Report of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, 2012–13

Introduction

The 2012–13 Committee A report includes both judicial and legislative activities. The judicial work of Committee A involves the imposition and removal of censure. In 2011–12, three institutions were placed on the list of censured administrations, and none were removed. In 2012–13, two administrations were censured, and two others were removed from the censure list. In one case, however, positive developments subsequent to our investigation led the committee to defer any recommendation on censure and instead to monitor developments and report back to the annual meeting in June 2014.

In legislative activity, Committee A completed its work, begun in June 2011, on a report entitled *The Role of the Faculty in Conditions of Financial Exigency* and approved associated revisions to the AAUP's *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*. This new policy and these revised regulations are certainly timely, given that both administrations placed on the censure list this year claimed that layoffs of tenured faculty members were necessitated by financial difficulties. Committee A has also initiated a review and revision of the Association's policy statement *Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications*, adopted in 2004. The committee hopes to present a final revision to the Council prior to the 2014 annual meeting.

Judicial Business

Impositions of Censure

At its June meeting, Committee A considered three cases that had been subjects of ad hoc investigating committee reports published since the 2012 annual meeting. In two of these cases—Southern University, Baton Rouge, and National Louis University—the committee approved the statements below recommending censure, the Council concurred, and the 2013 annual meeting voted to impose censure. In the third case—the University of Northern Iowa—the committee approved the statement below making no recommendation to the 2013 annual meeting but instead stating that it would monitor the situation and report back to next year's annual meeting. The Council voted its concurrence with all three statements, and the annual meeting voted to impose both censures.

Southern University, Baton Rouge. Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, a public, historically black university chartered in 1880, is the flagship institution of what is now the Southern University system and the largest of its five campuses. The system administration had been placed on the Association's censure list in 1968 and was removed from that list two decades later, in 1987, when the administration, among other conditions, adopted AAUP-recommended procedural standards for terminations of faculty appointment mandated by financial exigency. In May 2012, the Association authorized an investigation at Southern University in Baton Rouge following action by the system's board of supervisors to declare financial exigency and the SUBR administration's implementation of a plan to deal with the purported exigency. That plan resulted in the termination of

Status of Committee A Cases and Complaints as of May 31, 2013

All current open complaints, not opened as cases	384
All current open cases	175
Total complaints and cases currently open	559

nineteen tenured faculty appointments and a restructuring of the curriculum, without faculty participation, that reduced the number of colleges in the university from nine to five. The Association's investigation focused on the declaration of exigency and the resulting tenure terminations.

The system's board, when acting in October 2011 to declare a state of financial exigency, approved new policies and procedures that enhanced the administration's authority to act as it saw fit in reducing academic expenditures. The new policies provided for as little as thirty days of notice to professors selected for appointment termination, removed their right to any faculty hearing, and set forth a seven-day appeal process. Within months of its exigency vote, the board approved a restructuring plan that was developed by the administration without any faculty involvement. The SUBR administration mandated a 10 percent salary cut for all faculty members in addition to effecting the nineteen involuntary tenure terminations. Decisions to terminate particular appointments were made by department chairs or, in some cases, by college deans, without a hearing or review by a faculty committee. The layoffs occurred in two waves, with the second taking place just thirty days before the end of the 2011–12 academic year, when, according to Louisiana state law, the condition of exigency was to expire.

The investigating committee concluded that the administration's actions to cut or reorganize programs and to terminate tenured faculty appointments disregarded the provision in the joint 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* that termination on grounds of financial exigency must be demonstrably bona fide and disregarded provision after provision in Regulation 4c ("Financial Exigency") of the Association's derivative *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*. (The committee noted that in the same year the budget for the athletics program was doubled.)

Of particular concern to the committee was the administration's virtual exclusion of the university's faculty from successive phases of the decision-making process where the faculty's involvement should be crucially important: exploring alternatives to deal with the institution's financial problems, declaring a state of financial exigency, determining where within the university's academic programs cuts were to be made, determining the criteria for identifying individuals for appointment termination, and designating the person or group to identify the specific individuals serving as a hearing body in contested faculty cases. Especially troubling was the abruptness of the terminations in the second wave of layoffs. The already inadequate notice provided to those who were released was reduced to woefully scant notice for the new victims, because the terminal date for consummating layoffs was close at hand.

Committee A recommends to the Ninety-ninth Annual Meeting that Southern University, Baton Rouge, be placed on the Association's list of censured administrations.

National Louis University (Illinois). The investigation of Association concerns at National Louis University followed the actions taken by the administration in spring 2012 to discontinue numerous academic programs (nine degree programs and five nondegree certificate programs), to close four departments in the College of Arts and Sciences (English/philosophy, fine arts, mathematics, and natural sciences), and to terminate the services of at least sixty-three full-time faculty members effective as of fall 2012.

National Louis administrators did not declare financial exigency but emphasized the existence of financial problems and cited the likelihood of budget deficits as grounds for conducting a review of all academic programs, the goal of which would be to cut costs. Of those faculty members whose positions were subsequently eliminated, the investigating committee identified sixteen professors whose tenured appointments were terminated.

The investigating committee concluded that the administration acted in violation not only of the joint 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* but also of derivative Association-supported standards. Some of its actions also disregarded stated university policies and past practice, as well as the judgment of the faculty in almost every aspect of the program-elimination process.

The investigating committee was particularly struck by how quickly and extensively competent and experienced members of the faculty, many of them with decades of service to the institution, were replaced by a cadre of part-time adjuncts. The committee concluded that most of the courses taught by the faculty members with terminated appointments are still being taught, but by adjunct faculty members who serve at will and receive a small fraction of the compensation paid to the full-time faculty members they have replaced. The administration retained a few of the senior faculty members but only as poorly

paid part-time adjuncts after their full-time appointments were terminated, thus violating their tenure rights regarding procedural safeguards and continued compensation. Also invidious was the establishment of a "bumping process" whereby faculty members with more seniority, whose eligibility to "bump" had been confirmed by the administration and who could show they were qualified to teach another faculty member's courses, could replace or bump that individual in order to remain on the faculty.

The investigating committee concluded that the climate for academic freedom under the current administration of National Louis University, following the release of scores of experienced full-time faculty members and their replacement by adjunct faculty members serving at will, has made a poor climate for academic freedom chillier still.

Committee A recommends to the Ninety-ninth Annual Meeting that National Louis University be placed on the Association's list of censured administrations.

The University of Northern Iowa. The report of the investigating committee concerned unilateral actions taken in February and March 2012 by the administration of the University of Northern Iowa to discontinue nearly 20 percent of the university's academic programs and to close its laboratory school. In taking these actions, the administration threatened the termination through layoff of more than fifty faculty appointments. Although no terminations ultimately occurred, the administration led faculty members to believe that they would be released at the end of the academic year with no severance salary if they refused retirement offers that provided one year of severance salary and benefits. Several tenured faculty members accepted these offers.

The investigating committee found that the administration's decision to close the programs and terminate appointments lacked a legitimate basis and was effected in contravention of the joint 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom* and Regulations 4c and 4d of the Association's derivative *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*; that, in discontinuing the programs without having consulted the faculty, the administration failed to adhere to the university's policies, the policies of the Iowa Board of Regents, and widely accepted standards of academic governance; that the administration defined program areas for elimination solely for the purpose of laying off faculty members it no longer wished to retain; and that many of the retirements accepted as alternatives to layoff were in fact cases of constructive discharge in which the administration terminated tenured appointments without having demonstrated its grounds for so doing, thereby violating basic standards of academic freedom, tenure, and due process enunciated in the 1940 *Statement* and derivative policy documents.

In August, the president announced his retirement, effective in summer 2013. In February, the board of regents announced the appointment of his successor, who took office on June 1. Shortly after accepting the appointment, the incoming president expressed his interest in addressing the prospective AAUP censure and subsequently engaged the faculty union (UNI-United Faculty, an AAUP chapter), the faculty senate, and the AAUP's staff in discussions of the issues raised in the investigating committee's report.

In March, the AAUP chapter and the board of regents reached a settlement in the cases of the faculty members who had been constructively discharged. Under its terms, the faculty members may rescind their retirement agreements and return to their tenured appointments. As a result, the chapter expressed the hope that any potential action regarding censure be deferred until the 2014 annual meeting, adding that "during the next year, UNI-United Faculty, the board of regents, and the University of Northern Iowa administration leadership anticipate further developments that will address both United Faculty and the AAUP's remaining concerns."

In early May, UNI faculty senate officers wrote to the AAUP's staff to report improvements in academic governance at the university. They also urged that any action regarding censure be deferred until 2014. During the intervening year, they wrote, "we expect to make even more strides toward strengthening shared governance at UNI."

Several weeks later, the newly elected AAUP chapter president sent the Association's staff what he characterized as a more measured appraisal of the progress that has been made in addressing the issues identified by the investigating committee, noting, in particular, the outgoing administration's and the governing board's not having addressed adequately the definition of program area and not having been adequately responsive to faculty concerns. But he too stated his "strong support" for deferral of any censure consideration to "provide our incoming university president . . . an opportunity to demonstrate his commitment to AAUP principles."

Committee A commends the incoming president for his stated willingness to address outstanding issues and commends the UNI faculty leaders for agreeing to work with him on these matters. In the light of these recent developments, Committee A makes no recommendation to the Ninety-ninth Annual Meeting regarding the University of Northern Iowa. It will retain the matter on its agenda and report back to the annual meeting in 2014.

Removal of Censure

Committee A approved the following two statements recommending that St. Bonaventure University (New York) and Our Lady of Holy Cross College (Louisiana) be removed from the list of censured administrations. The Council concurred, and the annual meeting voted to remove both censures.

St. Bonaventure University (New York). The 1996 annual meeting placed St. Bonaventure University on the Association's list of censured administrations following the publication of an investigating committee's report on the administration's action to terminate the appointments of eighteen tenured faculty members on grounds of financial exigency. The investigating committee found that while the university had been experiencing very serious financial difficulties, the administration had acted in disregard of Association-supported standards by declining to demonstrate that the financial condition was so severe as to make the actions necessary, to afford on-the-record adjudicative hearings to the affected faculty members, and to allow the presence of counsel in the appeals procedure that was used. The committee found, further, that the administration had failed to give the faculty an adequate role in any of the decision making related to the declaration of financial exigency and the resulting appointment terminations.

Settlements in all outstanding cases were reached by 1999, but problems with the university's regulations governing terminations of faculty appointments on grounds of financial exigency remained unresolved. This past March, however, the faculty and the administration approved and the governing board adopted new faculty handbook provisions on financial exigency that comport in all essential respects with AAUP-recommended standards. The administration also agreed to initiate action at the beginning of the coming academic year to amend the faculty handbook to include a statement affirming the principles of shared academic governance and an explicit requirement to provide written reasons, on request, to probationary faculty members denied reappointment to an additional term.

An Association representative, accompanied by the executive director of the New York State AAUP conference, visited the campus in May and met with administrative officers and faculty leaders, including members of the AAUP chapter. In her report on the visit, the representative conveyed her belief that because "the issues that resulted in AAUP censure in 1996 no longer exist," the censure should be removed. Representatives of the faculty senate, the AAUP chapter, and the New York conference have separately indicated unqualified support for removing censure.

Committee A recommends to the Ninety-ninth Annual Meeting that St. Bonaventure University be removed from the Association's list of censured administrations.

Our Lady of Holy Cross College (Louisiana). The 2007 annual meeting imposed censure following a report on the college president's dismissal of a professor who, as the elected head of the faculty senate, engaged in an increasingly sharp dispute with the president over a revised salary schedule. Informing the professor in the middle of the spring semester that he was dismissing him, the president told him that he would be paid through the end of his annual contract but that he was to vacate the campus immediately. The professor had no opportunity for a hearing, nor did the president provide any reason for his action. The Association's investigating committee, meeting with the president, pressed him to explain. He said only that he acted "for the good of the college."

The investigating committee reached the obvious conclusion that the president had acted in total disregard of the joint 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* and the complementary joint 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings*. It described the atmosphere for academic freedom as "fragile to begin with," because all faculty appointments were for a single academic year, renewable at the president's discretion, with nonrenewal not subject to appeal. The committee concluded that the atmosphere had become "yet more precarious" as a result of the professor's dismissal and banishment.

In August 2011, without advance warning or explanation, the religious order that owns Our Lady of Holy Cross College notified the president and the governing board members that it was dismissing all

of them, and it named a member of the administration staff as interim president. The ensuing interim period witnessed significant initial reforms. With support from a new governing board appointed by the religious order, revisions were made in the faculty handbook providing for instruments of collegial governance and opportunity for multiyear faculty contracts rather than a single year only for everyone. Faculty members were included in the search committee for the new president.

The current president took office on July 1, 2012. Responding to a welcoming letter from the national AAUP staff, he wrote on August 6 that he was indeed interested in removing the censure and had already begun working with the AAUP chapter president on requisite further faculty handbook revisions. He stated that, with his predecessor having left the college in a precarious financial condition, he believed that the possibility of mass layoffs was an immediate worry for the faculty and he therefore agreed to work, as a first order of business, on the adoption of AAUP-recommended standards for appointment terminations on financial grounds. Expecting that the governing board would balk at faculty appointments of indefinite duration, the administration and the faculty assembly gained approval of a system of multiyear appointments but with the proviso that, after seven years, nonretention beyond the term is to be with the safeguards of academic due process that accrue with continuous tenure. By November, the college had adopted not only the Association's definition of financial exigency but also the procedural standards set forth in Regulation 4 of the AAUP's *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure*.

The president, a new provost, and the AAUP chapter president next turned their attention to other official standards and procedures bearing on faculty appointments, such as those addressing dismissal for cause, suspension and other severe sanctions, denial of reappointment, opportunity for grievance and review by faculty peers, and the faculty role overall in decisions affecting faculty status. The AAUP recommended that, rather than write or rewrite faculty handbook provisions for each and every category, they simply adopt the *Recommended Institutional Regulations* "wherever applicable."

The result was the final adoption on May 2 of a spring 2013 faculty handbook, approved by the faculty assembly, the president, and the governing board and stated as carrying contractual force, committing the college not merely to the *Recommended Institutional Regulations* but also, "wherever applicable," to the policy documents published in the AAUP's Redbook. Moreover, "when items and issues are concurrently addressed in either of these two AAUP publications and in this Faculty Handbook, the AAUP publications' criteria shall apply."

Remaining to be resolved was the issue of redress for the dismissed professor. The president has acknowledged the injustice of the previous administration's action and has expressed sympathy with the professor's wish for reinstatement to a full-time position but has stated that no such position in the professor's area of competence is available and that the lack of finances and student demand preclude the creation of a new full-time position for some time to come. A settlement, accepted by the professor late in May, included his return to the faculty this summer to teach courses part-time with assurance that he will be considered for a suitable full-time position if and when one should become available.

An Association representative visited Our Lady of Holy Cross College in May and met with administrative officers and faculty leaders. She reported that the president "repeatedly expressed his respect for the principles of academic freedom and shared governance and showed a willingness to work with the faculty members to reach mutually acceptable resolutions." The executive committee of the Association's Louisiana conference has conveyed its support for the lifting of censure.

Committee A recommends to the Ninety-ninth Annual Meeting that Our Lady of Holy Cross College be removed from the Association's list of censured administrations.

Legislative Business

At its November meeting, Committee A discussed the issue of academic freedom and MOOCs (massive open online courses), agreeing to place it more prominently on the committee's agenda and to inquire whether other standing committees of the Association were interested in pursuing the topic. After considering the 1990 *Statement on Conflicts of Interest* in light of issues raised in the 2012 *Recommended Principles and Practices to Guide Academy-Industry Relationships*, to be published in book form in 2014, the committee asked the Committee on Professional Ethics to work on revisions to the 1990 statement in cooperation with AAUP members who had helped

produce the academy-industry report. The committee charged a small subcommittee with developing a response to Yale University's establishment of a campus in Singapore. In cooperation with AAUP activists at Yale, the subcommittee produced "An Open Letter to the Yale Community," signed by committee members Joan Bertin, Marjorie Heins, Cary Nelson, and Henry Reichman and released in early December. The committee will continue to monitor the situation at Yale's Singapore campus as well as similar overseas programs of American colleges and universities in countries where academic freedom may be at risk. The committee also approved for online publication, with an invitation for comment, the draft text of *The Role of the Faculty in Conditions of Financial Exigency*, prepared by a Committee A subcommittee on financial exigency, program discontinuance, and termination of tenured faculty appointments.

The fall meeting also saw the appointment of a subcommittee charged with revising *Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications*, originally issued in 2004, in order to take into account more recent developments, including those related to social media, outsourcing, and the development of new personal communications devices such as smartphones. Extensive discussion of a draft text took place at the spring meeting (May 31–June 1), after which the committee agreed to send additional comments to the subcommittee chair so that a revised text would be produced before the end of the summer and sent to the parent committee for approval for publication with an invitation for comment. Alternatively, the subcommittee will bring a revised draft to the November 2013 meeting of Committee A for approval.

At its spring meeting, Committee A approved its financial exigency subcommittee's report and appendices, after amending the report's definition of financial exigency and making several additional changes in response to comments received. The committee is especially grateful to Professor Michael Bérubé, who chaired the subcommittee, for his hard work over many months in developing this important policy statement. The report includes as an appendix a helpful guide to faculty seeking criteria to assess the financial health of their institutions, prepared by AAUP president Rudy Fichtenbaum and AAUP-CBC chair Howard Bunsis. The committee also approved revisions, as recommended in the report, to Regulation 4 of the *Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure* as well as a new edition of the entire *Recommended Institutional Regulations* incorporating the change to Regulation 4 and other changes made since the 2009 edition. On June 14, the Council adopted as Association policy both the financial exigency report and the *Recommended Institutional Regulations* as revised.

At the same meeting, the committee discussed two draft texts—a report on intellectual property, much of which is based on the academy-industry report, with special emphasis on faculty rights with respect to patents and online course materials, and a shorter policy statement designed for potential inclusion in *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*—prepared by a subcommittee on academic freedom and intellectual property chaired by Professor Cary Nelson. Committee A authorized the subcommittee to prepare a revised draft of the statement to bring to the parent committee in November. It also authorized the subcommittee to distribute a revised draft of the report to Committee A by e-mail for approval in time for it to be employed in a fall 2013 AAUP campaign opposing current threats to faculty members' intellectual property. Also on the agenda was the topic of redress as a consideration in censure removal. The chair appointed a small subcommittee to revisit the topic and report back to Committee A.

Operational Items

The committee discussed staffing issues in response to the imminent retirement of a long-time staff member in the Department of Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Governance. A discussion of the role and activities of conference and chapter Committees A, including but not limited to devolving some staff responsibilities to these bodies, was postponed until the fall meeting.

Conclusion

I am grateful to the members of the committee and its subcommittees, who serve as volunteers, and to the staff of the Association, especially those in the Department of Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Governance, for their continued dedication and hard work. I have already mentioned the extraordinary contributions of Michael Bérubé to our report on financial exigency and of Cary Nelson, who has spearheaded our efforts in support of faculty intellectual property rights. Michael's and Cary's unflappable dedication to the Association and its principles and their willingness to patiently produce a seemingly endless series of policy drafts in response to suggestions and criticisms from committee members, staff, and others is nothing short of inspirational. I also want to thank Joan Scott, who

chaired Committee A from 1999 to 2006 and who rejoined the committee earlier this year, and AAUP senior associate general secretary Martin Snyder for their advice to and support for a novice committee member taking on the daunting task of chairing such an august body.

In conclusion, I must also extend my heartfelt gratitude to staff member B. Robert Kreiser, who retired this summer. Bob has served on the AAUP staff for thirty-one years. During that time, his staunch support for beleaguered faculty across the country, his implacable dedication to the principles of academic freedom and shared governance, his unparalleled editorial skills, and his uncanny ability to garner media attention to our cause, not to mention his biting wit and profound humanity, have left us all deeply in debt to him. I am certain that I write on behalf of the members and staff who have worked with Bob over the years, of the many colleagues he has aided, and of numerous faculty members who have never met him or even heard his name, when I thank him for his extraordinary and stellar service and wish him a healthy and happy retirement. Bob will be missed.

HENRY REICHMAN (History), *chair*
California State University, East Bay

Cases Settled through Staff Mediation

The four representative accounts that follow illustrate the nature and effectiveness of the mediative work of Committee A's staff in successfully resolving cases during the 2012–13 academic year.

An assistant professor at a regional public university in the Southwest was denied reappointment beyond her first year. She filed a grievance, alleging serious procedural flaws and seeking as remedy a year of additional salary. The grievance committee found in her favor on all counts and called for a remedy that included nine months of further salary payment. The chief administrative officer countered with an offer of six months. The assistant professor asked for the Association's help in resolving the dispute, and a member of the staff wrote to the administrative officer about her case and then discussed it with him. Emphasizing that the positive aspects of the candidate's performance had not been adequately considered and that she received virtually no advance notice of nonretention, the staff member urged that the university increase the offer at least to the amount proposed by the grievance committee, with fringe benefits included. The administrative officer replied that he followed the Association's recommendation, and the assistant professor gratefully accepted.

* * *

A part-time lecturer at a public university in New England was notified in the spring of her twelfth year of service that she would not be retained. She complained that the notice she had received was inadequate and said she would accept severance salary as an alternative, but the administration was initially unwilling to do anything more than comply with a request to remove negative material from her personnel file. She sought assistance from the Association, and the staff advised the administration that the AAUP-recommended standard for part-time faculty members with her length of service calls for notice one term in advance, with a term of severance salary as an alternative. Negotiations ensued, resulting in payment to the lecturer of severance salary approximating her prospective earnings for an additional term.

* * *

A specialist in theater at a church-related college in the Northeast had worked under various faculty and administrative categories of appointment and had never been evaluated for tenure, even though he had been consistently assigned classroom teaching as a significant part of his workload. On September 1, 2012, after he had served at the college for more than twenty-three years, the administration notified him of the termination of his services effective May 31, 2013. The teacher at age fifty-eight had previously declined an invitation to retire with $30,000 in a lump sum as

severance pay. In February, the faculty's professional rights and welfare committee recommended that the administration reconsider its position, pointing out that neither the quality of the teacher's performance nor his devotion to his students and to the college had ever been questioned and noting that it was unseemly to release him because of an apparent belief that it could be done without having to demonstrate cause, that there was no great need for continuing to retain him, and that the money to sustain him could be better spent elsewhere. The administration's response was to offer him one adjunct course to teach in the fall as a final gesture of its appreciation. The teacher thereupon requested assistance from the Association.

In April communications with the college president, the AAUP staff made the point that the teacher's not having objected to being moved from a faculty to an administrative appointment (with little alteration in what he actually did) was assent under coercion, because the two choices before him were acceptance or unemployment. The staff also noted that in the teacher's earliest years at the college he had served as an assistant professor beyond the seven-year maximum period of probationary service permitted under the joint 1940 *Statement of Principles* and the college's own regulations and thus should be recognized as having at that time attained the protections of tenure through the length of his faculty service. The focus of the staff's stated concerns, however, was on the depth and extent of the teacher's devotion to the college, emphasizing that his two dozen years of teaching were only part of a family's devotion spanning three generations.

The professor knew about the college from his early childhood because his father was a professor there, serving as chair of the education department. He is himself an alumnus of the college. His wife started teaching at the college before he did. They have five children, four of whom were educated at the college, with the fifth having worked there on a few occasions. One of his sons taught a course at the college in spring 2012 and taught it again (with his father on terminal notice) in spring 2013.

The staff, conveying the professor's need to continue working until he can begin collecting social security, urged the president to retain him on the faculty until a mutually acceptable date for his retirement is reached. The president responded by initiating negotiations with the faculty member. By June, a settlement was reached that the professor described as "certainly not optimal" but one that he could "live with." "Without the help of AAUP," he wrote, "I'm fairly certain I would not have had any meaningful recourse. I am profoundly grateful."

* * *

At the major public university in a midwestern state, a professor emeritus received notification that his monthly paychecks had been mistakenly calculated at too large an amount and that the overpayment would have to be corrected through reduction of the amount paid him in future checks. The overpayment to be deducted amounted to more than $20,000 plus interest. The professor, protesting about having to suffer from an error that he had not committed, complained to several officials with administrative responsibility, each of whom responded with sympathy but with claimed inability to alter what he had been informed would occur.

The professor, who was a former president of the local AAUP chapter, then turned to the national Association for advice and assistance. A staff member volunteered to speak with a former president of the university who had cooperated with the Association on many occasions and was known to be highly effective in getting things done. The former university president agreed to meet with the professor and see what might be accomplished. Shortly after their meeting, the university's vice president for human resources notified the professor emeritus that the university would cover the overpayment with other funds. The grateful professor emeritus told the staff that he could not have enlisted the former president's support on his own and that the staff's intervention had spared him from the equally distasteful alternatives of "dropping the matter" or "having to go to court." ■