Report from the Nominating Committee

Nominated to be re-elected to a two-year term: Joerg Tiede, Illinois Wesleyan University; Lee Malby, St. Augustine; Dan Tomal, Concordia University, Diana Vailera, Columbia College; Matthew Abraham, DePaul University; Lee Welch, Southwestern Illinois College. To elect for the first time to a two-year term: Linda Broshkurt, Illinois Annuitants Group, Springfield; Alan Iliff, North Park University. Nominations may also be made by petition signed by at least fifteen members of the Conference, counting no more than five (5) from any one chapter. Nominations by petition must be received by President, Michael Harkins (mharkbhs@att.net) by April 1, 2013.

In closing, I would like to thank the officers and Board of the Conference for the significant time commitment they make each month to serve as leaders to help our chapters improve these relationships. Please join us for this significant and important conference.

Since last November, the Illinois Conference has moved forward in efforts to add new members and chapters. To help us in that process we have continued to advocate on behalf of our members and faculty through the state, national and state announcements, articles, best practices, documents, our web site, and regular updates to our site with new information and ideas. We also have reached out to the National office for additional support on these vital faculty issues. Our Committee continues to be active and fully engaged in working with individual faculty. Chapter visits, daily phone conferences and e-mails have increased for our officers and Board. These communications are now commonplace as the needs of our chapters. The expertise of the Illinois Conference as well as the National office can be drawn upon and consulted at any time in the interests of our membership.

As leaders we are dedicated to helping you and your chapters protect faculty rights and ensure academic freedom and true shared governance. Your involvement in shared governance is vital to the success of our students and faculty. We are dedicated to helping you and your chapters protect faculty rights and ensure academic freedom and true shared governance.

In closing, I would like to thank the officers and Board of the Conference for the significant time commitment they make each month to help our chapters improve these relationships. Please join us for this significant and important conference.
The Illinois Conference of the AAUP seeks nominations from members in good standing to run as delegates and alternates to the Assembly of State Conferences (ASC) and the Annual Conference of the AAUP. These meetings are extremely important as they help to determine the priorities and direction of the AAUP.

The Illinois Conference is entitled to send four (4) delegates to the ASC meeting, and three (3) delegates to the Annual Conference of the AAUP. The election is to determine the remaining three (3) delegates to the ASC meeting, scheduled June 14, 2013, and two (2) delegates to the Annual Conference scheduled June 15, 2013. Individuals may run for both delegate positions. In addition, a member of the ASC and one (1) alternate delegate for the Annual Conference will also be elected. Alternates will attend only if elected delegates are unable to participate. The Illinois Conference has determined that this meeting will be conducted virtually by the members in good standing. The election results are to be announced by the President of the Illinois Conference immediately after the election.

All nominations must be received by midnight March 31, 2013. Nominations shall be sent by mail to the Secretary of the Illinois Conference of the AAUP, care of Lee Malby at St. Augustine College, 1545 W. Ar-
Students Return to WZRD After Six-Month Lockout By NEIU Administration

By John K. Wilson

After more than six months of being locked out of their radio station, WZRD (88.3 FM), students at Northeastern Illinois University (NEIU) were allowed back into their station, and returned to the air on January 7. The WZRD students posted on Facebook, “we are back in the driver's seat.”

The administration had demanded changes to the WZRD constitution, including adding “musical preference” to the prohibited nondiscrimination categories, and “a statement of civility and decorum.” However, the students refused to agree, and reportedly were locked back into the station without submitting to any of the administration’s demands.

On June 29, 2012, the administration at Northeastern Illinois University (NEIU) in Chicago shut down the student-run broadcast radio station, WZRD, and banned the student organization from the airwaves. It was an act of censorship without due process that ignored NEIU’s policies, violated the First Amendment, and broke a state law protecting student-run media.

The June 29 decision shocked WZRD DJs (who call themselves “wizards”). Administrators cited a variety of issues, ranging from maintaining proper FCC records to spending outside donations without authorization. Their memo also claimed that “some students labeled ‘ballyhoo’ or ‘bullying’” attacked “expression disagree with the type of music the student DJ has played.” According to the administration, this created a climate of fear, bullying, and intimidation and violated the Student Conduct Code.

The NEIU then telling another student that his music sucks might be offensive, but it is certainly protected speech. To invoke The illegal shutdown of WZRD by the NEIU administration was intolerable even for a day. The fact that this lockout continued for six months signal the NEIU administration’s disregard for both state law and its own students.

“By necessity, the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that students, for a day. The fact that this lockout continued for six months signal the NEIU administration’s disregard for both state law and its own students.

Rodriguez also noted that NEIU administrators were saying that WZRD must compel “civility and decorum” in its bylaws and constitution. What is disturbing is that the Student Code of Conduct is a fairly straightforward statement of rules without any mention of “civility and decorum.” NEIU’s administration does have a “Community Standard” statement on its website, but it’s not clear that this is actually a formal policy of NEIU, and even this “Community Standard” says nothing about compulsory civility. Even though NEIU doesn’t have a Code of “Community Standards” for “civility and decorum,” NEIU administrators were saying that WZRD must compel “civility and decorum” in its bylaws and constitution, and other campus conduct rules. This is an unconstitutional speech code.

This “civility and decorum” rule was being proposed back of December 2012 memo which clearly defined WZRD as “student-run,” the NEIU administration declared, “The closure of the radio station is effective immediately. No students or staff not authorized by the Office of Student Leadership will be allowed on the air.

John Boyle

Remarks to the NEIU Board of Trustees

By Peter Kirstein

I am professor of history at St Xavier University and Vice President of the American Association of University Professors in Illinois and chair of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure. AAPP has established guidelines to guarantee academic freedom, and virtually every post-secondary institution acknowledges AAPP principles.

AAPP Illinois in its report to President Sharon Hahs in 2012 included that Associate Professor of Linguistics John Boyle’s denial of tenure was at odds with widely recognized AAPP standards. His teaching was evaluated as superior and his scholarship and service met the criteria for tenure. His PhD from the University of Chicago and his subsequent performance demonstrates academic excellence as a NEIU faculty member.

Apparent there was a disagreement over advising students and a missed deadline in filing an advising-instruction report. This must not lead to a tenure denial. President Hahs graciously responded on July 19, 2012 to our report and stated “much of the information...is accurate.” Yet she claimed it was “selective” but declined to reveal the basis for her criticism. President Hahs graciously responded on July 19, 2012 to our report and stated “much of the information...is accurate.” Yet she claimed it was “selective” but declined to reveal the basis for her criticism.

Professor Boyle is the only professor I know who was unconditionally recommended for tenure by a department, department chair, school dean, and University Personnel Committee and who also received the question to consider our report’s comprehensive review of this case. We urge in the name of justice, due process, academic freedom and respect for shared governance, that this board reconsider the tenure decision in the case of John Boyle. I am confident a reconsideration would be a dramatic statement representing both the public perception of repression, arbitrariness and lack of respect for academic freedom at NEIU and on-campus divisions that have emerged in recent years.

You have the power, you have the authority to make this right and reconsider this case. Thank you for your honour of appearing here today and speaking to you this afternoon. 
An Interview with Harry Keyishian Four Decades After His Supreme Court Case

John K. Wilson interviewed Harry Keyishian via email for Academe Blog last year about the 1967 Supreme Court decision in which he served as a plaintiff. (He was also one of the last three members of the Chemistry Department.) We were, I guess, a little bit naive. However, after taking a year off to educate judges and to fight in court and try to educate judges about the importance of academic freedom, we didn’t have the opportunity to demonstrate the faculty member’s unfitness for his or her position.” The political upheavals of the sixties, in particular the anti-Vietnam War movement, had a profound effect on the Court and, I am sure, the AAUP as well. But there was almost as much backlash as there was support. For example, one of the great free-speech dissenters of the McCarthy era, Hung Black, was so outraged by what he considered excesses of the anti-war movement that he angrily dissented from the landmark Lincoln v. University decision that upheld students’ First Amendment right to wear armbands to school in silent protest of the Vietnam War. Black wrote: “groups of students all over the land are already running loose, decrib[ing] a breakdown in, sit-ins, lies, and smash-ins.”

Academe Blog: What was the atmosphere like on campuses in the early 1960s? Was there a lot of fear of speaking out politically and joining groups that might be considered subversive?

Harry Keyishian: Things had distinctly loosened up since the oppressive days of the early 1950s. There were several activist progressive organizations at work in Buffalo. The Quakers were a presence. I joined the peace group (the War Resisters League) which had organized a parade in 1963, I recall. We certainly felt the presence of the local police and the FBI were close presences, but we went about our business without much concern. Several faculty members made no secret of having Marxist sympathies, but were hired without incident. The Cold War was very much on, but the internal atmosphere was much looser. Fortunately, the University of Buffalo protected its faculty because it was aware of the value of academic freedom.

Academe Blog: Although your name was first on the lawsuit, there was a group of folks who sued together. Who were the others involved in this lawsuit, and how did you decide to sue over this?

Harry Keyishian: The true initiator of the suit was poet George Starbuck, who, then working as a librarian, first received the loyalty oath certificate and sued related to that. Also, there were five other faculty members who were named in the suit. My Eng- lish Department colleagues George Hochfield and Ralph Maud were two; philosopher Newton Garver, moved by Quaker principles, was another. (The fifth, if I recall, was a woman.)
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The National Association of Scholars (NAS) issued a report on the teaching of American history at the University of Texas at Austin and Texas A&M. UT-Austin professors responded to the NAS report on the blog of The Alcaldé, the University of Texas alumni magazine.

By Jeremi Suri

Two years ago I moved from Madison to Austin because I was convinced that the flagship university in Texas was better situated to educate students in my field of study: international history, foreign policy, and leadership. The History Department at UT already had a distinguished group of scholars. Upon arrival, I found that all parts of the globe and teach about what I call “the making of our modern world.” The History Department also housed the National Security Archive, a world where success requires making connections between different ideas, memories, experiences, and peoples.

Nothing could be more American. It was, after all, James Madison who defined the greatness of American democracy as its ability to incorporate a “diversity of opinion and the interposition of one man between the legislator and the people.” The strength of our democratic system is not just the fact that we loved in Wisconsin to the one we could compare. That is why I prevailed all of our history and related courses, is a requirement in American History. Frankly, we do not find the “special topics” courses at the University of Texas to fulfill the two course requirement in American History. Frankly, we do not find that the “special topics” courses at the University of Texas to fulfill the two course requirement in American History.

We had no prior knowledge as to the content of these readings and frankly we were somewhat surprised by what we found. The NAS report seems to demand a simple and one-sided history of American history and foreign policy and war are connected with the issues of race, class, and gender. We are teaching an inclusive history, in the process, and also the challenge of contemporary America relate to one another. What we are doing above all is understanding how slavery caused a civil war. They need to think about the American Indians, labor unions, womankind, foreign policy, and military affairs more than me. It is what I study. It is what I talk about all the time (so my wife and kids complain)! To teach the history of these subjects requires attention to slavery, the military, and economics. The majority of students who use broad readers or reader style textbooks had comprehensive and inclusive. The NAS report seems to demand a simple and one-sided history of just a few people—an elite view of history. But, we believe that the study of the Second World War, and an American history of foreign policy and war, are connected with the issues of race, class, and gender. We see no reason why the members of Salons and other groups would come and visit some of our courses. They have an open invitation to any of our lectures. We have never had their report. They did not include a single campus visit or interview. They did not do their homework. If they did, they would see why I moved to Austin from another great university. This is where serious history is studied and taught so well. If you haven’t been back in a while, come and see for yourself.

Jeremi Suri is the Mack Brown Distinguished Professor for Global Leadership History, and Public Policy at UT-Austin.

A Response from the NAS

By Richard Fonte

The answer to your question—what kind of history should we teach in American history study—is a comprehensive and inclusive. The NAS believes that all American History courses should involve significant reading assignments covering the topics of slavery, American Indians, labor unions, women’s suffrage, prohibition, civil rights, immigration, 19th century & 20th century, poverty, and yes, even popular culture.

No, we do not think these topics are “un-American.” No, we do not demand a simple and one-sided history of just a few people—an elite view of history. But, we believe that Political History, intellectual history, military history, and teaching have become so specialized that the study double and triple classified articles into as many categories as possible. Yes, we recognize that political history does not occur in a vacuum. A more appropriate mix of themes is clearly evidenced at A&M. Somehow they have found a way to do this. Why not UT?

No, we do not think these topics are “un-American.” We were also pleasantly surprised that those faculty who used broad readers or reader style textbooks had comprehensive and inclusive.

We frankly found that this approach to history is more characteristic of Texas A&M for these reasons. The NAS’ long-standing critique of the study of the National Association of Scholars documents is that many of our core tests who used broad readers or reader style textbooks had comprehensive and inclusive. The NAS report concludes that:

The groups’ answer to the title’s question is “yes,” which is hardly surprising given the NAS’ long-standing critique of the study of the National Association of Scholars who raise questions about the mythology of American greatness.

Based on an examination of the assigned readings for all 85 sections of lower-division American history courses at the University of Texas at Austin (where I have been a professor in the School of Journal-

ism for 20 years) and Texas A&M, the report concludes that:
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By Peter N. Kirstein, Professor of History, Saint Xavier University, Vice President II, Conference, Chair II Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure

I think it is judicious to define succinctly what shared governance means. It is a way to institutionalize an improved relationship between the administration of Colleges and Universities and a well-developed exploration of shared governance, it is comprehensive and not just a vague euphemism for litigation. When a concise definition is from the University from Colorado brief before the Colorado State Supreme Court in Churchill v University of Colorado. The case arose from the firing of tenured Ethnic Studies Professor Ward Churchill in 2007. A complex, multi-layered case was a crossroads of academic freedom, the 9/11 attacks, alleged egregious research misconduct, due process and shared governance. The university’s brief states:

Institutions of higher education are different from many workplaces, particularly in the relationship between the leadership and faculty. The Board of Regents implemented a system of shared governance based on the “guiding principle that the faculty and administration shall collaborate in major decisions affecting the academic welfare of the University.” Accordingly, the “faculty takes the lead in decisions concerning selection of faculty, academic ethics, and other academic matters.” The Regents cannot “impose, without a vote of the faculty members” that the professor is guilty of professional misconduct.

Many administrators have not sufficiently adhered to the Colorado Board of Regents fired Churchill despite faculty-recommended sanctions that recommended suspension, forfeiture of salary but absent a contractually required hearing. Ten years ago I was suspended, perhaps not coincidentally, on Veterans Day, November 11, 2002. Departmental replacement instructors took over my classes a mere three weeks before my sabbatical. The president of the university, a former West Point cadet, conducted a hearing the following fall that was not even scheduled during my sabbatical the spring term following my suspension. The hard-copy letter to Yanikoski and the faculty the following spring and fall. I was on a previously awarded sabatical the following fall. In a subsequent meeting but not the latter. In other words, my tenure at a university that parades itself as America ordered me not to file a grievance or pursue any remedy after the imposition of sanctions. Two days later, in fear of losing my tenure and before the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) came to the rescue, I wrote the president, “I do not intend to file a grievance or contest this action.”

The AAUP chapter sent an e-mail and later a hard-copy letter to Yanikoski and the faculty the following spring and fall. I was on a previously awarded sabatical the following fall. Two editorials. Jed Babbin, deputy undersecretary of defense, informed me that the president had returned early from a fundraising trip to the East and wanted to meet with me. I was given an inaccurate agenda. I was lied to about any sanctions being considered. Faculty members also should be notified in advance of a disciplinary hearing. They should be informed of the nature of the charges and of any sanctions being considered. Faculty members should also be notified in advance of the agenda and format of the hearing. (See Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Section 5, Dismissal Procedures).

President Yanikoski’s list of sanctions also included a bizarre, ad hoc three-person “Evidentiary Committee” to investigate my teaching. I had not been accused of any wrongdoing by a Saint Xavier University student, had previously won the university Teaching Excellence Award, and the president told me that his daughter enjoyed her class with me. There was no linkage between my e-mail and the quality of my teaching. Extramural utterances rarely suggest an incapacity to teach effectively. In fact I was accused of teaching about twelve days prior to my suspension. I used it as an example of antipathy for me on my class in Vietnam and America, and then the thunder on the right. If the president, the foundation, and the board should not be allowed to teach and that the e-mail proved I was unfit as a professor.

I was able to avoid the three-ring circus in assessing my teaching, and the chapter recommended a disciplinary hearing for an earlier than normally scheduled post-tenure review. I was responsible for incorporating post-tenure review in Article V of our by-laws. It was a preeminent measure to counter the growing national trend to use post-tenure review to eliminate non-confident tenured faculty or starve them out through denial of merit pay. Saint Xavier’s handiwork was post-tenure review imitative, and is intended to enhance the quality of teaching. It cannot serve as a new probationary-period assessment to threaten tenure: “The purpose of the review is to enhance and improve the teaching and other scholarly performance. The process review shall be formal and shall preserve academic freedom and tenure.”

Actually, post-tenure review is rarely conducted on my campus, despite the recommendation of the requirement. The AAUP chapter condemned the post-tenure review that was scheduled initially during my sabbatical.

Poor teaching and post-tenure review as a punitive process...The procedures specified in the Faculty Policies Section of the Faculty Handbook regarding post-tenure review must be respected at all times. It is not the purpose of the procedures to force the president or the administration to alter, amend, or revise these procedures. A challenge or reassignment to other duties that results in removal from the classroom is a major sanction. A university willing the freedom of our veterans and veterans groups must not impose sanctions to satisfy the criteria of retribution. Yanikoski stated that my

Ten Years On: The Kirstein Rist Years Case, Shared Governance and Academic Freedom

any administrator at my university. After reading the con-}
shared-governance procedures prior to sanctioning a faculty member. The faculty approved them in 2008 and the Board of Trustees in 2009. The bylaws specifically cite the AAUP Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure as standards that institutions are encouraged to adopt. Battalora also developed some novel structures unique to the institution. Here are some of the highlights of this creative and comprehensive pre-sanction due process that has become part of the FCRP:

1) A Faculty Committee for Pre-Sanction Review (FCPR) is established that acts as a pre-sanction advisory body. It is to consist of five members including a representative from the AAUP chapter.
2) The administration prior to implementing a sanctioning procedure, in the absence of any prior due process, should consult with the FCPR whose opinion on the levying of sanctions is not binding upon the president.

Faculty members in support of the faculty's role with regard to program discon-

The faculty should have the opportunity to read a written re-
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If you care enough about the future of higher education to be an AAUP member, we hope you’ll now take the next step and encourage your colleagues to join at www.aaup.org.
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- $30,000 and less: $47
- $30,001-$40,000: $63
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- $60,001-$70,000: $147
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The most effective way to get new members is to go door to door to your colleagues’ offices, because people are more likely to join if asked directly and offered the chance to talk with you in person about the work of the AAUP on behalf of the profession, at the local, state, and national level. Give them the new dues schedule, ask them what their key concerns about higher education are, and try to show them what AAUP is doing to help. See if they will join while you are there.
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The report continues:

The dominance of race, class, and gender themes in history curricula came about through disciplinary mission creep. Historians and professors of United States history should return to their primary task: hand-holding down the American story, as a whole, to future generations.

It would be interesting to find how the report’s authors came to understand the “disciplinary mission” of history (maybe it was revealed to them in a vision), but—sorry to have to repeat myself—any description of the mission of history has an underlying politics.

I don’t know if NAS scholars actually believe there is an “American story” that can be told from a neutral point of view, or whether this is merely a cynical debating tactic. But if we are going to address the very real problems facing the contemporary university, attempts at imposing ideology by claiming to be beyond ideology aren’t likely to help clarify problems or help generate solutions.

Robert Jensen is a professor in the School of Journalism at the University of Texas at Austin. He is the author of Arguing for Our Lives: A User’s Guide to Constructive Dialogue (City Lights, 2013).

We All Politicize History continued from page 5

and social sciences, no matter whether a professor ac-
knowledged it or not. From decisions about what to
cover, to the list of readings, to the framing of lectures
and discussions—teaching is always political, if by that
one means that judgments about the nature of power in a
society affect what, and how, one teaches. To recognize
that all research and teaching have a politics is not to claim
that the work of professors is nothing but politics, in the
sense of personal gain. Quality research and reasoned an-
gument are important, but the value of our work is height-
ened, not diminished, when the political nature of that
work is understood and acknowledged.

That is not to say that those who keep the status quo as
those who challenge it. The issue is not whether teaching
reflects political judgments, but whether one can defend
those judgments on their own merits.

Academe Blog: You were suing the
Board of Regents, but the real prob-
lem here was the legislature passing
a law requiring the Board to keep out
subversives. Did you think any ad-
ministrators and regents supported
your efforts to make the politicians
stay out of campus decision-making,
or did you regard them as supporting
these laws?

Harry Keyishian: We had a good
deal of covert support from adminis-
trators. To give one crucial example,
the letter in which I was told that I
would lose–the Feinstein Law, on
which the loyalty oath was based, had
been upheld only a few years before–we were pretty cocky about
winning. It was the Warren Court, af-

er all. And, though we did not know it,
we had a brilliant advocate on it in
the person of Justice William Bren-
nan, who wrote the decision.

Academe Blog: What do you think
has been the impact of the Keyishian
ruling in the past 45 years, and do
you believe courts today are still up-
holding it?

Harry Keyishian: This is a ques-
tion I’ll leave to legal experts, but I
understand that part of the case is be-
ning chipped away at by later courts.
Still, I think it is well grounded and
has worked its way into legal culture
deeply. But if things start go-
ing bad, I count on five other stub-
born people to pop up and do some-
thing about it.

During this “depoliticized history” campaign.

The Greater Our Numbers, the Stronger Our Voice

If you care enough about the future of higher education to be an AAUP member, we hope you’ll now take the next step and encourage your colleagues to join at www.aaup.org.

The AAUP is introducing a new simplified dues structure based on income:

- $30,000 and less: $47
- $30,001-$40,000: $63
- $40,001-$50,000: $84
- $50,001-$60,000: $105
- $60,001-$70,000: $147
- $70,001-$80,000: $173
- $80,001-$90,000: $195
- $100,001-$120,000: $215
- More than $120,000: $237

The most effective way to get new members is to go door to door to your colleagues’ offices, because people are more likely to join if asked directly and offered the chance to talk with you in person about the work of the AAUP on behalf of the profession, at the local, state, and national level. Give them the new dues schedule, ask them what their key concerns about higher education are, and try to show them what AAUP is doing to help. See if they will join while you are there.

To Join the AAUP, Visit www.AAUP.org
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