We Must All Become Ambassadors

At a recent faculty meeting, I spoke of the importance of having an active AAUP chapter on the campus. A colleague asked, “But what is AAUP? I never heard of this organization.” His question shocked me, and plunged me into long and painful reflection. He made me realize that some of our colleagues have never heard of our organization, its many services and the very principles that it defends and promotes. I am sorry to admit that this is a problem on both state and national levels, and it needs our urgent attention.

I believe that one of the best ways to properly address this challenge is for all of us to become active ambassadors of AAUP and all that it stands for. We need to acknowledge, openly and without fear, our affiliation and commitment to AAUP so that our colleagues can seek us out for advice, guidance and support in time of need.

We ourselves must be knowledgeable and well versed in AAUP principles and position statements. Now the gold standard in academia, they address academic freedom, tenure, due process, shared governance and many other critical issues. Each of us must be willing to become involved in the shared governance of our own institution. We must all see ourselves as ambassadors of AAUP.

The state office is doing its share of reaching out by creating a new breed of ambassadors which can be characterized as “peripatetic,” a term for those whose mission can only be achieved by going from place to place. This new initiative, the Speakers Bureau, is designed to serve our members and chapters throughout the state. The Bureau is composed of experienced AAUP-Illinois leaders, who are committing their energy and time for the common good in academia. The names of the founding members of the Speakers Bureau are listed in this edition of Illinois Academe and will also be posted at our web site, www.ilaaup.org. To arrange for a speaker to come to your campus, please contact me or the speaker directly. The state office will undertake all related expenses. We urge all our members to make the most of this, the latest of our services and one which I am especially proud to announce.

Remember, the Speakers Bureau is only one of numerous services that the state office currently provides. We offer grants of up to $300 per year to chapters that wish to arrange for a special event on their campus, as well as grants of up to $500 to members who wish to start an AAUP chapter at their institution. For details visit our web site.

Finally, mark your calendars for the exciting annual meeting. The theme of the meeting, which will be held in Chicago in April of 2004 (tentatively scheduled for either the 17th or the 24th), will be Contingent Faculty. We are planning to have a well-known figure as our plenary speaker, so do mark your calendars and plan to attend.

In closing, I wish to paraphrase a famous line from President Kennedy: “Don’t ask what AAUP can do for you. Ask instead what you can do for AAUP.” One of the easiest ways of responding to this challenge is to become an active ambassador of AAUP at your own institution.

P. Papacosta
President AAUP-IL

Ken Anderson, Speech Communication, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, past president, IL AAUP:
1) Shared Governance and Due Process; 2) Academic Freedom & Tenure.

Joseph Felder, Economics Bradley University, Secretary, IL AAUP (member of AAUP National Council):
1) Academic challenges of the national AAUP office; 2) Types of services and assistance from the national AAUP office.

Lawrence Poston, English, University of Illinois at Chicago:
1) Academic freedom and tenure; 2) Academic governance.

Leo Welch, Biology, Southwestern Illinois College, and past president, IL AAUP:
1) Legislation and academia; 2) Collective bargaining issues in academia.

John K. Wilson, editor, Illinois Academe; founder, www.collegefreedom.org; Ph.D. student, Illinois State University:
1) History of Academic Freedom in America; 2) Inequalities in academia.

We invite all our chapters and members to make use of this Speaker Bureau. Contact IL AAUP Executive Director Lynne Meyer at (773) 510-5923, lmeyer@mindspring.com. We are accepting nominations and applications from experienced AAUP members who wish to serve on this bureau.
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A Success Story at Bradley University

By Joseph Felder

At Bradley University, the faculty of a college evaluates the college dean. Each faculty member is asked to fill out a form once a year. Those forms go to the Provost. Every third year those forms and other information go to an elected faculty committee that evaluates the dean.

It was not always so. The local AAUP chapter had long asked the administration to put this process in place. First there was an AAUP committee. It developed a process and evaluation system. They then submitted it to the University Senate, which then chartered its own committee, made up of faculty members, including representatives of AAUP and administrators, to develop its own procedure and form. Finally, in 1991, the Senate approved a process and form. They were written into Bradley’s Faculty Handbook. That is the system we had in place for about 15 years.

Then a new Senate committee, made up of faculty and one dean, was charged with improving the process and form. The committee solicited input from all members of AAUP and the faculty members who had chaired dean evaluation committees.

The committee first revised the forms that faculty members and others were asked to fill out each year. Its revisions were accepted by the Senate.

The next step was to develop a procedure and evaluation system that faculty and administrators would feel comfortable using. One thing the committee and the Senate felt strongly about was that college deans needed to be judged on the same criteria as any other major university administrator.

As the committee deliberated, the chair of the committee presented his report and recommended abolition of the faculty committees. A senator moved for acceptance of the report and its recommendation of abolition.

In debate that followed, the keynote was whether the college would have another voice at dean searches and selection process. The committee and the Senate felt strongly that the faculty needed to be involved in the search and selection process. They also felt that the committee could be useful in selecting deans.

The committee was successful in making the case that the faculty committee should be kept in place.

IL AAUP Visits National-Louis University

On June 11, 2003, IL-AAUP President Paul Papacosta and Executive Director John Meenaghan visited National-Louis University, where Papacosta was guest speaker at the NLU Faculty Association meeting. His topic was the successful outcome of 1991 enemy of academic freedom or requiring intellectual orthodoxy or behavioral conformity.

St. Xavier University AAUP Response to Peter Kirkstein Case

From: St. Xavier University-AAUP Chapter Executive Committee; Richard Fritz; President; Jayse Hileman, Treasurer; Norman Boyer, At-Large Representative; Michael Clark, At-Large Representative; Olga Villala, At-Large Representative

To: President

On May 19, 2003, the St. Xavier University-AAUP Chapter Executive Committee sent the attached letter via e-mail to President [now Emeritus Richard] Yankoski and other concerned parties. Since then, several recipients have requested a "hard copy" version of the document. The Executive Committee has redrafted and, in addition, also decided to distribute the letter to all faculty members at St. Xavier and the general public.

The intent of the attached letter is to articulate the Executive Committee’s interpretation of AAUP policy on faculty participation in due process and academic freedom, and to encourage faculty members and their elected representatives to openly discuss the faculty’s role in managing and/or adjudicating complex, difficult cases. Another goal is to urge the establishment of binding rules and procedures that specify faculty participation in ensuring due process, fair results, and a respectful, constructive working relationship between the administration and the university community.

As an advisory body, we urge the Faculty Senate and the administration to work closely with one another to uphold academic freedom and due process. We need clear policies that spell out the Senate’s role in this process and, in the words of the AAUP’s Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Section 5, “due process itself and after months of deliberation decided on a split vote to recommend to the Senate that the third year faculty committees be abolished.”

TheBradleychapterwasstunnedanddecidedtofightthesissueoutontheflooroftheSenate:BradleyhasaUniversity,notafacultycollege. Then they turned the committee to the process itself and after months of deliberation decided on a split vote to recommend to the Senate that the third year faculty committees be abolished.

The BradleychapterwasstunnedanddecidedtofighttheissueoutontheflooroftheSenate:BradleyhasaUniversity,notafacultycollege. Then they turned the committee to the process itself and after months of deliberation decided on a split vote to recommend to the Senate that the third year faculty committees be abolished.

The BradleychapterwasstunnedanddecidedtofightthesissueoutontheflooroftheSenate:BradleyhasaUniversity,notafacultycollege. Then they turned the committee to the process itself and after months of deliberation decided on a split vote to recommend to the Senate that the third year faculty committees be abolished.
The October 21 Science Times section of The New York Times on “Ethics 101: A Course About the Pitfalls” details many complicated issues scientific researchers encounter: ownership of data, who has the right to be listed as an author on a paper, sharing of knowledge, data manipulation, requests for laboratory equipment desired but not needed for a research project. Two things particularly caught my attention: The first was the claim by scientists that even though they are not experts in ethics, they are the right people to teach courses on the ethics of doing science since “by and large people who are ethicists are not going to know much about the practical issues of doing science over generally said they were largely self-taught in scientific ethics: anyone who runs a lab deals with ethical issues several times a day. The second, a case study in which a prospective hire for a tenure-track position was asked by the prospective department head to include some expensive equipment in his start-up laboratory request that he didn’t need for his lab but that the department wanted.

I take two lessons from the article: First, those of us without formal training in ethics nevertheless must address the ethical issues that arise in our work and that we are the proper people—to do so. That is part of being professional, a member of a profession. Second, the individuals with whom we work or to whom we are responsible may create an ethical climate that places our values at risk. We are part of that ethical climate as our actions help to create and shape that climate and we are affected by it.

The focus upon the role of higher education in promoting ethical action is as old as the institutions of higher education in this country. The 1987 statement by the AAUP (see sidebar) notes: “membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities.” The statement stresses intellectual honesty: “Professors make every reasonable effort to foster the advancement of learning and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit.”

A paragraph by Peter Markie in Professor’s Duties: Ethical Issues in Teaching summarizes a powerful view of the role a teacher: “Professors also represent certain values. When they speak or act on behalf of others, they protect their academic freedom. They encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the commitment to the truth and objectivity, a belief in the value of free inquiry—are moral values. Like all values, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene the stated purposes of the institution or when undertaking sponsored research. The Statement on Professional Ethics that follows set forth those general standards that serve as a reminder of the variety of responsibilities assumed by all members of the profession.

The statement which follows, a revision of a statement originally adopted in 1966, was approved by the Association’s Committee on Professional Ethics, adopted by the Association’s Council in June 1997, and endorsed by the Seventy-third Annual Meeting.

INTRODUCTION

From its inception, the American Association of University Professors has recognized that membership in the academic profession carries with it special responsibilities. The Association has consistently affirmed these responsibilities in major policy statements, providing guidance to professors in such matters as their utterances as citizens, the exercise of the responsibilities to students and colleagues, and the conduct of research. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors support such local action and stand ready, through the general secretary and the Committee on Professional Ethics, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed by the appropriate disciplinary body to warrant action, the Association supports such local action and stands ready, through the general secretary and the Committee on Professional Ethics, to counsel with members of the academic community concerning questions of professional ethics and to inquire into complaints when local consideration is impossible or inappropriate. If the alleged offense is deemed sufficiently serious to raise the possibility of adverse action, the procedures should be in accordance with the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings, or the applicable provisions of the Association’s Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

THE STATEMENT

1. Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

2. As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and their right to personal privacy, and to their proper roles as academic guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

3. As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.

4. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of work done outside it. When concerned with the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.

5. As members of their community, professors have the rights and obligations of other citizens. Professors measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their subject, to their students, to their profession, and to their communities. When they act or speak as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.
The IWF report begins with four assertions, which apparently reflect the most scandalous information learned by the group:

"A freshman at Bowdoin cannot take a course in Shakespeare."

"A freshman at Amherst won't find that sex, race, class, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and hate crimes."

"A freshman at Wellesley will find that the few broad English courses offered to freshmen focus on gender and not the books' themes and styles."

"The English Department at Williams College is condemned as a failure because its history course on 'race, ethnicity and gender' is dismissed because "it studies only narrative history.""

The IWF report is full of dubious facts and questionable conclusions, such as, "At least 10 of the 25 most expensive (by catalogue page number) liberal arts colleges, including Bowdoin, claim to offer "systematic close reading of Shakespeare's 154 sonnets." Also in Spring 2003 (and open to freshmen who had taken one English course), Williams College offered "Shakespeare's Tragedies and Roman Plays." And English majors are required to complete three courses on early English literature. But the IWF report goes on to dismiss any of those authors who have written in the ten centuries since the year 37, which is the supposed "birth" of the English language."

The IWF report claims that all of these colleges, including Bowdoin and Wellesley, are "anti-Shakespeare," "anti-American literary canon," and "anti-English." The IWF report goes on to dismiss any courses that the group considers "scandalous information learned by the top-ranked liberal arts colleges." The IWF report states that Bowdoin College's small English Department is "false. Far from being anti-Shakespeare, Bowdoin's offering of "Shakespeare, Hamlet," "Hamlet," "Beowulf to Milton," "Survey II: Neoclassical to Post-Colonial," "A History of European and American Literature," "The United States," and "American History Survey Class" is a "misrepresentation.""

The IWF report concludes that all of these colleges, including Bowdoin and Wellesley, are "anti-Shakespeare," "anti-American literary canon," and "anti-English." The IWF report goes on to dismiss any courses that the group considers "scandalous information learned by the top-ranked liberal arts colleges." The IWF report states that Bowdoin College's small English Department is "false. Far from being anti-Shakespeare, Bowdoin's offering of "Shakespeare, Hamlet," "Hamlet," "Beowulf to Milton," "Survey II: Neoclassical to Post-Colonial," "A History of European and American Literature," "The United States," and "American History Survey Class" is a "misrepresentation.""
The CLOSING OF THE AMERICAN MIND

by Allan Bloom

When the differences among students are reduced to a few technical points, as in the case of survey classes or critical reading, the differences among faculty are greatly magnified. In my experience, there is no more widely understood concept than the difference between critical reading and survey. Both terms are relatively well defined, but the faculty on the one hand and the students on the other have rather different ideas about what they mean.

Most faculty would distinguish two types of reading: the detailed problem and the all-purpose problem. The former requires a deep understanding of the text, and the latter requires a superficial understanding. The former type of reading is better suited to critical reading, and the latter type is better suited to survey.

The difference between the two types of reading is important, because both are necessary to the process of education. Critical reading is necessary for the development of critical thinking skills, and survey reading is necessary for the development of general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of teaching. Critical reading is more suited to the discipline-oriented teaching that is characteristic of the humanities, and survey reading is more suited to the discipline-oriented teaching that is characteristic of the sciences.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of student. Critical reading is more suited to the student who is interested in the development of critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the student who is interested in the development of general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of curriculum. Critical reading is more suited to the curriculum that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the curriculum that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of assessment. Critical reading is more suited to the formative assessment that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the summative assessment that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of instruction. Critical reading is more suited to the instruction that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the instruction that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of research. Critical reading is more suited to the research that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the research that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of teaching. Critical reading is more suited to the teaching that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the teaching that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of learning. Critical reading is more suited to the learning that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the learning that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of understanding. Critical reading is more suited to the understanding that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the understanding that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of application. Critical reading is more suited to the application that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the application that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of interpretation. Critical reading is more suited to the interpretation that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the interpretation that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of perspective. Critical reading is more suited to the perspective that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the perspective that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of engagement. Critical reading is more suited to the engagement that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the engagement that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of development. Critical reading is more suited to the development that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the development that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of achievement. Critical reading is more suited to the achievement that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the achievement that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of value. Critical reading is more suited to the value that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the value that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of purpose. Critical reading is more suited to the purpose that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the purpose that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of function. Critical reading is more suited to the function that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the function that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of context. Critical reading is more suited to the context that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the context that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of relationship. Critical reading is more suited to the relationship that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the relationship that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of level. Critical reading is more suited to the level that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the level that is designed to develop general knowledge.

The differences between the two types of reading are also important because they reflect the differences between the two types of person. Critical reading is more suited to the person that is designed to develop critical thinking skills, and survey reading is more suited to the person that is designed to develop general knowledge.
By Leo Wolch, Past president, IL-AAUP
Gov. Rod Blagojevich has completed action on legislation sent to him from the Illinois General Assembly and scheduled for October 23, November 18-20.

Legislation that was signed (approved) by the Governor on or before August 26 has become Public Act number. Legislation that was vetoed or amendatorily vetoed will be returned to the Illinois General Assembly and scheduled for further consideration during the fall veto session. The General Assembly can choose to accept the Governor’s Vetoes, override them, or not act at all. If a veto is not overridden, legislation will be returned to both houses of the General Assembly, then the entire bill is lost. The 2003 fall veto session was scheduled to run through Tuesday, November 23.

Vetoed Bills

Bills Signed into Law by the Governor

Senate Bill 1586 - Verbatim Minutes of Closing Session
Requires that all public bodies (including community college boards) make a verbatim audio or video recording of their meetings. Establishes procedures for the availability to the court of closed meeting minutes and recordings. Effective January 1, 2004.
Public Act 93-0523.
HB 2671 - FY 04 Higher Education Appropriations
Sets FY 2004 appropriations to the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Department of Education, the Higher Education Authority (for medical education scholarships), the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy, the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, the Service Commission. The total budget for higher education was approved at a level of about $25.5 million above the Governor’s funding recommendations. The community college budget was approved above the Governor’s recommended level, with the addition of $7.4 million in new funding for “harmless” dollars. These additional dollars will be used to implement a new allocation of state funds to community colleges through a new funding formula.
Public Act 93-0090.

Bills Signed into Law by the Governor

Senate Bill 1980 - Lincoln Land Community College Election By Subdistricts
Requires the election of Lincoln Land Community College trustees by subdistrict rather that at-large, beginning with the 2005 (unscheduled) election. The terms of each trustee elected before the effective date of the amendatory Act would on end on the date that the trustees elected under the new subdistrict system was first determined. The bill also provides for 4-year and 2-year terms (rather than 6).
Public Act 93-0353.

House Bill 1457 - Redefinition of Educational Employee
Amends the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act to provide that an educational employee of a community college who provides less than 3 (currently 6) hours of instruction during a summer academic semester is not an “educational employee” within the meaning of the Act. Amends the Mandates Act to require implementation without reimbursement.
Public Act 93-0134.

House Bill 3396 - Union Elections
Amends the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act to provide that an educational employer shall (rather than may) voluntarily recognize a labor organization as the exclusive representative if that organization appears to represent a majority of employees in the unit.
Public Act 93-0444.

House Bill 1119 - Increase in IIA Grants
Change the name of the Illinois Incentive for Access Grant Program to Illinois Incentive for Access Grant Program, and in FY 05 increases the maximum annual contribution of 50.
Public Act 93-0455.

House Bill 1118 - Limits on University Tuition Increases
Provides that, for students first enrolling after the 2003-2004 academic year, for 4 continuous academic years following initial enrollment (or for undergraduate programs that require more than 4 years to complete the program to the Illinois Parnell Illinois Incentive for Access Grant Program, and in FY 05 increases the maximum annual contribution of 50.
Public Act 93-0455.

House Bill 761 - Sale of Higher Education Directory Information
Prohibits a community college, school district or other public or private entity from providing a student’s name, address, telephone number, social security number, driver’s license number, or other personal identifying information to a business organization or financial institution that is not authorized by law, unless the student is 21 years of age or older. Effective July 1, 2003.
Public Act 93-0429.

Senate Bill 19 - Chicago School Reform
Implements and agreement to repeal parts of the Chicago School Reform Act of 1995. The City of Chicago has been granted the power to impose an additional $10 billion in general obligation bonds. Provides for the provisions of a new facility and finance district to reduce the unfunded liabilities of the five state funded retirement systems (the Teachers Retirement System, the University Retirement System). This is Gov. Blagojevich’s initiative to provide a partial relief from funding reductions in fiscal year 2004 by (financing or “refinancing”) the unfunded accrued liability of the public pension systems.
Public Act 93-0002.

BILLS VETOED BY THE GOVERNOR

House Bill 221 - Surplus State Property
Amends the State Property Control Act to redefine the term “responsible officer” to include community college trustees. This bill also requires that un-used state property leased by the Illinois Department of Central Management Services may not be leased at less than 60% of the fair market rental value unless specified conditions are met, and provides procedures for determining the fair market rental value; and prohibits the sale of surplus real property if any state agency requests its transfer. The bill was introduced in response to the dis-persal of the former Zeller Memorial Health Center to [N] Illinois Central College.
Total Vetoes: Bill 3412 - Governmental Ethics Act
Creates the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act. Prohibits state officials and employees of the executive, legislative, and judicial branch of state government and the Auditor General and his or her employees from engaging in political activities during time state employees. Requires the implementation and maintenance of personnel policies for those of-ficials and employees. Prohibits certain practices by those officers candidates for those offices, and those employees with respect to campaign contributions, public service announcements, and post-state employment. Creates protections for whistleblowers. Prohibits home rule and units of local government and school districts to adopt simi-lar regulations. Requires that a recrui-ted lobbyist may not serve on a board, commission, authority, or task force authorized or created by a state statute or by executive order of the Governor.
Amendatory Veto.

BILLS THAT HAVE NOT YET PASSED BOTH HOUSES

Senate Bill 1021 - Campus Book Stores
Requires boards of trustees of public universities to extend an invitation to the University Retail Sales Act by defining “state institution of higher learning” to mean “a university, college, or community college, or junior college in this state that is publicly supported by taxes levied and collected within the jurisdiction of income, sales, or property.” Does not permit the sale of surplus real property unless it is located out to a private vendor. Provides for the Governor's Community College Dormitories
Amends the Public Community College Act to allow a community college board to provide or contract for residential housing for students and employees.
SB 815 / HB 2806 - Mandated Ratio of Part-time / Full Time Faculty
Requires the governing board of each public university and commu-nity college to achieve a ratio under which at least 75% of all full-time faculty instructional positions are held by part-time teachers. The bill also provides for a phase-in, starting the FY 2004, and increasing the minimum to 33% of its increase in state fund distribution formula grants to achieve the ratio.

House Bill 2522 - Community College Purchasing Consortium
Amends the Public Community College Act to add contracts for goods of services procured through purchasing consortia to the state governmental agency consortium as an exception to the requirement that purchase of state supplies, materials, or work involving and expenditure in excess of $10,000 must be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder.

House Bill 2593 - New Community College for East St. Louis
Requires the Illinois Community College Board to establish a new community college district, comprised of the territory of the former Metropolitan Community College, to be known as Gateway Community College. Provides that ICCB may not abdul, restrict, or take over the operation of Gateway Community College without first notifying the General Assembly and receiving permission from the General Assembly for the action.
House Bill 19 - Higher Education Scholarship Act
Provides for an award for entering freshman, sophomores, jun-ior, and seniors who have and maintain at least a “B” average at the time of the award. Students must be full-time at a public or private col-lege, university, or community college located in Illinois.

House Bill 254 - Income Tax Credit for Tuition Fees
Creates and income tax credit of up to $500 for taxpayer (with an adjusted gross income of less than $100,000) for tuition and fees paid at any public or private col-lege, university, or community college located in Illinois.

House Bill 2334 - Illinois Students Opportunity Scholarship
Creates the Illinois Opportunity Scholarship Program to be adminis-tered by the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. Students will be awarded the award, beginning with the 2004-2005 academic year, of un-dergraduate scholarships of up to $1,000 for up to four years, for use at institutions of higher education located in Illinois.

House Bill 2257 - Community College Dormitories
Amends the Public Community College Act to allow a community college board to provide or contract for residential housing for students and employees.
By John K. Wilson

George Gollin didn’t intend to launch a computer science mill that would eventually lead the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign to censor this physics professor’s websites. Instead, he started a pop-up ads that continually came up on his computer. After clicking them shut, over and over again, he says, “after a couple months, I realized what was going on.”

Gollin, a professor in the College of Medicine, has a year to pay. Robertstown University gave a multiple-choice quiz to give credit for “life experience.” Gollin took the quiz. Because the 100 multiple-choice questions were worth 1,000, he got an identical test offer by St. Regis University, got only 21 right (wrong than random guessing), and received the same offer of $1,000 in APA.

Gollin posted this information on his website at the University of Illinois and complained to the Federal Trade Commission and state fraud agents. He now is fighting over the money he is receiving from websites. The $100,000 in APA is a clear waste of time. The University of Illinois is the university that is wasting time.

Gollin believes that “it’s an infringement of academic freedom, it needs to be dis- continued.” But he is afraid that the simple fact that Gollin is putting his information on their website: “It makes me a hell of a lot safer, it makes the university a hell of a lot safer.”

Gollin says, “I don’t want to be teaching in a Osterville (the site of an education policy where students should be able to have their academic freedom protected.)

Because the new state “truth-in-tuition” law requires a fixed level of tuition for four years (rather than requiring public colleges to announce in advance what tuition increases will be), Illinois colleges will make increases will be), Illinois colleges will make such increases whenever they choose. The new law also would make it possible for the administration to set new tuition rates for next year's budget. The law also would allow the university to sack all its tuition increases in 2002 and 2003.

The University of Illinois College Press Association investigated the case and determined, “ad- ministrators have acted inappropriately, and probably illegally, with blatant disregard for students’ First Amendment rights.”

The courts do not rule in favor of the students involved in these suits, you can kiss your constitutional guarantees goodbye. The courts have made it clear that the university would precipitate an onslaught of censorship.
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Contingent Faculty Policy

Adoption and Implementation

The governing Council of the American Association of University Professors adopted a new policy statement, Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession, on November 9, 2003. This statement addresses the increasing overreliance on part-time and non-tenure-track faculty that threatens the quality and stability of higher education and the academic profession’s capacity to serve the public good. Read the new policy at www.aaup.org.

IL AAUP's Annual Meeting

In April 2004 in Chicago will focus on contingent faculty, as will the next issue of Illinois Academe. For more information or to submit an article or book review, contact editor John K. Wilson at jkwilso2@ilstu.edu.

The AAUP has also announced a new contingent faculty research fund for faculty, publishers, and institutions. The ILAAUP has also announced a new policy for its Institutional Council on Academic Freedom.

National Security and Academic Freedom

In a new report (published in the Nov./Dec. issue of Academe), an AAUP Special Committee on Academic Freedom and National Security in a Time of Crisis assessed the risks to academic freedom in the wake of 9-11. UIUC law professor Matt Finkin was one of the committee members.

AAUP Annual Meeting

The national AAUP Annual Meeting was held in June in Washington, D.C., and IL AAUP representatives at the event included Ken Andersen, Joe Felder, Pan Papacosta, and John K. Wilson.

The AAUP members voted to remove four institutions from the censured list and added none, although a resolution criticalizing the administration of the University of South Florida for its violation of due process in the Sami Al-Arian case was passed. Censure was not recommended by Committee B because internal appeal procedures have not been fully exhausted. The president of one institution was on hand to urge removal from censure, and noted that his first priority upon becoming president was to urge changes in campus procedures so that the university would no longer be under AAUP censure.

Rep. Sherwood Boehlert (D-N.Y.) received the Henry T. Yost Congressional Recognition Award. Eileen Burchell, an AAUP member from Marymount College of Fordham University received the Georgia Smith Award for improving the status of academic women or advancing collective bargaining. San Francisco Chronicle reporter Seth Rosenberg won the Iris Molotsky Award for Excellence in Coverage of Higher Education for his remarkable series that took more than a decade to gather data for Freedom of Information Act requests. “The Campus Files: Reagan, Hoover and the UC Red Scare” (available online at www.sfgate.com/campus). The Alexander Meiklejohn Award for Academic Freedom went to Molly Corbett Broad, president of the University of North Carolina, for defending the right of faculty and staff to select a book about the Qu for freshman reading program in 2002 (see the summer 2003 issue of Illinois Academe for more details).

Join the AAUP

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is the only faculty organization devoted solely to higher education. We address the issues that concern you as a teacher and as a scholar. Our policies ensure that faculty members are afforded academic due process. The AAUP protects and defends your rights. If you are a member of the faculty, you need to be a member of the AAUP.