

UNITED FACULTY OF EVERGREEN COMMUNIQUÉ

October 31, 2009
Volume 3, Issue 1

Coordinating Committee:

Chair: Laurie Meeker
Vice-Chair: open position
Treasurer:
Rebecca Sunderman
Communications:
Ruth Hayes
Steward Coordinator:
Sarah Ryan
At-Large Representatives:
Tony Zaragoza
open position

Stewards:

Peter Bacho
Peter Bohmer
Lori Blewett
Peter Dorman
Kathleen Eamon
Marla Elliott
Anne Fischel
Judith Gabriele
Stephanie Kozick
Anita Lenges
Paul McMillin
Laurie Meeker
Daryl Morgan
Donald Morisato
Lin Nelson
Chuck Pailthorp
Alan Parker
Susan Preciso
Andrew Reece
Frances Rains
Liza Rognas
Sarah Ryan
Zahid Shariff
Rebecca Sunderman
Joe Tougas
Michael Vavrus
Sonja Weidenhaupt
Elizabeth Williamson
Bob Woods
Tony Zaragoza
EJ Zita

Fall General Membership Meeting

The UFE fall general membership meeting will be held Friday, November 13th, from 5-7 pm, in Sem. II D1107. Refreshments and childcare will be provided.

We have a full agenda for the Fall UFE General Membership Meeting. The most pressing business is to elect two new members of the Coordinating Committee. These are the Vice-Chair and one At-Large Representative. Nominations are open for these positions. Please contact Laurie Meeker with your nominations (meekerl@earthlink.net).

Another urgent issue to take action on is the Administration's audit of the Labor Center at the request of the conservative Landmark Legal Foundation. This has raised serious questions about the guarantees of academic freedom written into the Collective Bargaining Agreement (see article below).

Other items on the agenda have to do with the work UFE Stewards are doing on several initiatives to strengthen the union. The Solidarity working group is developing ways to show our support of staff and

students in light of current budget shortfalls. At the meeting, the Solidarity committee will present a proposal for a UFE scholarship program to help students with tuition increases. If the membership approves this proposal we may be able to award scholarships by spring, 2010.

Another working group is defining ways to respond to issues raised in the Collective Bargaining Agreement that have to do with conversion of term faculty. We want to effectively support term faculty up for conversion review this year and in years to come. A working group on contract clarity is assessing what the CBA says about faculty responsibilities. Another group is crafting a proposal for a policy and guidelines for faculty who lead travel abroad programs in the absence of one authored by the Administration.

Academic Freedom at Evergreen: The AAUP Stands Up for Us

The American Association of University Professors issued a statement in response to the audit of Evergreen's Labor Center. The Landmark Legal Foundation asked for an audit of 12 labor centers or labor education programs nationwide, charging that they were a conflict of interest for colleges and universities. Landmark is headed by a right-wing "shock jock." The only college that responded was Evergreen, whose auditor examined not only the finances but also the mission statement and activities of our Labor Center and concluded that the center shouldn't receive public funds for working with "private interests" like unions and immigrant groups. The President and Provost published this audit but have taken no action. The AAUP issued the following statement about the audit report's threat to academic freedom.

Landmark Threats to Academic Freedom: the Case of Labor Education statement by the Executive Committee of the AAUP

In the last few years the Landmark Legal Foundation has lodged public records requests of and complaints in regard to labor education centers in at least eleven public universities and colleges, including Florida International University, Indiana University, UCLA, UC Berkeley, the Universities of Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts-Amherst, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, and The Evergreen State College. Thus far, to our

knowledge the most serious complaints, which threaten academic freedom, appear to have taken place at UC Berkeley and Evergreen, where the foundation seeks to restrict the work of the centers, in terms of who they serve and what they do. At Berkeley, Landmark's complaint alleged, among other charges, that the Labor Center provides services for private (union) benefit rather than for public benefit. At Evergreen, Landmark made a

Join the
UFE! 

Contact Sarah Ryan: s.f.ryan@comcast.net
or go to <http://www.ufws.org/evergreen/index.html> for more information

About United Faculty of Evergreen

The purpose of the United Faculty of Evergreen is to represent all eligible faculty members in bargaining, grievances, and in all matters relating to terms and conditions of employment with The Evergreen State College, to protect and enhance Evergreen's unique traditions that have earned it prominence among the nation's public colleges and liberal arts colleges, to encourage mutual understanding and cooperation among union members, to engage in legislative, political, civic, welfare and other actions which further the interests of the membership, public education and the labor movement; and to bring about a world where justice and equality are a reality, not just empty words.

The UFE is affiliated with:

United Faculty of Washington State

The Washington Education Association

The National Education Association

AFT Washington

The American Federation of Teachers

The American Federation of Labor/Congress of Industrial Organizations and

The Washington State Labor Council

<http://www.ufws.org/evergreen/index.html>

Who is the Landmark Legal Foundation, what is their agenda, and why should Evergreen allow them to meddle in our work?

Check out their web site for the skinny:

<http://www.landmarklegal.org>

**Come to the November membership meeting,
Friday the 13th, 5-7 pm, Sem II, D1107
MAKE IT YOUR LUCKY DAY!**

AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom (cont'd)

request for a state audit of the Labor Center, charging that this program "is in violation of Washington's requirement that public funds must only be used for a valid public purpose." The letter from Landmark went on to say that "Rather than a valid public purpose, the Center's activities are designed to promote a particular political ideology."

In the two examples provided above, an external body (Landmark) is seeking to interfere with work in the academy, on ideological grounds, in situations that in some regards are comparable to those faced by university legal clinics (see Robert R. Kuehn and Peter A. Joy, *Lawyering in the Academy: The Intersection of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility*, *Journal of Legal Education*, 53,1(2009): 97-124). And that external body has a highly politicized agenda: the website of the foundation (the full name of which includes, "The Ronald Reagan Legal Center") has as its banner, "The best investment a conservative can make," and has a running news item that the foundation nominated Rush Limbaugh for the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize.

The claims of Landmark in regard to labor education are a fundamental threat to academic freedom, to the autonomy of higher education institutions and professionals in them, and to the responsibilities of each to serve society. They also run counter to common sense thinking about the role of educators and researchers, and of colleges and universities in society. Landmark focuses on labor education without addressing far more common centers and programs that serve private economic concerns and interests. Imagine a higher education institution which could not have a business school or economics department with centers or programs that educate future entrepreneurs or business leaders or provide in-service opportunities to current businesspersons. Indeed, that was part of the response at Berkeley, where the complaint also related to Proposition 209 and the Center's hosting a Summer Institute for Union Women and sponsoring a Latino Leadership School and Black Trade Union Leadership School. Educating potential union leaders is not unlike educating potential CEOs and managers. Both are legitimate academic endeavors.

It appears that most universities have responded to Landmark's requests in ways that defended the rights of labor centers. However, at Evergreen, despite the fact that the state auditor gave the college significant flexibility in how to handle the audit request, college administrators went forward with a review – conducted by the college's internal auditor – that raised questions about the ethics of providing educational services to unions and community groups (e.g., of immigrant communities), and of being involved in any work that could be seen as opposing the work of federal agencies (in this case, for example, Immigration and Customs Enforcement). Those questions

mirrored charges made by Landmark that "the Center's focus appears to be increasingly directed toward thwarting federal and state law enforcement efforts to combat illegal immigration in Washington ... The use of public funds to undermine federal and local law enforcement in the performance of their duties is not a valid public purpose."

The claim, as applied to the Labor Center's activities, appears to suggest that any effort to educate workers and immigrants about their constitutional rights would be counter to the public interest. Such interpretations not only lack face validity, they run counter to the concept of academic freedom, of both individual professionals as well as of the university. They run counter, as well, to conceptions of academics and academic institutions responsibly providing services to society. If academics and universities are involved in community outreach and service, as they should be, they must be protected from ideologically motivated attacks on their academic work. That dimension of academic freedom is part of the contribution of this concept and condition to the benefit of society.

The founders of the American Association of University Professors, articulated in their "1915 Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure" the "special dangers to freedom of teaching," referring to "the danger of restrictions upon the expression of opinions which point toward extensive social innovations, or call in question the moral legitimacy or social expediency of economic conditions or commercial practices in which large vested interests are involved." The statement then cautions against related threats that lie in "governmental policy or a strong public feeling on economic, social, or political questions." The founders of this association knew whereof they spoke. The fourth case investigated by the AAUP was that of Scott Nearing, a graduate of the Wharton School, who in 1915 was non-renewed as an assistant professor at the University of Pennsylvania. The AAUP, and the *New York Times*, construed the non-renewal as a dismissal. The reasons for the action of the University lay in Nearing's political views, statements, and writings, among other matters, on the topic of child labor, and the relationship between capital and labor. Nearing ran afoul of vested interests.

We reaffirm the core value of academic freedom, which works to the benefit of society, and which underlies and protects the involvement of academics in the lives of their communities. The Landmark Foundation's actions and claims as regards labor education are a threat to academic freedom and to academic institutions and professionals fulfilling their professional responsibilities. Administrations will best serve the public interest by supporting that freedom, including by supporting the freedom of college and university labor centers to do their work.