

Report on ACRL Preconference

*Report on the ACRL Preconference
Institute on Collective Bargaining in
Higher Education: Its Implications for
Governance and Faculty Status for
Librarians*

*Submitted by
Jean Whalen
Personnel Librarian
State University of New York
at Albany*

The distinctive clang of cable car bells could be heard in the distance as 160 librarians gathered in San Francisco to attend the ACRL Preconference Institute on Collective Bargaining held June 27-28, 1975. The growing awareness of the implications of collective bargaining on higher education is reflected in recent literature and made this program particularly timely. Prior to the institute, participants had been supplied with material assembled by the Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, which addressed in detail some of the major issues of collective bargaining in higher education today and provided a comprehensive perspective for this two-day institute.

Participants had an opportunity to meet and socialize at a reception in the San Francisco Hilton Hotel on Thursday evening before convening for the first General Session on Friday morning. C. James Schmidt, chairperson of the ACRL Academic Status Committee, introduced the session in a speech addressing the background of the institute and its goals and identifying some of the key issues of collective bargaining in the academic environment. In the fall of 1973, as ACRL began plans for a program on "Governance" for the ALA Conference in New York City (July 1974), it became evident that the topic was too complicated to cover in a single two-hour meeting, and a committee was formed to plan a preconference institute on collective bargaining for 1975. Millicent Abell was chairperson of this group which included Mary Lou Cobb, Marjorie Dennin, and John Haak. The goal of the conference was to provide information about collective bargaining which today covers 15 percent of the faculty in higher education and 10 percent of the institutions in higher education—and particularly to address the issue of collective bargaining as it impinges on faculty status for librarians. Among the key issues identified by Mr. Schmidt was the jurisdictional morass which may result from the definition of the bargaining unit and

the choice of bargaining agent. He pointed out that librarians should study the possible implications of collective bargaining on patterns of library service and on the organizational structure of libraries.

The first speaker of this session was Donald Wollett, director of employee relations, State of New York, whose topic was "The Nature of Collective Bargaining and its Relationship to Governance in Higher Education." Mr. Wollett described and compared the components and characteristics of both a governance system and a collective bargaining system with an emphasis on identifying areas of conflict which may develop as a result of differences in these characteristics. For example, in a governance system authority is shared by choice rather than by compulsion, and the authority of the governing body can be recalled with no effective legal recourse. Also, collective bargaining typically deals with a much narrower scope of issues than those involved in a governance system, yet bargaining units are more broadly based than traditional governance systems, since the criterion for identifying the group of employees affected by the decisions of management (i.e., the bargaining unit) becomes "community of interest" rather than scholarship. Some of the tensions which may exist as a result of the differences between governance and collective bargaining systems are found in the difficulty of identifying management, in the scope of subject matter, and in the areas of bargaining procedures, personnel administration, and funding.

In the second keynote speech, Kenneth P. Mortimer, Pennsylvania State University, described "a survey of experience in academic collective bargaining." He pointed out that, until now, collective bargaining has been primarily a phenomenon of the public sector and that, of the 358 campuses on which faculty members have chosen collective bargaining agents, 86 percent are public institutions. The growth of collective bargaining parallels the enactment of state bargaining laws. By 1973, 161 institutions of higher education were organized under collective bargaining, but a loss of momentum has been noted since that year. Currently twenty to twenty-three states have statutes permitting collective bargaining. However, these state statutes rarely recognize college and university faculty as different from industry workers. Both the bargaining structure and the scope of negotiations vary from state to state as states adopt their own patterns based on prior structure. Adopting collective bargaining introduces a po-

tential set of new actors and redistribution of roles as union officials and arbitrators enter the academic picture bringing with them a basic set of assumptions about labor relations.

Mr. Mortimer discussed academic governance and its form in collective bargaining. It is traditional that faculty have a role in "management decisions" (planning, staffing, quality control), although there are few studies documenting the extent of faculty participation in governance. Some obvious questions, therefore, concern the relationship between collective bargaining and academic senates. Are senates likely to atrophy in competition with collective bargaining? Are the two contradictory rather than complimentary? There seems to be a growing formalization of the relationship between these two decision-making bodies. The union may be viewed by some as a means of supplanting the power base of a strong senate, and it appears evident that a senate will only continue in competition with collective bargaining where that senate is responsive to the needs of its constituency.

Student involvement in collective bargaining adds yet another dimension to this phenomenon in higher education. This issue is also forcing a new look at the role of nonteaching professionals in faculty governance. The question of full-time versus part-time employees and their conditions of employment is another unresolved question.

The second General Session featured a panel discussing "alternative organizational approaches to governance and status issues." The first three speakers represented the three major bargaining agents who have contracts in public and private higher education today. Dirck Brown, National Education Association, indicated that the position of NEA on economical, governance, and faculty status issues is that there should be equality between librarians and faculty as it pertains to professional status and compensation. There should be for all faculty protection of professional rights.

Charles McClain, American Association of University Professors, emphasized AAUP's concern for improving the professional welfare of faculty in higher education. In his opinion, the implications of college governance in collective bargaining are seriously diminished or have never been fully realized.

In his remarks, Warren Kessler, president, United Professors of California (an affiliate of AFT) observed that AFT has been an advocate of collective bargaining for higher education for some time. The AFT position was summarized as one not of promises but of offerings of substance—one which offers structure and federation among autonomous locals and thus one which would allow librarians to define their needs on an individual basis.

The two final panelists presented different perspectives. David Feller, president of the Berkeley Faculty Association, stated that the decision to embrace collective bargaining should be made by the constituency of the senate. Addressing the question of professionalism and unions, Mr. Feller said that people make the union—not the label which a union may receive. The faculty needs an organizational voice to effectively represent it in matters concerning faculty welfare. In the absence of a bargaining agent, decisions may be made without consulting faculty and, as employees, faculty need their representatives participating in making those decisions.

The opposite viewpoint—advocating retention of the current faculty governance system rather than adopting collective bargaining—was presented by Daniel Orr, University of California, San Diego. He stated that academic groups should define goals in a manner consistent with the goals of the university and suggested that a careful look be taken to ascertain just what unionization has accomplished. Labor unions are at an advantage in a recession, and we are in an era of reduction of public support of research and reduced enrollment in higher education.

The day's program ended with a reception which again afforded participants an opportunity to meet informally and pursue ideas generated during the sessions.

On Saturday morning the third General Session was initiated by a paper delivered by Jean Kennelly, University of Washington. Her topic was "The Current Status of Academic Librarians' Involvement in Collective Bargaining." During the two months preceding the conference, Ms. Kennelly had surveyed library personnel officers at 130 of those four-year colleges and universities whose faculties were identified by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* as having adopted collective bargaining. The survey attempted to verify factual information concerning the impact of bargaining on the faculty status of librarians and requested comments on twenty-four issues and conditions relating to that status and having a potential for change. Survey results indicated that in only three of the twenty-four areas polled was substantial change documented: due process, salaries, and fringe benefits. There was predominantly no change in the areas of relationship with students, selection of paraprofessionals, and work day and only very minor changes in the remaining areas surveyed.

Concerning the implications of bargaining on faculty status, 51 percent reported no effect since faculty status was a reality prior to collective bargaining (9 percent reported faculty status a direct result of collective bargaining;

Continued on page 262



An overflow audience of ACRL members in San Francisco heard Peter Drucker describe issues in the management of public service institutions. The Drucker program was one of more than twenty-five ACRL programs held during the ALA conference.



H. William Axford, president ACRL, reports to the membership at its annual business meeting June 30.



Rare Books and Manuscripts Preconference participants heard Donald D. Eddy, Cornell University, advocate the preparation of the eighteenth-century short-title catalog which would use the basic elements of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules adapted to the MARC format and stored in the OCLC data base.

The publication of an eighteenth-century STC, planned by Bowker Publishing Co., Ltd. and University Microfilms Ltd. was announced at the RBMS preconference by John W. Jolliffe (right), keeper of the catalogues at the Bodleian Library. William B. Todd (left), editor of the Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, and Herman W. Leibert, librarian emeritus of the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, consider the matter.



The impact of collective bargaining on the governance and faculty status for college and university librarians was the theme of the preconference planned by ACRL's Academic Status Committee. Charles McClain, AAUP, and John Haak, University of California, San Diego, talk with David Feller, University of California, Berkeley, about the role of faculty senates in university governance.

ACRL Preconference

Continued from page 242

10 percent reported faculty status was negotiated but not achieved; 8 percent reported achieving faculty privileges, but not status; 3 percent reported that librarians were not interested in achieving faculty status).

In summary, for the most part, librarians are included in faculty bargaining units. Library administrators are included in one-third of those units. Substantial changes as a result of collective bargaining were reported in only three of the twenty-four areas surveyed and areas of material gain (salaries, fringe benefits) were affected more than areas of decision making.

During the next hour, participants selected one of nine group sessions for small group discussions. Group leaders included David Feller, Johanna Ross, Lothar Spang, Lorraine Guirlani and Joan Edgar, John Weatherford, Jeanette Carter, Anne Commerton, Barbara Marks, and Daniel Orr—several of whom had recently authored articles in library literature on the topic of collective bargaining.

The final paper of the institute was delivered by Gwendolyn Cruzat on "Issues and Strategies for Academic Librarians." Ms. Cruzat identified five areas for elaboration: enabling legislation; the posture of negotiators; characteristics of the faculty; the treatment of librarians in collective bargaining; and faculty status. She noted in surveying the nature of those institutions of higher education engaged in collective bargaining that no major research-oriented universities have yet turned to collective bargaining. Traditionally the type of environment in which collective bargaining has flourished has been that of the two-year college. The correlation between the power of the faculty self-governing mechanism and the failure to embrace collective bargaining seems high.

In summarizing the presentations and discussions of the institute, Kenneth P. Mortimer again noted the special nature of universities and observed that 20 percent of the institutions of higher education which have adopted collective bargaining are former teacher's colleges which are not dominated by the shared authority concept, but rather by administrators. Among the variety of motivational factors resulting in collective bargaining, perhaps the strongest is the desire to preserve the status quo and keep a system of effective faculty governance from erosion. As he discussed the scope of contracts, Mr. Mortimer remarked that the more simple the mission of the institution, the more detailed the contract seems to be.

Finally, he advanced four avenues of action for librarians who are contemplating collective

bargaining. (1) Codify the experiences of other academic librarians. Establish contact with the National Center for Collective Bargaining and the Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service. (2) Collective bargaining is a political situation and given the small percentage of librarians in the work force, it is probably unwise to attempt to establish separate bargaining units. (3) Any voluntary organization can be dominated by a minority. Union politics are usually dominated and controlled by "dues paying" members and librarians should be aware of their potential power in this area. (4) Because national policies don't always control local policies, take a careful look at the individuals (not the organization) who are attempting to organize you.

In retrospect, I would conclude that the two-fold objectives of the institute were achieved. Individual participants were provided information on the nature of collective bargaining and its influence on bargaining agents as well as on academic library experiences with collective bargaining. And a substantial contribution has been made to the ACRL Academic Status Committee's development of materials and programs on the issues of governance and status which can benefit the profession at large. ■ ■

Fantastico

The General Libraries of the University of Texas at Austin maintains one of the broadest Latin American acquisitions programs in the United States. Appropriately, it has provided its Latin American cataloging copy to the international library community through the National Union Catalog and the G. K. Hall *Catalog of the Latin American Collection*. In 1975, the General Libraries also began entering its Latin American cataloging records into the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) data base.

As a member of the AMIGOS Bibliographic Council, the General Libraries of the University of Texas at Austin is committed to providing its Latin American cataloging through the OCLC system on a continuing basis. Current Latin American receipts will be cataloged on arrival and input into OCLC; two OCLC terminals will be devoted exclusively to searching and input of cataloging data for Latin American materials. Six full-time professionals and assorted support staff will be assigned to work with these materials. Monographs, serials, and non-book materials will all be cataloged for input into the OCLC data base.