The 2017 Spring Conference of the Illinois Conference of AAUP will be held Saturday, April 22, 2017, at Columbia College, Chicago. This year’s Conference will focus on the current state of higher education in Illinois and the issues faculty now face. Individuals can register for the Conference by emailing Diana Vallera, Conference secretary at diana@studioera2.com.

Faculty participation is vital to a strong AAUP. Illinois higher education is facing significant challenges to academic freedom and shared governance. The current financial stalemate within the state has added to the difficulties faculty are now encountering. The April 22 Conference has assembled a group of talented presenters who will address these concerns and present strategies to protect the principles of effective higher education.

In early January of this year, the Conference received a grant from the Assembly of State Conferences (AASC) to address the threats to academic freedom and shared governance. Alan Iliff, a current officer, and a team of our Board members will be presenting a number of workshops throughout the state starting this summer and continuing in the fall. These workshops will cover faculty handbooks, strengthening shared governance and specific strategies to maintain and enhance faculty rights. More information about scheduling a workshop will be available at the Conference and on our website in early May.

Our National meeting will be held June 14-18 in Washington, D.C. The Conference will focus and highlight the rights and freedoms of students. All faculty should consider attending. On Friday, June 16, the Assembly of State Conferences (AASC) will meet. The ASC provides leadership, expertise and direct support to state Conferences. The Assembly board has a strong network of resources ready to support state conferences, local chapters and faculty at large. They work to protect faculty rights and our profession. Since our November, 2016, board meeting, the officers and board have supported faculty throughout the state. The challenges and threats to academic freedom and shared governance are evident. As these threats continue, the Conference will provide support, expertise and resources to help our Chapters and faculty in general.

Committee A will continue defending faculty rights and assuring our colleagues. The journey ahead in higher education may continue to be difficult. Faculty should be prepared for these challenging times. If you do not have an AAUP Chapter, consider starting one. If you have a local Chapter, make sure to meet regularly and involve your Chapter members and faculty-at-large. If you have achieved a level of engagement, become active at the state and national levels. Faculty can volunteer for committee work, submit proposals to the state and national conferences, contribute to Academe, and develop workshops to present to other state chapters. By moving in this direction you can make a difference in the future of higher education in Illinois and at the national level.

Engagement and involvement are critical to the protection and enhancement of academic freedom, shared governance and tenure. The Illinois State Conference of the AAUP is looking forward to your participation and contributions.
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Amends the Illinois Community College Board Act. Provides that the board of trustees, in addition to one at-large trustee, shall be subdivided into 20 trustee districts by the General Assembly for seats on the board of trustees. Provides that the City of Chicago shall be subdivided into 20 trustee districts by the General Assembly for seats on the board of trustees, in addition to one at-large trustee. Provides that in the year following each decennial census, the General Assembly shall redistrict the trustee districts to reflect the results of each decennial census. Makes other changes. Effective immediately.

HB1776
COM COL-CHICAGO-ELECT BOARD
House Sponsor
Rep. Robert Martwick (D) Norridge, and forty seven other sponsors
Synopsis As Introduced
An act by which the people. Provides for the election of the board of trustees of the City Colleges of Chicago, Illinois Community College District No. 50, at the general primary election in 2018 on a nonpartisan ballot. Provides the number of vacancies for each election, the number of persons elected at each consolidated election thereafter. Makes related changes.
Amends the Public Community College Act. Sets forth provisions concerning nominating petitions and ballots. Provides that the City of Chicago shall be subdivided into 20 trustee districts by the General Assembly for seats on the board of trustees, in addition to one at-large trustee. Provides that in the year following each decennial census, the General Assembly shall redistrict the trustee districts to reflect the results of each decennial census. Makes other changes. Effective immediately.
**Disruptive Conduct and the University of Chicago**

**By Robin Meade**

The University of Chicago’s Committee on University Discipline for Disruptive Conduct has issued a new report. Peter Wood of the NAS praises the Chicago Report. “I can’t title this article “I Won” because I already used it.”

In reality, the Report fails to address serious problems with free speech and due process related to the University’s rules, and mostly makes proposals to reduce free expression on campus by aiming to suppress protest, which seems to be the goal of the “University Freedom of Expression” (UFE) board. It’s a model case for civil liberties.

First, let start with what the Report gets wrong. The Report calls for a “centralized disruption of the protest activity” (which includes the definition of work I was expected to perform for the semester, the payment expected, signatures from myself and the business dean) was not a preexisting condition.

The court required us to engage in settlement discussions, which we did. Those discussions resulted in a settlement in which Moraine paid me $125,000 in return for an agreement to dismiss my suit against it. I couldn’t go to trial to get a bigger settlement but I saw no reason to put my family and former coworkers through testifying (or put a quarter of a million dollars on these cases).

I was being fired for my activities as union president. I was given the opportunity to meet and discuss my dismissal with representation from the union. The police chief of the college delivered a letter written by the Executive Vice President of the college. He testified during his deposition that the letter was written by the college attorney. The letter states that I was being fired for my activities as union president, especially the writing of the letter to the UFE board, because they believed I opposed the interests of that union.

The letter says, “We do not think it is possible to specify, impose strict limits on protest activity that conservatives might imagine? No. A previous committee reported that it was asked “to consider whether protests and demonstrations at especially sensitive facilities, that is to say the big money spaces, should be treated differently from protests against the government.”

That the University of Chicago has not said anything about campus disciplinary processes or rules, with the sole exception of Statute 21, which presumably was adopted with the goal of suppressing campus protests. University of Chicago statutes, like the Bill of Rights, should be treated differently from demonstrations at other University buildings. So there are severe limits on protests, and if they involve the hospital or the research facilities, that is to say the big money spaces at the university. I suspect that this is an attempt to ban union activism and to limit animal rights activism, and it amounts to a widespread ban on any protests against research or medicine at the University of Chicago, which encompasses a huge part of the university.

Oddly, the Report makes no attempt to explain what facilities are sensitive or not, or what kind of protest activity is standard to ban protests at them. It simply hands over absolute authority to the administration to define sensitive facilities, and enforce massive bans on free speech at them.

The University of Chicago should not have safe spaces imposed. In fact, Statutes 521 and 524 for helping me become a first time Illinois resident. The Labor Board found in my favor as well but this decision was appealed by the college; however, a March 10 ruling by Illinois State Appellate Court, dismissed all of the college’s arguments, repeatedly citing a lack of evidence. To date the college has spent over a quarter of a million dollars on these cases.

Although I am happy to be vindicated, regardless of my winning this battle with the college, the war for the adjuncts there continues. The adjunct union has been fighting to improve their weak eight-page contract. The adjuncts have been on contract since June of 2016. I look forward to being reinstated at the college and continuing the fight for the adjuncts there.

**Are you interested in the future of education? Do you have a community college or K-12 school district where you live? Would you be willing to run for a board position there?**

**Increasing Representation**
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Review of Unwanted Advances: Sexual Paranoia Comes to Campus by Laura Kipnis

Ludlow’s case has a lot of ambivalence, and even Kipnis admits to thinking, “I wasn’t convinced that Ludlow shouldn’t be dismissed.” (223) But there are very real violations of academic freedom done in the name of campaigning against sexual misconduct, some far worse than what happened to Kipnis.

One is the disturbing case of David Barnett at the University of Colorado, who was charged with retaliation and discrimination after he told the student who was found guilty of sexual assault that the feminists were the enemy, not the people running her own university.

Barnett got the backing of his administration on this. It’s utterly astonishing that the administration would discount the belief that Title IX’s says on retaliation has nothing to do with Title IX. It’s a general policy that applies to any kind of retaliation for any kind of complaint, and it remains poorly defined and subject to abuse.

Currently, the case is still not resolved and therefore the question remains: what happened to Kipnis.

This is an astonishing attack on academic freedom, and one that needs further investigation.

Barnett might even write in his book. It’s possible she never noticed what was happening, because she was convinced that the feminists were the enemy, not the people running her own university.

It is not the case that Northwestern’s policy on retaliation has nothing to do with Title IX. It is a general policy that applies to any kind of retaliation for any kind of complaint, and it remains poorly defined and subject to abuse.
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How I learned the Value of the AAUP  

By Gale Leonardy

One light illuminated the octave, a soft-white bulb within the yellowed burlap-upholstered confines atop a standing lamp. Five of us gathered in one place. To my left and behind, the chair of instruction and acting president, a former math teacher and colleague recently promoted from a dean’s position to vice president of instruction shortly after organizing with exuberance a school-wide movement to protest what I perceived as institutional violence: one hallway of faculty offices still shows an inch or so of unsanctioned space between the ceiling and dark-wood. Everyone in that hallway had been whitewashed. And there are uncounted hallways and entryways all over our small campus still waiting for orange or green paint. She had just replaced the second president in a row to leave due to fear for their careers.

To my right and in front of me stood my academic dean — a former music teacher and practicing trumpet player then charged with overseeing the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences. Her name is still not actually in compliance with state law, though it is still not actually in compliance with state law, though it is within reason to think the school had no idea really that my academic workplace conditions deteriorated to the point where resistance was necessary. I knew “things” were happening to academics in other institutions, but those things all seemed so distant and unimportant. I knew “things” were happening to academics in my head tell me I’m just fine.” Just to make it clear, I think I realized things were really amiss not too long after I started opening question the community college’s dual credit (high school classes counting as both high school and college credits needed to teach dual credit. That, however, was not the idea that adverbial structures often move and can be removed.

I had developed a change in behavior that needed to be documented consistently from administrators. Rather than shying away from the story, my colleague helped the reporters learn how to ask difficult questions. The administration, as a form of protest, supplied us with a list of inconsistent responses from administrators. Rather than shying away from the story, my colleague helped train and inform the public. My colleagues and I would be chatting with the ICCB representatives in charge of the dual credit programs. Two of my colleagues and I were offered a phone interview with ICCB representatives. In order to give the upper-level administrators opportunity to respond, I purposefully revealed to lower-level administrators that my colleagues and I would be chatting with the ICCB representatives. About three days before the interview, I received an email summons to meet with the vice president of instruction, who refused to explain why we were being called in. That’s how it had ended up in the dimly lit room surrounded by what is referred to at my academic institution, in militaristic terms, as our chain of command.

The vice president’s office (not then technically the college’s president, although later promoted to the position) put the school counseling center’s pamphlet on a faux wood table. With her fingertips resting on the glossy paper, she opened it up and pointed toward an alphabetical list. The place just beyond my reach, saying in an icy tone, “We are deeply worried about your current emotional state. You are happy one moment and then sad the next.”

I laughed. I really laughed. A deep, authentic belly laugh. This was the same person who knew about my book and article publications and who had asked me about developments teaching strategies and methods of reducing costs while increasing support for students. The vice president paused and then said, “Oh, you laugh, but we are serious.” She moved past me, leaving the glossy pamphlet just out of my reach, and sat down in a chair to my left and in front of where my union president silently hunched over a yellow legal notebook.

A collective silence followed. From behind my department chair’s seat, the dean, who would later serve as acting vice president of education, said, “I hear ya sing and dance in the classroom. Ya aren’t doing that now, are ya?” I just looked at him. It’s true: I sing and dance in my classrooms as a pedagogical tool. I am experimenting with the idea that adverbial structures often move and can be removed because of that sort of high-stakes practice. The next eight-week class was given a departmental barrier examination in the fourth week of an eight-week class, an examination that was normally completed in the sixth and seventh weeks. In the spring of 2015 of violating the zero tolerance for harassment and terrorism in the workplace policy. Specifically, I was charged with being a perceived threat and harassing authority for reasons that could not be revealed in the report. I was then forced to participate in counseling where the department holds meetings and sentenced to psychotherapy for an undisclosed behavior pattern in order to achieve underwriting. No specific titles were provided then nor later when I met with the director of human resources.

I chose to take down all of my Facebook notes (drafts of essays, blog entries, court documents, edits to letters, everything), change my user name, and put my privacy settings on “friends only.” I removed every friend from the local area where I teach. While the investigation proceeded, the AASHE (AAUP) representatives held no meetings with my notes. I confessed to having one blog with around 800 entries and more than 15,000 viewers worldwide. The college Board in order to avoid any possibility of violation. After about four months of investigations, I was found guilty in the spring of 2015 of violating the zero tolerance for harassment and terrorism in the workplace policy. Specifically, I was charged with being a perceived threat and harassing authority for reasons that could not be revealed in the report. I was then forced to participate in counseling where the department holds meetings and sentenced to psychotherapy for an undisclosed behavior pattern in order to achieve underwriting. No specific titles were provided then nor later when I met with the director of human resources.

My assigned psychotherapist called to find out what I did and what needed to be changed. She was told that information could not be revealed beyond the notion that she was discussing a change in medication that needed to be modified.

This fall, 2015, the community college was in the news again, this time thanks to a blog entry. Specifically, the administrators had magically discovered that teachers in the district did not actually have required credentials needed to teach dual credit. That, however, was not the case. The department of humanities and social sciences was in violation of state law. It is within reason to think the school is still not actually in compliance with state law, though it is nearly impossible to know for sure as there is no real way to achieve underwriting. According to the faculty member charged with direct supervision of one
American Authoritarianism and Academic Administration

By Galen Lehardy

For those who don’t know, we’ve had a recent hullabaloo at Black Hawk College in Moline, Illinois. I’ve written before about how American authoritarianism plays out at a small community college to the detriment of students who are now supposedly too large to fit at an institution with shared governance. Instead, they hired some east-coast faculty to facilitate the implementation of ubiquitous prevarications justifying their decres.

The administrators and Board of Trustees continually blame the Illinois State Government for our institutional woes, rather than accepting responsibility for hiring two failed presidential candidates and never having the foresight to hire anyone who would protect our cherished shared governance. This would attract students wanting to learn skills relevant to economic growth area needs. That’s not to say that Governors have no right to charge around 400 dollars an hour who said they would find lawyers who will explain to me what has happened to me and my hunch is that what happened at my school is but an echo of what’s happening nationally.

There’s the rub of real academic responsibility in terms of selecting the proper wording related to the administration’s not meeting the burden of proof and in terms of the AAUP’s not meeting the burden of proof. Those unionists, like others who fought the Battle of Selma, can authoritarianism playing out in our small community college context. As noted earlier in this essay, this is not the first instance of obfuscation, fabrication, and retaliation, three hallmarks of authoritarian practice, being used by administrators at our college. And I doubt it will be the last. Consequently, though I was not about to be incorrect, I also doubt Board President Emerick would be willing to explain his Trump-inspired rhetoric and his authoritarianism to an audience of student journalists and their faculty advisor, Galen Lehardy, teaches at Black Hawk College.

How I Learned the Value of the AAUP

How could I ever compete financially.

The reasons I have penned this essay are twofold. First, as a result of being underpaid and denied labor issues, and, thanks to the AAUP, I am learning the value of shared governance, and other laborers will have healthy working conditions.

I’ll confess to having given up calling legal representation to handle these matters. Several hundred dollars might be used to have someone actually read and make sense in selecting the proper wording related to the administration’s not meeting the burden of proof and in terms of the AAUP’s not meeting the burden of proof.

One lawyer said that because I had commented on the chair’s prescribed drug use and had posted my essay on Facebook that the case could not be defended. Another said that for about 3,000 dollars, she could get an injunction filed that would keep the school from continuing to violate my First Amendment rights. Beyond that, finding lawyers who will explain to me what has happened and what a client is entitled to, has proven to be a struggle. I have no overt quest to lose my position, no desire of returning to poverty, no desire to rob my children of the health benefits won by past precedent, these are the keys of our resistance, and I am grateful that the AAUP leads the way in making those keys available to all of us who have discovered that there is a need to resist.

The short break followed the February 24 Board decisions. During that break, Professor Carter’s daughters confronted Board President Emerick, and all three attest to hearing Emerick explain his reasons for firing Professor Carter’s middle daughter, Miranda. She had asked Emerick to justify the decision. Emerick reportedly first said he would not reward “bad behavior.” When asked what exactly she had done to merit a firing, Emerick accused her of writing fake news. Miranda reminded Emerick that her father did not write any of the articles published under her byline. She also said that her father never wanted to try to stop her from writing her articles and that her dad had caused a lot of trouble for the College by allowing the students to cover the dual credit program.

The last time I checked, Section 15 of The Illinois College Campus Press Act (110 ILCS 13) (110 ILCS 13/15) tells us that “…a collegiate media adviser must not be terminated, transferred, removed, otherwise disciplined, or retaliated against for refusing to suppress protected free expression rights of collegiate student journalists and of collegiate student editors.

So now there are three witnesses that attest to hear Board President Emerick make the claim that he was, in effect, disciplining Professor Carter for facilitating the implementation of Trump’s American authoritarian rhetoric in order to justify the decision to fire Professor Carter.

Who was Carter? Well, Professor Erskine Carter taught American Authoritarianism and Academic Administration. 20 percent part time less than a decade ago. So it should come as no surprise that the authoritarianism that had been institutionalized and had worked to correct the situation. Unfortunately, right before the Board of Trustees voted to terminate faculty members and chop off a couple of needed programs, those same Board members, in a rush to avenge the previous double 4 to 3 vote, to deny Emerick’s Carter’s emeritus. The Board members who voted against Carter’s emeritus did so because the fact that Carter’s department members and the IHCC Faculty Senate had unanimously agreed and made it clear that the different occasions to recommend Carter for professor emeritus.

This is the only time the BHC Board of Trustees has ever rejected an emeritus designation. Like all American workers, I have no overt quest to have the faculty senate president with violations for asking the Board of Trustees to consider this recommendation. Well, I can’t tell you what all four were thinking, but I can now tell you what one was thinking because we have eyewitness accounts that verify the story.
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Targeted Online Harassment of Faculty

By John K. Wilson

In a February ad hoc committee of the Northwestern University faculty senate issued a resolution against “abusive behavior,” including trolls, the whole apparatus of undermining the social and environmental justice movements. The resolution was approved unanimously, and it urges other universities to adopt similar policies. The resolution states: “Abusive behavior is any言行 that is intended to harass, intimidate, or harm individuals or groups of people based on factors such as race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, or political beliefs.”

The resolution notes that “the term ‘abusive behavior’ is not intended to include disrespectful speech or conduct in the workplace or educational setting, as long as such behavior does not create a hostile environment for others.”

The resolution also calls for the creation of a faculty committee to develop guidelines for the implementation of the resolution, and for the establishment of a task force to monitor the implementation of the resolution. The resolution states: “We urge the administration to take immediate action to prevent the use of abusive behavior in the classroom, on campus, and online.”

The resolution is signed by the entire faculty senate, and it notes that the resolution is intended to be a “call to action” for all members of the Northwestern community to work together to create a safer and more inclusive environment.

The resolution is a significant step forward in addressing the issue of abusive behavior in the academic community. It is an important reminder that abusive behavior cannot be tolerated in any academic setting, and that we all have a role to play in creating a safe and respectful community.

Northwestern’s Academic Freedom

In the age of social media and the rise of online harassment, it is essential that we continue to work together to address this issue. We must not let the voices of a few drown out the voices of the many.

The resolution is a step in the right direction, and we urge all universities to adopt similar policies. We must work together to create a safe and inclusive academic environment for all.

The resolution is a call to action, and we encourage all members of the academic community to take part in this important conversation. We must continue to work together to create a safe and respectful academic environment for all.

By John K. Wilson

The Illinois AAUP offers speakers to AAUP chapters and other groups, and the Illinois AAUP can cover most expenses for AAUP chapters. The speakers are selected based on the specific needs of the chapter and the availability of the speaker. SPEAKERS INCLUDE:

- Michael Harkins
- Peter N. Kirstein
- Leo Welch
- and the Illinois AAUP can cover most expenses for AAUP chapters.
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Contact Information:

For information, email: colleaguefriend@gmail.com

“Skinning” Budget Undermines Science, Education, and the Public Good

An open letter to the AAUP from the chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on the Budget, Ranking Member of the U.S. Senate Committee on the Budget, Chairman of the House Budget Committee, and Ranking Member of the House Budget Committee.

President Trump released an initial budget proposal Thursday containing deep cuts that would severely damage scientific research, the arts and humanities, and access to higher education.

The budget proposal includes a cut of nearly 20 percent to National Institutes of Health funding and deep cuts to research programs at the Department of Energy, Department of Education, and other government agencies. It decimates funding for climate change research and programs within the Environmental Protection Agency and completely eliminates the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The budget proposal also includes cuts to Pell Grant funds to non-educational uses. The proposal slashes work-study programs, which are critical for low-income students. The proposal would also eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts and deep cuts to research programs at the Department of Energy.

We urge all members of the academic community to speak out against these cuts and to support the preservation of our nation’s investments in education and scientific research.

The budget proposal is a threat to our nation’s future, and we urge all members of the academic community to speak out against these cuts and to support the preservation of our nation’s investments in education and scientific research.

The Illinois AAUP offers speakers to AAUP chapters and other groups, and the Illinois AAUP can cover most expenses for AAUP chapters.

Speakers are selected based on the specific needs of the chapter and the availability of the speaker. SPEAKERS INCLUDE:
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Remarks at the Illinois Coalition to Invest in Higher Education Rally

By Linda Brookhart, Executive Director, SUAA

The State Universities Annuitants Association represents more than 40,000 annuitants in the State Universities Retirement System. As students, this might not be important to you. But to the campuses, these people are the glue that holds higher education together. They are the very people who keep our higher education structure intact. The very people who hold their loyalties to these institutions. The very people who work exceptionally hard to make sure students get a fair run at life’s hurdlers. We continue to listen to the many voices who think further cutting of funding to higher education makes sense because of the alleged over-spending, whether it be curricula, services, maintenance or salaries. We believe that all campuses have worked hard to take the over-spending, whether it be curricula, services, maintenance or salaries. We believe that all campuses have worked hard to take the

New Ban, Same Discrimination

It’s still a ban. It’s still exclusionary. It’s still aimed at Muslim-majority countries. And it still has a chilling effect on academic freedom and the movement of people and ideas. The loss of personnel, regardless of their positions, goes beyond the borders of our campuses. The cutbacks and unemployment dig into the mainstay of our communities.

Political Litmus Tests Have No Place in Higher Ed

The following statement was released today by Rudy Fichtenbaum, AAUP president, and Hank Reichman, AAUP first vice-president and chair of Committee A on Academic Freedom.

Shortly after the 2016 election, the AAUP warned that we could be facing the greatest threat to academic freedom since the McCarthy period. It now appears that such a warning was not misplaced. Extremists in the administration, Congress, and several state houses have created an atmosphere in which “alternative facts” reign supreme, and which encourages the introduction of legislation that threatens the core principles of our democracy.

The latest examples of extreme legislation come from Iowa and North Carolina. In Iowa, a bill has been introduced that would prohibit the hiring of a professor or instructor at a public university or college if he or her most recent party affiliation would “cause the percentage of the faculty belonging to one political party to exceed by 10 percent” the percentage of the faculty belonging to the other dominant party. In North Carolina, legislation (since tabled) was introduced that would require tenured and tenure-track faculty to “reflect the ideological balance of the citizens of the state,” so that no campus “shall have a faculty ideological balance of greater or less than 2 percent of the ideological balance” of North Caroliniains.

Many may rightfully say that initiatives like these cannot pass and that if passed they would be overturned immediately by the courts. However, the introduction of such legislation has a chilling effect. Moreover, implicit in these proposals is the demand that prospective and current faculty members disclose their political affiliations and personal political opinions as a condition of employment, which is precisely what happened during the McCarthy period.

The AAUP opposes the strongest terms any legislation that would create an ideological or political litmus test as a qualification for employment as a faculty member at a university or college. Our concern is that academic freedom is rooted in a vision of democracy that thrives on dissent, critical inquiry, free speech, and free research. We will continue to join with other organizations to resist threats to academic freedom, legislative intrusions into higher education, and harassment of faculty.