in having the AAUP serve in that function. But I think it’s important to recognize that even Lovejoy had other goals for the establishment of the AAUP, most notably to have it serve as an organized voice against coordinated efforts to standardize higher education that did not include the professoriate. However, when you look at the activities of the AAUP in its first year, you can get the impression that the founders of the AAUP had come together specifically to create an organization with the sole or primary purpose of defending academic freedom. That is not what happened. Although the first call for the founding of the AAUP mentioned academic freedom, by the time of the founding meetings the organizing committee decided not to make academic freedom one of the issues to take up. It was Seligman who proposed from the floor of the meeting for the issue to be taken up, and it was the case at the University of Utah a few months later that created the impetus to put that proposal into action. And so, to that extent, it was accidental.

I do think that it matters what goals Lovejoy had for the AAUP, because it was primarily through his efforts that the association was founded. I don’t think that his views were so much contradictory as that the goals that Lovejoy had for the AAUP were at times in competition with one another. And so, rather than a “secret scheme,” I think Lovejoy was trying to advance different goals at different times. For example, when Lovejoy served as AAUP president in 1919, a large portion of his efforts was directed toward negotiations with the Carnegie Foundation over the establishment of TIAA. It mattered a great deal to Lovejoy that the AAUP was being recognized as the voice of the professoriate, and he considered this an important achievement. And so, I read that quote you cite as an indication that Lovejoy was cognizant of the competition between different goals from the start.

Illinois Academic: The irony is that Lovejoy was writing about a “trade union” to James McKeen Cattell, a leftist professor later fired by Columbia for his criticism of World War I, and Cattell’s case helped spark the AAUP’s statement on academic freedom during wartime, largely written by Lovejoy.
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Illinois Governor Bruce Rauner’s War on Unions

By Leo Welch

Gov. Bruce Rauner is living up to a campaign promise of declaring a “war on unions.” He is following in the footsteps of Scott Walker, the Governor of Wisconsin, until recently a presidential candidate. Walker succeeded in taking away many of the rights of public employees in his state, and now Rauner is showing his true colors and attempting the same thing in Illinois.

In February of 2015 he included a section on prohibited subjects of collective bargaining and for good measure eliminates tenure rights. The following are the prohibited subjects of collective bargaining:

Prohibited subjects of bargaining:
1. Employee pensions, including the impact or implementation of changes to the provision to include the Employee Consideration Pension Transition Program as set forth in Section 30 of the Pension Code.
2. (Wages, including any form of compensation including overtime, compensation, vacations, holidays, and any fringe benefits, including the impact or implementation of changes to the same; except that the law entered into, renewed, or extended on or after the effective date of this amendatory Act of the 99th General Assembly.)
3. Hours of work, including work schedules, shift schedules, overtime hours, compensatory time, and lunch periods, including the impact or implementation of changes to the same.
4. Matters relating to the employment of employee tenure, including the impact of employee tenure or time in service on the employer’s exercise of authority including, but not limited to, any limitations placed by the employer on the transfer of the employee to the employees adversely affected by the employer’s exercise of management’s right to conduct the layoff.

In case of any conflict between this Section and any other provisions of this Act or any other law, the provisions of this Section shall control; except that any conflict between this Section and any other provisions of this Act as amended by this amendatory Act of the 99th General Assembly. The

The above comments of Rauner’s reform efforts clearly attempts to overturn provisions of the 1984 Educational Labor Relations Act. Included in the Act are mandatory subjects of bargaining such as wages, hours and working conditions, as well as the impact of these mandatory subjects.

The Tenor Act of 1980 which covers faculty in public community colleges and universities. There is no statute protecting public university faculty, except by policy or contractual agreements. The bright side of this picture is that the Democrats have a veto override power on the Illinois Senate. Keep in mind that no one is safe when the General Assembly is in session.

Committee A Report

By Peter N. Kirstein, Chair

Our Committee A was well-represented at the AAUP national meeting last June. Our committee was the first to release a supportive statement on behalf of Steven Salaita, who was fired from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for political posts on the Israel/Gaza conflict last August 2014. Several members of III. Committee spoke for a vote of censorship against the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Illinois Governor Bruce Rauner was adopted by the members at the national meeting. Illinois Committee A was cited in the Chronicle and InsideHigherEd for its participation in the Illinois Academic, Fall 2015 Page 2

1. House Bill 821, (amended) Mussman (Hutchinson) PA 99-0426

Opportunities for At-Risk Women

2. House Bill 2567, (amended) Winger (Bertino-Tarrant) PA 99-0058

Opposes the Preventing Sexual Violence in Higher Education Act. Requires public universities, public community colleges, and independent, not-for-profit or for-profit higher education institutions to adopt a comprehensive policy to address all allegations of sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

3. House Bill 3197, (amended) Cha LaVia (Collins) PA 99-0432

It is higher education institutions to adopt an act to ensure that every new student is given the opportunity to complete and submit the authorization form if he or she so desires.

4. House Bill 3428, (amended) Flowers (Hutchinson) PA 99-0414

Creates the Opportunity for At-Risk Women Program. Provides that the Task Force on Opportunities for At-Risk Women shall assist at-risk women who are at increased risk of incarceration because of poverty, abuse, or mental illness, or mental or other causes. Includes representation from the Illinois Community College Board.

5. House Bill 3570, (amended) Chante Pott (Laria) PA 99-0417

Increases the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure members. Loretta Capeheart, who was a professor at the University of Illinois at Northern Illinois University. She has left Chicago for Portland, Oregon to begin a new chapter in her life. Her dynamism, courage and advocacy for faculty will be dearly missed. She is one of the greatest colleagues I have ever to serve in any capacity in our profession. We are very pleased, however, to have such a capable replacement in Robin Meade, who has been the Moraine Valley Community College administration. She was president of the adjunct union at MVCC.

6. House Bill 3528, Hernandez, Referred to Rules Committee

included in the Act are mandatory subjects of bargaining. In the Act are prohibited subjects of collective bargaining including the Employee Consideration Pension Transition Program as set forth in Section 30 of the Pension Code. The Act includes a section on prohibited subjects of collective bargaining and for good measure eliminates tenure rights. The following are the prohibited subjects of collective bargaining:

Prohibited subjects of bargaining:

1. Employee pensions, including the impact or implementation of changes to the provision to include the Employee Consideration Pension Transition Program as set forth in Section 30 of the Pension Code.

Illinois Legislative Report By Leo Welch

7. House Bill 3197, Cha LaVia (Collins) PA 99-0432

Uses public university or community college facilities for political activities.

8. HB 3599, (amended) Ives (Connelly) PA 99-0482

Amends the Public Community Colleges Act. Provides that the student poses a clear, imminent danger (rather than a clear and present danger) to himself or herself, or others. Provides that all institutions of higher learning shall create a policy and supporting procedures to ensure that every new student is given the opportunity to complete and submit the authorization form if he or she so desires.

9. House Resolution 240, Chapa LaVia, Resolution Adopted

States the belief that a public or private postsecondary educational institution shall include a student under its governing board if the institution wished to call itself “veteran friendly”.

10. House Resolution 333, Dunkin, Resolution Adopted

Urges all public and private colleges and universities in the State to work to strengthen the Illinois Articulation Council. Provides that the Auditor General conduct a performance audit of the State moneys provided to the College of DuPage.

11. House Resolution 240, Chapa LaVia, Resolution Adopted

The bright side of this picture is that the Democrats have a veto override power on the Illinois Senate. Keep in mind that no one is safe when the General Assembly is in session.

12. House Resolution 333, Dunkin, Resolution Adopted

Urges all public and private colleges and universities in the State to work to strengthen the Illinois Articulation Council. Provides that the Auditor General conduct a performance audit of the State moneys provided to the College of DuPage.

13. House Resolution 460, Conroy, Resolution Adopted

States the belief that a public or private postsecondary educational institution shall include a student under its governing board if the institution wished to call itself “veteran friendly”.

14. Senate Bill 221 (amended) McGuire, Placed on 3rd Reading

Urges the College of DuPage to participate in programmatic development training to enhance their knowledge of board governance and duties of Trustees, and urges the College of DuPage Board of Trustees to establish a finance committee to evaluate and implement best practices in accounting, transparency, and budgeting.

15. Senate Bill 760, (amended) Claybrooks, Resolution Adopted

Urges all public and private colleges and universities in the State to work to strengthen the Illinois Articulation Council. Provides that the Auditor General conduct a performance audit of the State moneys provided to the College of DuPage.

Year 2015 and all forthcoming years to the General Assembly; urges Trustees of the College of DuPage to participate in professional development training to enhance their knowledge of board governance and duties of Trustees, and urges the College of DuPage Board of Trustees to establish a finance committee to evaluate and implement best practices in accounting, transparency, and budgeting.

Our committee can boast in having two adjunct faculty members, one of whom teaches primarily at Columbia College Chicago.

If any of you have an academic freedom, shared governance or personnel issue on your campus, we are open to hearing from you. The other members are Jerry Kendall. John Marshall Law and John Wilson, co-editor of AcademeBlog.org.
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American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Criminal Background Checks

October 19, 2015

Whereas, the Board of Trustees (BoT) of the University of Illinois (University) recently adopted a new policy for criminal background checks; and

Whereas, the said policy states: “The University, when hiring employees or students, is required to access criminal background information that may ensure that applicants are qualified and fair in the recruitment process of University Professors (UIUC-AAUP) believes that the said policy will most likely lead to discrimination and discourage certain groups from applying for positions at the University. Whereas the National AAUP has recommended that criminal background checks of university employees be limited and be proportionately and fairly conducted (AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, 11th Edition, 2015), these principles (limited scope, proportionality and fairness) are expanded to state that such background checks be performed “only as necessary in order to ensure that the information that may ensure that applicants are qualified to meet the particular obligations of specific positions”

Steven Salaita Returns to Illinois

By John K. Wilson

The faculty senate sent a letter to the DeVito family expressing our sorrow and condolences over this devastating loss to his family and our community. At a reception for parents of new students in July, Dr. DeVito said: “Don’t worry; we will take care of them. We will educate them. They can then go out and change the world!” For many of us, he changed our world. The faculty of Saint Xavier University extends our deepest sympathy.

In Memoriam: Paul L. DeVito

Dr. Paul L. DeVito died suddenly and unexpectedly on the weekend of August 22-23, 2015. He had been provost at Saint Xavier University for two years. During his tenure, many witnessed a recu-

Dr. DeVito was the consummate administrator. He was, as he put it, “a natural leader” and “a leader from the front lines.” He frequently affirmed his commitment to the words, “academic freedom,” at a general fac-
I Won! A Victory for Academic Freedom

By Robin M. Higginbotham

I won! On September 17, the Illinois Education Labor Relations Board (IELRB) made its final ruling in my case against Moraine Valley Community College (MVCC). It all started in August of 2013, when I was employed by the Moraine Valley Community College in Illinois for writing a letter to the League of Innovations (LOI) magazine. MVCC’s lack of innovation toward adjuncts. I sent the letter as president of the adjunct bargaining unit. My termination letter came on August 26, 2013. It was a far cry from the days of Arthur Lovejoy, who was not challenged the war-making authority of the government. He was liberating as a persecuted political prisoner from the American gulag that included the federal prison of the Charles Schenck case. As an “elite intellectual,” yet it is arguable that Lovejoy’s anti-draft advocacy was an obstruction of the war effort. In 1917, Lovejoy received his draft notice. He voted total of 914,191 votes. He garnered 3.41% of the vote, “campaigning” from prison in 1920, received his largest vote total of 1,914,191 votes. He garnered 3.41% of the vote, which is an impressive number for any third-party candidate much less one imprisoned by corporate, militaristic America for liberalization of war, his leadership in the rise of the labor movement during the epic Pullman Strike (1894) and his opposition to unlawful firings of unconstitutionally fired professors. As with the Charles Schenck case, Holmes frequently ignored the constitution and conducted these Supreme Court inquiries as if he expected no meaningful explanation of dissent that challenged the war-making authority of the government.

Examples abound of Deb’s riveting oratory that resulted in his 32-month incarceration as a prisoner of conscience. From the Wilsonian “War to make the world safe for democracy”:

I have been accused of obstructing the war. I admit it! I would have preferred to stand there if I stood alone…. I have sympathy with the suffering, struggling people everywhere. It does not make any difference under what flag they were born, or where they live. … Wars throughout history have been waged for conquest and plunder. … And that is war in a nutshell. The master plan has always declined at the war’s end; the subject class has always fought the war, which led to 116,000 U.S. combat deaths and over 900,000 wounded. Lovejoy’s letter to Salaita, the bar has been lowered to monitor and punish academic freedom. In 1917, Lovejoy responded to the magazine’s criticism in a letter to the editor on April 4, 1917. It is stunning to consider that the A.A.U.P. report episodically cautions against university administrators and the board agreed to fire me. Where do things go from here? According to the IELRB ruling, MVCC must offer me full and unconditional reinstatement of my position without prejudice, pay me with interest the wages I have lost since being terminated, wipe away any reference to my case against Moraine Valley Community College (MVCC) and one in federal court defending my freedom of speech. Professor Lovejoy defended one professor who was fired during the war. The Report of the Academic Freedom in Wartime defended an “unusual dis- crimination” from “an important university” who was fired after twenty-five years of service for “seditious or treasonable doctrines.” His funeral was held written shocking the church, slandering the church, and challenging war and imperialism.

The report expresses a preference that the government and not the university sanction extramural utterances opposed to the barbaric slaughter and then soaking the trenches from the English Channel down to Switzerland. Of course the A.A.U.P. should denounce, regardless of its source, those who support criminals resisting the barbarity and evil of war. No sanctions should be levied against an intern enemy, whether they are imposed by university administration or the government. The Nation magazine’s March 7, 1918 issue contained a comprehensive denunciation of the A.A.U.P. report as an assault on academic freedom. Titled, “The Professors in Battle Array,” it blasted the Association for delineating areas where a university could fire an antiwar professor without challenge war-making authority of the government. “The American Association of University Professors was founded and is a law-abiding body. Itwelcomed an unnamed “dis- crimination” from “an important university” who was fired after twenty-five years of service for “seditious or treasonable doctrines.” His funeral was held written shocking the church, slandering the church, and challenging war and imperialism.
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I have discussed academic freedom, in general, and Atrium, specifically, with the Dean of the Medical School. Both he and I assure you of the importance of academic freedom and the need for the Medical School and the University to defend academic freedom in terms of the publication of a journal that we have agreed to publish. Indeed, the importance of Atrium resonates with the fact that the back issues be made available online again, reversing that editor's previous decision, those issues were immediately restored to the web site.

The ongoing publication of any journal depends on a number of factors that are quite distinct from academic freedom. Financial and support from the Medical School or the University for publication of a journal that bears the institution's name would depend on the publication making a significant contribution to scholarship and not being a drain on the financial resources of the institution. Other considerations are if journal is edited and managed by the University, in particular, the journal's readership and impact are substantial enough to justify the expense and effort of production and distribution. The decision of an institution whether or not to publish a particular journal in no way restricts individual faculty from publishing their work in other suitable journals. I found this very disappointing. In point of fact, the suggestion that Katie Watson was to blame for the censorship of the journal—when she clearly acted in fear in response to Dean Tenylock's order—is misleading, unfair, and insulting. It places responsibility on the wrong person and evades the institution's responsibility for the censorship.

What happened here had nothing to do with an institutional decision whether to fund some new proposed journal in the future. I return to my point about the University's failure to publish the Atrium article as another example to demonstrate how the university has failed to defend academic freedom. I lived in fear that my work might further irritate the dean, and I was afraid that the dean would censor an article because it recounted a story of academic freedom, demonstrated its value, and encouraged others to defend academic freedom.

Hence, my resignation.
Among School Children: A Review of Steven Salaita's Uncivil Rites

By Steven Salaita

I wish to thank the AAUP leadership for their advocacy on behalf of academic free- dom, shared governance, and fair labor practices, work that seems more and more pressing in our current environment. I am grateful for your efforts.

I do not question how to urge anybody to vote a certain way on the matter before you. Do as your conscience impels. I simply ask you to vote for candidates who will articulate two points for your consideration.

First: despite the consensus view – effectively conceded by the administration – that the university’s actions contravened principles of academic freedom, due process and faculty governance, university officials are actively working to extinguish the very justifications that the chancellor and that you have made clear in order to sust...
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Censure at AAUP Annual Meeting

September 8, 2015

Dear Professor Emeritus of Aerospace Engineering,

I had originally asked to address the Board September 8, 2015, but the meeting in a non-confrontational and helpful manner about steps that needed to be taken by the BoT and the UI and UIUC administrations for them to be removed censure and regaining its place among the most respected public institutions of higher education in the country. The decision to reinstate Dr. Salaita will also make it easier to resolve pending litigation and save the university community and state taxpayers from the costs of defending a wrongful decision in the court of law.

We ask for a meeting to discuss our request to restore the rightful stature of the University of Illinois.

Sincerely,

James Anderson, Head, Department of Education Policy, Organization and Leadership
Matthew Ando, Chair, Department of Mathematics
Michael Ando, Associate Director, Illinois Program for Research in the Humanities
C.L. Cole, Head, Department of Media and Cinema Studies
David Cooper, Director, Russian, East European, and Eurasian Center
Clare Crowston, Chair, Department of History
Jerry Davila, Director, Lemann Institute for Brazilian Studies
Anna Maria Escobar, Director, Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies
Michael Finke, Head, Slavic Languages and Literatures
Stephanie Foote, Chair, Department of Gender and Women’s Studies
Behrzogh Ghamari-Tabrizi, Interim Director, Center for South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies
Greg Giroldi, Head, Department of Chemistry
Wull Hassan, Director, Center for Translation Studies
Stephanie Hilger, Head, Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures
Valerie Hoffmann, Head, Department of Religion
Valerie Hotchkiss, Director, Rare Book and Manuscript Library
Jonathan X. Isa, Head, Department of Latina/Latino Studies
Jeffrey Eric Jenkins, Head, Department of Theatre
Lydia Kaganovskiy, Director, Program in Comparative and World Literature

Dr. Steven Salaita was censured for the firing of Leo Koch declared: “We firmly believe that if censure is voted, it will be instrumental in improv- ing the climate so that this does not happen again.” He noted that a poll of the AAUP chapter members found that a majority of those voting supported censure.

Professor Emeritus of Aerospace Engineering,

Harry Hilton (right) spoke at the AAUP annual meeting, as did Cary Nelson (left).

UIUC professor Bruce Levine noted, “You can’t miss the fact that this was a po- litical firing.”

UIUC also voted to censure the ad- ministrations of the University of Southern Maine, Felician College, and the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, and to remove Yeshiva University from the censure list.

In conclusion, we would like to offer the help of the in a manner similar to the enumera- tion of the CAFP dismissal hearing procedures.

Implementations

A number of these proposed chang- es to CAFP hearing and processing proce- dures will need strengthening by appropriate wording of the UI Statistics and Testimonial Communication docu- ments.

Potential financial settlement with Dr. Salaita

We will or without the legal court case developments, a speedy settlement should be achieved with Dr. Salaita. In censure cases, the National AAUP does not call for specific items only for a resolution agreed to by both par- ties or mandated by court action.

Other items that may surface with time

Other items may come to light as

UIUC and UI proceed to take corrective measures.

Timing for removal of censure

The earliest time that could be removed is at the next annual AAUP meeting in June 2016. This would mean the University would have to have completed and in place by December 31, 2015 all necessary changes including complete approval of statute revisions by the three. This would allow the national Committee to ask for corrective actions and for their reports. From a practical point this does not seem doable. Therefore, June 2017 would appear to be a more plausible earli- est date.
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Ben Carson Demands Monitoring of Colleges for “Political Bias”  
By John K. Wilson  
Ben Carson, who has surged to a lead in the race for the Republican presidential nomination, has called for the Department of Education to monitor all colleges for “political bias” and eliminate federal funding for any college deemed guilty of “political bias.”  
In an interview on Oct. 21 with Glenn Beck, Carson declared: “I actually have something I would use the Department of Education to do. It would be to monitor our institutions of higher education for extreme political bias and deny federal funding on that basis.”  
This would be one of the most dramatic expansions of federal power in the history of education, to have the government “monitor” political bias at all private and public colleges and then threaten federal funding.  
On Oct. 25, Carson appeared on “Meet the Press” and defended his idea when host Chuck Todd questioned him about it:  
CARSON: This is not just spouting off, I’ve thought about this. The way that works is you invite students at the universities to send in their complaints, and then you investigate. For instance, there was a university – I’m sure you’ve heard of the situation – where, you know, the professor told everybody, “Take out a piece of paper and write the name ‘Jesus’ on it. Put it on the floor and stomp on it.” And one student refused to do that and was disciplined severely. You know, he subsequently was able to be reinstated - TODD: We’re not violating the First Amendment? How is what you’re advocating not a violation of the First Amendment?  
CARSON: It’s not a violation of the First Amendment, because all I’m saying is tax-payer funding should not be used for propaganda. It shouldn’t be.  
TODD: Your definition of propaganda could be what somebody else views as free speech.  
CARSON: Well that’s why I said, we’re going to have the students send in, and we will investigate.  
This is an extraordinarily disturbing attack on academic freedom. Carson is calling for the government to investigate “political bias” and presumably eliminate federal funds for that college if even one professor is guilty of this bias. Carson goes even further when he states that not only “political bias” but also “propaganda” would be grounds for removing all federal funding from the university.  

By John K. Wilson  
This National Labor Relations Board issued a ruling overturning a decision last year by a Chicago district official that had supported the right of Northwestern’s football players to unionize. The NLRB ruled that the case “would not promote stability in labor relations.” They wrote, “Our decision is primarily premised on a finding” that the NCAA and conference exert control over individual teams, and most college football teams are public colleges not covered by the NLRB.  
By that kind of logic, all private college faculty could be denied the right to unionize on the grounds that most college professors work in public colleges. And even though the NCAA has no power over athletic programs, there are plenty of issues that could be negotiated. The Northwestern players declared that they were not seeking to get paid salaries for their work, something which the NCAA bans.  
The NLRB cited “the absence of any controlling precedent” as the reason for their ruling, which did not prohibit campus athletic unions in the future, but simply refused to enforce them as required at this time. The NLRB ruled that “recent changes, as well as calls for additional reforms” indicated that “the situation of scholarship players may well change in the near future.” That may be true, but how many unions could be shut down on the grounds that the employer promised to makes some things better in the future?  
They did make an example of “political bias” mentioned by Carson wasn’t political bias at all. The student at Florida Atlantic University was not disciplined to refusing to step on the paper that said “Jesus” on it. Most students refused, which was the point of the exercise. The student was disciplined for making violent threats against the professor because the student felt the assignment was offensive to his religion. The professor, a Christian, was denounced by conservative politicians and pundits seeking his dismissal, and received so many death threats that the university put him on leave and banned him from teaching for the rest of the semester.  

The NLRB’s misguided decision follows a long line of anti-union rulings afflicting US higher education. The most notorious was the Yeshiva case in 1980, where the Supreme Court ruled that the Board could be restricted by the employers could be “managers” and therefore the university was allowed to ban the college to unionize. As a result of Yeshiva, faculty unionizing at private colleges has been largely unenforceable.propaganda could be what somebody else views as free speech.  

A Petition to Protect Higher Education in Illinois  
In response to the ongoing crisis in Illinois politics that threatens funding of public colleges and universities as well as state aid to students, a petition has been started at change.org, titled “Protect Higher Education in Illinois.” The petition reads:  
To our duly elected officials in state government:  
We, the undersigned, have a direct interest in the state’s prioritization of pub- lic higher education within the ongoing state budget debate. On the heels of a 13 year devestment in funding for state higher education, we now find ourselves months into a budgetary standoff that has required universities to operate in a complete absence of state funds. State budget inaction will directly impact time-to-degree for students who cannot complete expected and required coursework due to scaled back course offerings or lack of access to financial aid. It is time for the state to fulfill its promise to public university students and their families with a rapid and adequate infusion of state funds. Moreover, it is time to reconnect to investing in our public universities as engines of progress for our state.  
Do not shut out the lights on public higher education.

By CFAIllinois.org, illustrated by Damian Duffy (damianduffy.net)