

70-9633

**SHOUP, Charles A., 1939-
A STUDY OF FACULTY COLLECTIVE
BARGAINING IN MICHIGAN COMMUNITY
COLLEGES.**

**Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1969
Education, administration**

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

A STUDY OF FACULTY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
IN MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Charles A. Shoup

:

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration
and Higher Education

1969

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF FACULTY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Charles A. Shoup

Faculty collective bargaining is a new phenomenon in higher education and is presently limited to a very few states. In Michigan, enactment of a law in 1965 providing for collective bargaining by public employees was closely followed by bargaining activity in a number of community colleges. By the 1968-1969 academic year the number of colleges operating under negotiated agreements had reached sixteen.

The purpose of this study was to obtain the opinions of faculty, administrators and trustees in regard to three major questions:

- (1) Why have the faculties in the institutions included in the study chosen to bargain collectively with their employers?
- (2) What are the most significant outcomes of collective bargaining in these institutions?
- (3) What outcomes are likely to result from collective bargaining in these colleges in the next three to five years?

Charles A. Shoup

Thirteen Michigan community colleges, all of which had operated under a negotiated contract for at least one academic year prior to the fall of 1968, were selected for inclusion in the study. For each of these institutions, the investigator interviewed three persons: the chairman of the faculty negotiating committee, the chief administrative officer of the college or his representative, and the chairman of the board of control or another trustee knowledgeable about negotiations. The interview which was tape recorded was largely unstructured but followed a standard format outlined in an interview schedule. The findings were presented in the form of a verbal description of the problem with quantitative data presented where appropriate.

The chief factors that contributed to the development of collective bargaining according to those interviewed were: the desire by faculty to increase their salaries and improve their fringe benefits and to gain greater participation in institutional decision-making. Faculty also reported dissatisfaction with too much unilateral decision-making by administrators as a major contributing factor. The presence of the enabling Michigan labor legislation was seen as an extremely important facilitating factor in the development of collective bargaining.

There were found to be a number of variations in the outcomes of collective bargaining between institutions.

However, there were several common effects as well. The most widely agreed upon effects were the greater increases in salaries and fringe benefits and the increased participation of faculty in deciding questions of salary and other conditions of their employment. Opinion was divided, however, about the effect of collective bargaining on the involvement of faculty in the larger institutional decisions.

The existence of a contract specifically spelling out various policies was seen as reducing the flexibility in the operation of the college but faculty also saw the contract as assuring equitable treatment for all faculty. The claim that collective bargaining had caused a greater division between faculty and administration was the most frequently mentioned undesirable outcome. However, whether an openly antagonistic relationship resulted appeared to depend largely on the personalities involved in the respective colleges.

The majority opinion was that collective bargaining had not significantly affected instructors' performance in the classroom.

There was general agreement among the interviewees that the primary issues of the past--faculty participation in decision-making and salaries and fringe benefits--would continue to be the central issues of the future. The prediction was also made that the tensions and friction

Charles A. Shoup

between faculty and administrators associated with collective bargaining would tend to subside.

In several colleges the viewpoint was expressed, especially by trustees and administrators, that the college would not be able to continue granting salary increases of the magnitude of those granted in the last two or three years.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to extend his appreciation to those who provided the guidance and direction for this study. Dr. Eldon R. Nonnamaker assisted through all phases of the study and Dr. Walter Johnson and Dr. Richard Featherstone contributed their suggestions and support in the developmental stages of the research.

Also, I am especially indebted to the thirty-nine trustees, administrators and faculty members who so graciously shared their thoughts concerning collective bargaining with me.

Special thanks go to my wife, Karen, who has provided her assistance, support, and understanding throughout my graduate work and particularly during the preparation of this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	11
LIST OF TABLES	v
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM	1
What is Collective Bargaining?	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Need for the Study	4
Definition of Terms.	6
Overview of the Study	8
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
Background of the Problem.	10
The Development of Collective Bargain- ing in Private Employment	10
Collective Bargaining in Public Employment	14
Collective Bargaining in Public Education	16
The Role of Teacher Organizations	18
The Michigan Public Employment Labor Legislation.	21
The Community College in Michigan	24
Conditions in Michigan Community Colleges in 1965	26
Collective Bargaining in Michigan Community Colleges	28
Review of Related Research	29
Summary.	35
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.	38
Sources of Data	38
Method of Collecting the Data	40
Presentation of the Data	43

Chapter	Page
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS	46
The Development of Collective Bargaining	46
Reasons for the Development of Collective Bargaining.	47
The Faculty Leaders of the Movement.	59
Faculty Support for Collective Bargaining	61
The Outcome of Collective Bargaining	62
Salary, Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions	62
Financial Impact on the Community College	67
Faculty Involvement in Decision-Making.	69
Relationship Between Faculty and Administrators	73
Effect on Teachers and Teaching	78
The President's Role.	83
The Board of Trustees' Role	85
Community Reaction	87
Most Desirable and Undesirable Outcomes	88
Net Evaluation of Collective Bargaining	89
Future of Collective Bargaining	91
Probability of Faculty Strikes	95
Probability of State-Wide Master Contract	97
Dependency on State Funds	99
Summary	100
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	104
Conclusions.	106
The Development of Collective Bargaining	106
The Outcomes of Collective Bargaining	107
The Future of Collective Bargaining.	110
Implications for Further Research	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	114
APPENDICES	120
A. PERSONS INTERVIEWED FOR THE STUDY	122
B. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	125
C. INTERVIEW CONFIRMATION LETTER.	131

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Michigan community colleges operating under negotiated agreements, 1968-69.	30
2. Relative importance of factors that contributed to the development of collective bargaining in thirteen Michigan community colleges as indicated by trustees, administrators and faculty	57
3. Net evaluation of the desirability of collective bargaining.	90
4. Chance of faculty strike occurring within the next three to five years	95
5. Are chances of a strike lessening, increasing or is there no change?	96
6. Chance of state-wide master contract for community college instructors in the next three to five years	98
7. Will it be necessary to depend on the state for an increased portion of operating funds? .	99

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The advent of collective bargaining in the public schools, strikes by teachers in New York, Detroit, Chicago, and in other locales, and the rapid unionization of teachers have recently gained nation-wide coverage by the mass media. With far less publicity, collective bargaining by faculty in higher education has experienced significant, if less dramatic, growth. A quick review of some recent developments will illustrate this fact.

To date, much of the collective bargaining activity in higher education has been centered in just three states--Michigan, Illinois and New York. Michigan has been the most active state with sixteen community colleges operating on negotiated contracts in the 1968-69 academic year. Illinois has been the scene of collective bargaining since 1966 when the multi-campus Chicago City (Junior) College faculty emphasized their demands with a three-day strike. Subsequently, they were successful in negotiating a contract which the teachers' union called "probably the most

comprehensive union contract for college teachers in the nation."¹

Unlike Michigan and Illinois where collective bargaining has been limited to two-year colleges, New York has been the scene of unionization and negotiating activity in four-year as well as two-year colleges. The City University of New York became the first university in the United States to elect a bargaining agent for purposes of collective bargaining in the fall of 1968. Other states including Rhode Island, New Jersey, Washington and California have witnessed the beginnings of collective bargaining in higher education.

The introduction of collective bargaining in higher education has been attended by a number of problems. In some cases, boards and administrators have resisted its coming. Strikes have occurred and state labor officials have been called in to help settle impasses in the bargaining process. The topic has drawn increasing attention in the professional journals and among college administrators and faculty. If its present development continues, and there is every indication that it will, collective bargaining is destined to affect higher education in major proportions.

¹Harry A. Marmion, "Unions and Higher Education," Educational Record, XLIX (Winter, 1968), p. 42.

What is Collective Bargaining?

For the purposes of this study, it is not necessary to discuss or describe the process of collective bargaining in detail. The significant point to be understood is that bonafide collective bargaining as provided for under Michigan law² is closely patterned after the industrial model of collective bargaining. The process and the resulting faculty-administrative relationship is distinct from the traditional consultations between faculty and administrators.

Perry and Wildman of the University of Chicago Industrial Relations Center explain it this way:

The substitution of collective bargaining for consultation or testimony as the basis for teacher participation in decision-making involves more than a change in form. Full-scale collective bargaining is much more than an elaborate structure for open communication or a formal procedure for the mutually satisfactory resolution of problems. As traditionally perceived and practiced, it is an adversary process for the articulation and accommodation of group conflict on the basis of power.³

The essence of bargaining is compromise in search of accommodation on matters over which there is disagreement between the parties to the bargaining relationship.⁴

²See Chapter II, p. 21 for a discussion of the Michigan Public Employment Relations Act.

³Charles R. Perry and Wesley A. Wildman, The Impact of Teacher Bargaining on the Schools, Vol. IV of Collective Action by Public School Teachers, Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968), p. 1.

⁴Ibid., p. 7.

Purpose of the Study

This study is concerned with faculty collective bargaining in Michigan community colleges. The purpose of the study is to investigate the reasons for the development of collective bargaining in these colleges, the impact it has had on these institutions, and its probable future trends in the state.

More specifically, the study is designed to answer the following questions:

1. Based on the opinions of trustees, administrators and faculty:
 - a. Why have the faculties in the institutions included in the study chosen to bargain collectively with their employers?
 - b. What are the most significant outcomes of collective bargaining in these institutions? Which of these outcomes are most desirable and most undesirable?
 - c. What outcomes are likely to result from collective bargaining in these colleges in the next three to five years?
2. What are the similarities and differences between the opinions of trustees, administrators and faculty in regard to the above questions?

Need for the Study

The magnitude of the collective bargaining movement in higher education has already been described. Although presently limited to colleges in relatively few states,

collective bargaining will, in all probability, soon appear in a number of other states as well.

Until now, insufficient experience has been accumulated on which to base a study of this nature. This is evidenced by the fact that no studies relating to this subject have yet been completed.

At the present time approximately one-half of all institutions operating under negotiated contracts are located in Michigan. In addition, many of these institutions are in their second or third year under such agreements. Thus, there is afforded in Michigan an excellent opportunity to study collective bargaining in higher education.

As interest in collective bargaining grows, and as faculties at an increasing number of colleges become more serious in their deliberations with respect to collective bargaining, there is a real need for all parties in the higher education community to know more about this new phenomenon.

For example, why have faculty resorted to collective bargaining? Is it symptomatic of problems existing between faculty and administration? What kinds of problems does it help solve and what kinds of problems does it create? These are but a few of the questions that require answers.

The current literature in the field includes a number of very informative presentations expressing various viewpoints about the factors behind the growth in collective bargaining and its relative merits and demerits. Most such articles are written by those intimately involved with the process itself, either as a faculty or administrative negotiator, or as a labor relations specialist.

But as Ray Howe, chief negotiator for the administration at Henry Ford Community College in Dearborn, Michigan, told a conference of community college educators:

Those of us in the field are too involved in the hurly burly of the turbulence to step back and examine the issue dispassionately. But someone has to do that. And while we deal with the process directly, someone has to project and plan based upon the consequences of both what we are doing and what we are trying to do.⁵

It is hoped that this study, which represents the first effort to systematically study the development and impact of collective bargaining in a number of institutions, will materially add to the understanding of the subject under consideration.

Definition of Terms

Collective bargaining; collective negotiations. A process whereby representatives of employees and

⁵Ray A. Howe, "Collective Bargaining and Its Portents for Higher Education" (address delivered at a meeting of the Midwest Community College Leadership Council, East Lansing, Michigan, June, 1968).

representatives of employers meet together and make offers and counter-offers in good faith on the conditions of their employment relationship for the purpose of reaching a mutually acceptable agreement, and the execution of a written contract binding on both parties for an agreed upon period of time.⁶ The terms collective bargaining and collective negotiations are used interchangeably in this study.

Master contract. The written contract resulting from collective bargaining. A master contract includes the conditions of employment for all who are included in the bargaining unit.

Bargaining unit. A collective group of employees, usually defined by commonality of interests, who have organized for the purpose of collective bargaining. As applied to this study, the bargaining unit normally consists of teaching faculty and certain other persons such as counselors.

Administrator. As used in the analysis of findings, this term will refer to the chief administrative officer of a college or the person representing him for the purposes of the interview.

⁶ Adapted from Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration (Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1966), p. 418.

Faculty negotiator. The chairman of the faculty negotiating committee who is the chief spokesman for the faculty at the bargaining table.

Overview of the Study

Chapter II consists of a review of the literature related to the subject. Since no studies concerning collective bargaining in higher education have yet been completed, this chapter is largely concerned with the background of the problem, including the development of collective bargaining in public employment and a discussion of the Michigan labor law relating to public employees. Where appropriate, the findings of research conducted in the area of public school collective bargaining are presented.

In Chapter III, the method used in conducting the study is presented. The source of data, the procedure used in collecting the data and the method of presenting the data are discussed.

The findings of the investigation are presented in Chapter IV. This chapter consists of three principal parts, each one dealing with one of the questions posed in the study. The first part is concerned with the question of why the faculties in these colleges chose to negotiate their contracts collectively. The second part is devoted to a discussion of the outcomes of collective

bargaining; the future of collective bargaining in Michigan community colleges is the subject of the last part.

A summary of the study and the conclusions reached as a result of the research are reported in Chapter V. The chapter is concluded with some suggestions for further research.

In this chapter the problem has been introduced and an overview of the study has been presented. The background of this problem is discussed in further detail in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

It is the purpose of this chapter to describe the setting within which collective bargaining has developed in Michigan community colleges. Also, findings of research related to the problem are presented.

Background of the Problem

The relatively recent development of collective bargaining in higher education has its roots in the long struggle for employee bargaining rights, first in private employment and then in certain sectors of public employment. An acquaintance with the history of the labor movement in the United States is helpful in understanding the subsequent development of collective bargaining in higher education.

In addition to the historical development of collective bargaining, the Michigan labor legislation providing for faculty negotiations and the nature of the community college are discussed in this section.

The Development of Collective Bargaining in Private Employment

Efforts of workers in private industry to organize for collective bargaining purposes date from the early

nineteenth century. In 1806 a court decided in the Philadelphia Cordwainers case that workers who sought to organize for bargaining purposes were guilty of a conspiracy to raise their wages.¹ This landmark decision formed the basis for what was known as the "doctrine of criminal conspiracy." This doctrine guided subsequent court decisions until 1842 when a decision by the Massachusetts Supreme Court voided this viewpoint. Even so, efforts to achieve collective bargaining rights in the ensuing years were largely unsuccessful. Unsympathetic courts and employers who were openly hostile to organized labor were among the factors that combined to prevent any significant progress by the labor movement.

The formation, in 1886, of the American Federation of Labor marked the beginning of accelerated attempts to organize labor. However, four years later the labor movement was dealt a serious setback with the passage of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. Originally enacted to outlaw monopolies in business, the federal courts applied to labor organizations the provisions of this act which prohibited conspiracies in restraint of trade. Thus, such organizations were stymied in attaining their objectives until the enactment of the Clayton Act in 1914. This act exempted employee labor organizations from the anti-trust laws. However, even though employees now had the right to

¹Leiberman and Moskow, op. cit., p. 63.

organize, they still had no legally based right to bargain with their employers.

Labor organizations' efforts to gain recognition and to obtain the right to bargain with their employers grew more intense in the 1920's. As a result of negative decisions in the courts and vigorous opposition by employers, relations between labor and management grew worse. The situation deteriorated into violence and, in some cases, virtual warfare between company and worker during the years of the "Great Depression." "Company arsenals were found to include pistols, rifles, tear gas bombs, and even machine guns. Expenditures for weapons and strike-breaking services in the years 1933-37 amounted to nearly \$9.5 million."²

Faced by this critical situation and pressured by the conditions of the depression to take remedial action, Congress, in 1935, passed the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), commonly known as the Wagner Act. Without doubt, this legislation is the most important in the history of the labor movement in the United States. It still serves as the legal foundation for labor-management relations in the private sector of employment and, further, it has been used, though often in a modified form, as the basis for state labor legislation applying to public employees.

²Ibid., p. 68.

In effect, this act:

1. Guaranteed employees the right to organize and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.
2. Required employers to recognize the representative selected by employees as the exclusive representative of all the employees in the bargaining unit.
3. Required employers to bargain in good faith with the employees' representative with respect to wages, hours, and other conditions of employment.

In addition, the act provided for the establishment of the National Labor Relations Board which serves as the administrative agency responsible for carrying out the provisions of the act. For the first time, employees had the legal right to engage in collective bargaining with their employers under a law that provided for penalties to employers who violated it.

It is important to note, however, that the NLRA applies only to employee-employer relations that affect interstate commerce since it is based on the Constitutional provision that gives Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. Also, employees of the federal government, of any state or political subdivision thereof, or of non-profit hospitals are specifically excluded from federal labor legislation. Consequently, neither private nor public college employees are covered by the NLRA.

The growth of unions and of collective bargaining under the NLRA was rapid. Union membership reached a peak

of 17.3 million in 1957, a figure which represented 32.8 per cent of the nonagricultural labor force and 24.5 per cent of the total labor force.³ Although membership has declined slightly since that time, the position of union labor in private employment remains strong.

Collective Bargaining in Public Employment

The advent of collective bargaining in public employment, including the field of education, is, of course, much more recent.

The growth of employee organizations in public employment roughly paralleled the growth of unions in the private sector. However, even though the right of employees to belong to unions was generally recognized, employers were under no legal obligation to bargain with these organizations. Thus, public employees were unsuccessful in efforts to secure the right to bargain collectively with their employers for a number of years after this right had been guaranteed to millions of workers in private employment.

After World War II a number of strikes by public employees led to a "get tough" policy by state and federal governments. A total of eighteen states passed anti-strike

³Ibid., p. 87.

legislation which included severe penalties for strikers.⁴ The Taft-Hartley Act, passed in 1947, forbade strikes by federal employees. However, public employees achieved a significant breakthrough during the 1950's when several large cities authorized collective bargaining for their employees.

President Kennedy appointed a task force in 1961 to study and make recommendations with regard to employee-management relations in the federal service. As a result of the ensuing report, President Kennedy issued Executive Order 10988 in 1962 which extended to federal employees some of the same rights to organize and to bargain collectively as are embodied in the NLRA. It is generally agreed that this order was a great stimulus to the collective bargaining movement in public employment.

Since that time, a number of states have enacted labor legislation applying to public employees. Such legislation varies widely in its application to various classifications of workers and in regard to the rights it grants to employees. In a limited number of states court decisions have provided the guidelines for organizational and bargaining activity by public employees. Although the present trend is toward more state labor legislation,

⁴Harold S. Roberts, Labor-Management Relations in the Public Service: Part VI (Hawaii: Industrial Relations Center, University of Hawaii, 1968), p. 746.

states having comprehensive labor legislation for public employees are still clearly in the minority.

Collective Bargaining
in Public Education

In the 1951 case of Norwalk Teachers' Association v. Board of Education of City of Norwalk, a state court held that, in the absence of a state law granting teachers the right to organize and collectively bargain: (1) public school teachers may organize, (2) a school board may, but is not legally obligated to, negotiate with such teachers' organization, and (3) public school teachers may not strike to enforce their demands.⁵ These guidelines are generally considered to apply to both the public schools and higher education where applicable state legislation does not exist.

Thus, teachers may gain the right to collectively negotiate in one of two ways: a state law may extend this right to them or, in the absence of such a law, they must convince their employers of the efficacy of granting this right to them. The employers (the boards of control) have not always been easy to convince. In most cases teachers have had to use the power generated by collective action in the form of a strike or a threatened strike to achieve

⁵George M. Johnson, Education Law (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1969), p. 219.

this goal. Those in power have not been noted for voluntarily relinquishing their power to others!

While workers in certain sectors of public employment first achieved the right to collectively bargain in the 1950's, this right was not extended to professional employees in public education until the 1960's. As Charles Schmidt of the School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Michigan State University, has written:

Although there are probably thousands of examples of some type of consultations between teachers and boards of education over the past fifty years or more, the acknowledged breakthrough that served as a forerunner for contemporary bargaining activities in Michigan and elsewhere was the December, 1961, recognition of the United Federation of Teachers as the exclusive bargaining agent for public school teachers in New York City. Their negotiated settlement has been followed by similar settlements in Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland and hundreds of other districts throughout the nation.⁶

State negotiating laws have since been enacted in a number of states and negotiating activity has experienced a rapid growth. At the present time, collective bargaining is much more prevalent in the public K-12 schools than in higher education. Most colleges that have operated under negotiated contracts are located in three states--Michigan, Illinois and New York. However, collective negotiations between college faculties and college

⁶Charles T. Schmidt, Jr., Hyman Parker, and Bob Repas, A Guide to Collective Negotiations in Education (East Lansing: Social Science Research Bureau, Michigan State University, 1967), pp. 3-4.

administrations, aided in some cases by state legislation, is now taking place in colleges located in several other states.

The Role of Teacher Organizations

At the national level, three organizations representing teacher interests are most often mentioned: The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the National Education Association (NEA), and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

Of these three organizations the AAUP has been by far the least active in promoting collective bargaining in higher education. Their present official position is that collective bargaining leads to a sharpening of lines between faculty and administration and results in less professionalism and more employeeism. The belief of the AAUP is that the most promising alternative to the undesirable consequences of collective bargaining lies in the development of responsible, thoughtful, and ethical college and university governance.⁷ Thus, this organization has never taken an official position in support of the concept of collective bargaining.

The AFT, as an affiliate of the AFL-CIO, has long championed the right of teachers at all levels of

⁷Peggy Heim, "Growing Tensions in Academic Administration," North Central Association Quarterly, XLII (Winter, 1968), 247.

education to organize and bargain with their employers. Originally formed in 1916, the AFT experienced a slow growth in its membership until the depression years of the 1930's when it grew to include 32,000 members. At the present time membership is said to be about 140,000.⁸

Although its traditional strength and activity has been in the public schools, the AFT has recently focused more attention on efforts to organize at the college level. In 1966, a separate college division was formed and for the first time college faculty were able to join a "local" of the union composed only of college teachers. It is reported that a total of 104 AFT college locals have been chartered and approximately 14,000 professors have affiliated.⁹

The National Education Association, although historically concerned with teacher welfare, began to move toward a position of supporting collective bargaining in the early 1960's. Priding itself on being a professional organization rather than a labor union, the NEA originated the term "professional negotiations." At its 1962 convention in Denver, Colorado the concept of professional negotiations was introduced and guidelines prepared. This development marked the beginning of a continuing campaign

⁸Marmion, op. cit., p. 42.

⁹Philip A. Grant, Jr., "Unionism in Higher Education," Labor Today, VII (Fall, 1968), p. 24.

by the NEA and its state level organizations to support the concept of shared decision-making in public education through a formal process of negotiations between teachers and their boards. Although original efforts were directed toward the public schools, these efforts eventually affected higher education as well. Like the AFT, the NEA has recently recognized the need for directing specific efforts toward organizing college faculties. Consequently, it has formed a division called the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

The efforts of the Michigan Federation of Teachers and of the Michigan Education Association contributed to the development of collective bargaining in Michigan public education. Even before passage of "enabling" legislation, a number of local affiliates of the MEA and of the MFT had negotiated agreements with boards of education. The MEA claimed that thirty-six such agreements had been drawn up by the time the Michigan Public Employment Relations Act was passed.¹⁰ Locals of the MFT had been engaged in a form of collective bargaining in both schools and two-year colleges, especially in the Detroit area, for a number of years.

Not only did these organizations assist and encourage their local affiliates to organize and secure the

¹⁰Thomas Patterson, "PN Spreads Across the Country," Michigan Education Journal, XLIII (September, 1965), p. 2.

right to collectively bargain, but they sponsored, and actively lobbied for the passage of, state labor legislation covering employees of public educational institutions. Although the two organizations disagreed on the form the legislation should take, their efforts contributed to its passage.

The Michigan Public
Employment Labor
Legislation

In July, 1965 two laws were enacted in Michigan relating to collective bargaining for public employees. Act No. 379 amended the Hutchinson Act which had been mainly concerned with prohibiting strikes by public employees. This new law, known as the Public Employment Relations Act (PERA), extended to public employees the right to organize and collectively bargain with their employers.

The second act, known as the Michigan Labor Mediation Act of 1965, provided for the Michigan Labor Mediation Board to act as the legal agency to carry out the provisions of the PERA.

When Governor George Romney signed into law Act No. 379, he issued the following statement describing the nature of the Act and the rationale for it:

The bill is the most basic revision of the (Hutchinson) act since its adoption in 1947. The major provisions of the bill give public employees primarily at the local level, the rights of organization and of collective bargaining.

It also eliminates automatic penalties for striking employees but permits public employers to discipline striking employees, to the extent of discharge, with the employees having the right of appeal to circuit court.

.

"It is apparent that public employees in our state and throughout the nation are demanding and deserve a greater voice in their own working conditions than we have historically given them."

"The provisions called for in this revision of the Hutchinson Act give them this greater voice, while at the same time (will leave) the ultimate determination in labor relations matters with public employers."

.

The Governor said his decision on this bill was succinctly summarized 10 years ago in a statement of the Committee on Labor Relations of Governmental Employees of the American Bar Association:

"A government which imposes upon private employers certain obligations in dealing with their employees may not in good faith refuse to deal with its own public servants on a reasonably similar basis modified, of course, to meet the exigencies of public service."¹¹

The Act covers public employees in any branch of public service including political subdivisions of the state, the public schools and publicly supported colleges and universities. However, state employees within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission are not covered by the provisions of the Act.

In effect, the Michigan PERA:

1. Makes it lawful for public employees to organize and to engage in collective bargaining with their public employers through representatives of their own free choice (Section 9).

¹¹Schmidt, Parker and Repas, op. cit., pp. 17-18.

2. Prohibits public employers from interfering with the rights of employees to organize and to bargain collectively and specifically spells out other unfair labor practices (Section 10).
3. Extends to employees the right of exclusive representation for purposes of collective bargaining. In other words, employees must be represented by only one organization in the bargaining relationship (Section 11).
4. Requires the public employer to bargain collectively with the representatives of its employees. It defines collective bargaining as "the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract . . . incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party, but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession" (Section 15).

At the same time, three sections of the Hutchinson Act were repealed including a clause providing for dismissal and loss of all benefits to public employees who strike.

The act closely parallels the National Labor Relations Act in its provisions and in the structure provided for administering the act. Thus, in Michigan, public employees have the right to organize and to collectively bargain with their employers in much the same fashion as those in private employment who are covered by federal labor legislation.

The Community College in Michigan

The State of Michigan was among the first states to have public two-year colleges. Such colleges were organized in Grand Rapids (1914), Detroit (1917), Highland Park (1918), and in Flint and Port Huron (1923). The early two-year colleges were formed as upward extensions of the K-12 public school system. As divisions of the public schools, they had closely articulated curricula, shared faculty and administrative staffs and were even housed in the same building with the high school.¹²

These two-year colleges, or junior colleges as they were called, were organized in response to a growing interest in higher education. They were designed to meet the needs of a limited number of students for whom a four-year college away from home was not feasible.

The enrollment in Michigan community colleges grew slowly until the 1950's. By then the community college had developed a reputation for its excellent vocational-technical programs in addition to its traditional college transfer courses. As the demand for occupational training beyond high school was stimulated by rapid advances in science and technology, and as the educational aspirations of the general populace moved upward, community

¹²Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 25.

colleges experienced a vigorous growth. From 1950 to 1960 the number of community colleges grew from nine to sixteen, and the enrollment multiplied five times to over 27,000.

The growth of the public two-year college in Michigan was even more dramatic during the 1960's. The latest figures, show 95,065 students enrolled in twenty-eight institutions for the fall of 1968. Thus, between 1960 and 1968 twelve more colleges were opened and total enrollment more than tripled.

In contrast to the early organizational structure of community colleges, most colleges formed after 1950 were independent of the public schools and served a county or regional area rather than one public school system. In addition, several of the colleges originally associated with public schools later formed independent and enlarged districts. Consequently, community colleges became accessible to the majority of Michigan residents.

The philosophy and purpose of present day Michigan community colleges have been stated by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges as follows:

The community college is becoming the one versatile educational institution with the flexibility and adaptability to meet the ever changing requirements of community needs in a dynamic world. It is coming of age under the spiraling needs that a modern, democratic society has for educated and trained manpower. It offers hope that in this nation there shall not exist an educational gap breachable only by the economically, the socially, or intellectually elite.

Public community colleges can and should provide additional educational opportunities leading not only to advanced academic study in our four-year institutions of higher education, but also to the best in continuing education programs, in vocational/technical, occupational and re-training programs, in general and in broad educational programs beneficial to the entire community and to society, in diversified community enrichment activities and functions that will elicit maximum participation by both youths and adults.¹³

Conditions in Michigan
Community Colleges
in 1965

In 1965, when the Michigan Public Employment Relations Act was passed, the State's community colleges were in a period of rapid expansion. New institutions were in the planning stages while others had just been opened. Meanwhile, the older institutions were experiencing rapid growth.

Unprecedented enrollments necessitated employing large numbers of new instructors. Most of these instructors came either directly from graduate school or from the public schools, but regardless of their origin, the majority had several things in common. They were young men who had significant family and financial obligations. They came from a time in our history characterized by sociologists as "a period of rising human expectations." They were schooled in the philosophy of participatory democracy

¹³A Position Paper by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges (Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1967), pp. 1-2.

and had been taught that they could and should make a contribution to their educational institutions outside of the classroom. In short, these instructors expected to earn salaries appropriate for professional people and they were prepared to assume an active role in shaping the educational and personnel policies of their college.

The conditions encountered by these young faculty members did not always match their expectations. Many of the colleges to which they came did not have a tradition of strong faculty participation in policy decisions. In addition, these institutions were struggling with problems associated with newness and with rapid growth. Those that were new had not yet had time to develop patterns of active faculty involvement. In the interest of expediency, administrators had made many decisions unilaterally. The longer established colleges were in the process of moving from an informal mode of operation appropriate to the small college to a more highly structured and formal operation required of a large, complex college of several thousand students. Many had not yet completed this transition.

Salaries could at best be described as modest. In those community colleges that were a part of the public school system, salary schedules were closely tied to the limited rates of pay received by K-12 teachers. Salaries in independent community colleges were not much better.

This, then, was the situation in Michigan's community colleges in 1965 when the Public Employment Relations Act (Act No. 379) was signed into law.

Collective Bargaining in
Michigan Community
Colleges

Soon after passage of Act No. 379 in the summer of 1965, faculties in a number of Michigan community colleges began to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining under the provisions of the law. By the fall of 1966, eleven colleges had succeeded in negotiating contracts covering their faculty and related professional staff. Another four colleges were added to this number in the next year and, by the fall of 1968, sixteen colleges were operating under master agreements.¹⁴

A total of eight of these bargaining units were affiliated with the Michigan Education Association and three were affiliated with the Michigan Federation of Teachers. However, five units elected to remain independent of these organizations.

In cases where the community college was a part of a public school system, it was possible for the faculty of the college to be included in the same bargaining unit

¹⁴For a summary of the provisions of these master agreements see: Summary of Community College Salary Schedules and Selected Provisions from Community College Agreements: 1968-69 (East Lansing: Michigan Education Association, 1968).

with the K-12 teachers or to be included in a separate bargaining unit composed only of college faculty. Of the sixteen colleges operating under negotiated agreements during the 1968-69 academic year, six were a part of a public school system. Of these six colleges, three were included with the K-12 teachers in a combined bargaining unit, the other three having established a separate unit.

Table 1 summarizes this information for the Michigan community colleges currently operating under master agreements.

Review of Related Research

Because of the development of collective bargaining in the field of education is so recent, insufficient time has elapsed to permit the completion of much research in this area. In fact, a review of the research revealed no studies concerning collective bargaining in higher education. However, one study was disclosed that assessed the impact of collective bargaining in the public schools. Even though the study was not concerned with negotiations in higher education, its method and purpose were sufficiently similar to the present study to warrant its review.

The study was conducted under the direction of Perry and Wildman¹⁵ of the University of Chicago Labor Relations Center and was sponsored by the United States Office of

¹⁵Perry and Wildman, op. cit.

TABLE 1.--Michigan community colleges operating under negotiated agreements, 1968-69.

Institution	Organizational Basis	Bargaining Unit Composition	Year First Negotiated Contract in Effect	Bargaining Unit Affiliation
Alpena Community College	Public School	K-14	1966-67	MEA
Flint Community Junior College	Public School	K-14	1966-67	MEA
Glen Oaks Community College	College	College	1968-69	None
Gogebic Community College	College	College	1967-68	MEA
Grand Rapids Junior College	Public School	College	1966-67	None
Henry Ford Community College	Public School	College	1966-67	MFT
Highland Park College	Public School	K-14	1966-67	MFT
Jackson Community College	College	College	1966-67	MEA
Kellogg Community College	Public School	College	1966-67	MEA
Lake Michigan College	College	College	1967-68	MFT
Macomb County Community College	College	College	1966-67	None
Muskegon County Community College	College	College	1966-67	MEA
Oakland Community College	College	College	1966-67	None
St. Clair County Community College	College	College	1967-68	MEA
Schoolcraft College	College	College	1966-67	None
Washtenaw Community College	College	College	1967-68	MEA

Education. The researchers investigated the shortrun and probable longrun impact of negotiating activity between school boards and teacher organizations in twenty-two selected school districts in eight widely scattered states. The data were collected through interviews with board members, faculty, administrators and others connected with the schools and by analyzing agreements, minutes of meetings and other documents related to negotiations.

Perhaps the most significant conclusion reached by the investigators was that collective bargaining is an evolutionary, not revolutionary process. Its impact was found to be less dramatic than might be expected.

It was reported that the greatest impact of collective bargaining was on the level and structure of teacher compensation. Not only was there a marked increase in teacher salaries in general, but yearly increments and differentials for education beyond the Bachelor's degree increased considerably. However, the possibility was seen that these were only shortrun gains and that the rate of gain might well diminish in the future. Also, as a result of collective bargaining, extra curricular school activities were found to command supplemental pay.

In another area that has been a central issue in collective bargaining--the struggle by teachers to become more meaningfully involved in the affairs of the school--

the conclusion was reached that "bargaining has gained for teachers a voice, if not control, in matters hitherto reserved exclusively to board and administrators."¹⁶

It was found that personnel codes and manuals dealing with such matters as promotions, decisions on teacher assignments, the length of the school day, holidays and grievance procedures were being rewritten and made more explicit by joint action of union and administration. The emphasis in the rewritten policies was on standardized treatment of all teachers, therefore leaving less discretion in the hands of principals. Furthermore, the possibility was seen for even greater involvement of teachers through committees functioning outside of the bargaining context. However, the authors observed that: "(to date) collective negotiations has not . . . resulted in any wholesale restructuring of the traditional control patterns affecting basic school district policy or its implementation."¹⁷

The authors found that some reduction in class hours per teacher had been achieved but they felt that a practical lower limit would ultimately be reached that would not be subject to further reduction. The overall pupil-teacher ratio had not been reduced but some internal shifting had taken place to eliminate some over-sized

¹⁶Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 69.

classes and to effect better balance and equity among teachers.

As for the future, the authors observed that the question was not whether collective negotiations will revolutionize education but whether it would tend to "freeze" the present structure and administrative practices of the educational enterprise. As is true with collective bargaining in the private sector of the economy, the authors reported that there were indications that collective negotiations in public education was essentially an affirmation of and an adaption to the status quo.

The possibility that the state might become more involved in the determination of salaries and in other important aspects of the employment relationship was suggested as was the danger of politicizing highly controversial issues.

In summary, the study conducted by Perry and Wildman presented evidence that most of the changes brought about by collective action of teachers in the public schools have been moderate, not radical. The upsurge in teacher salaries has been the most obvious result although some gains have been made in teacher involvement in forming personnel policies and in securing a greater voice in policy formulation. The view was presented that, although salary increases will begin to level off, the power

generated by collective action by teachers has the potential for much greater involvement of teachers in the determination of policies that affect them personally and that affect the operation of the schools.

A statement made by Dr. Wildman in a recent address summarizes the current state of knowledge concerning the impact of collective negotiations in the public schools:

We must admit that our study of bargaining at the elementary and secondary level is essentially inconclusive so far. We are not now able to declare whether collective bargaining is inevitable or necessary in American education. Indeed, we are not able to guess whether the ultimate impact of bargaining on the educational enterprise as a whole will be good or bad. We do have a fairly good notion, however, of what's going on at the moment.¹⁸

Thus, while this study makes a significant contribution to understanding the impact of collective negotiations, there are sufficient differences between higher education and public schools to warrant a study of this phenomenon as it relates to higher education. Also, as Dr. Wildman stated, the evidence is inconclusive. It is hoped that the present research will add to the knowledge of collective bargaining at the college level.

¹⁸ Wesley A. Wildman, "Collective Bargaining on the Campus: Two Views" (address delivered at the Spring meeting of the Michigan Association of Colleges and Universities, May, 1967).

Summary

The efforts of workers in private employment to bargain collectively with their employers concerning their wages and other conditions of employment date from the early 1800's. This long struggle culminated in 1935 with the passage of the National Labor Relations Act which guaranteed to employees in certain sectors of private employment the right to organize and bargain collectively with their employers.

Subsequent efforts by public employees to gain similar rights were largely unsuccessful until the mid-1950's when certain cities recognized the right of their employees to enter into a negotiating relationship with them. Beginning in 1960, certain states began enacting state labor legislation which covered public employees.

Bargaining activity in public education was initiated in the public schools in the early 1960's and began gaining momentum in about 1965. At approximately the same time, collective bargaining on a limited scale was begun in higher education. At the present time, while significant bargaining activity has been limited largely to colleges in Michigan, New York and Illinois, indications point to its imminent emergence in a number of other states.

In Michigan the Public Employment Relations Act (PERA) was passed in 1965. It guarantees to public

employees, including those in publicly supported institutions of higher education, the right to organize and to bargain collectively "with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment." It provides for a form of collective bargaining not unlike that practiced in industry.

When this act was passed, community colleges in Michigan were in a state of flux resulting from rapid expansion. The large numbers of new instructors employed often brought with them expectations for higher salaries and the desire for greater involvement in policy-making decisions. Organizational activity by community college faculties for purposes of collective bargaining was almost immediate. By the fall of 1966, eleven colleges had negotiated contracts and this number had grown to sixteen by the fall of 1968.

It was reported that research related to the problem of this study was found to be extremely limited. The one study reviewed supported the viewpoint that collective bargaining in education is an evolutionary process and that its most dramatic impact was in the area of improved teacher compensation. Moderate gains were also made in achieving a greater voice for teachers in policy formulation.

In this chapter the background of the study was discussed in some detail. Also, a review of the related

research was presented. In Chapter III the method of the study will be described.

CHAPTER III.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

It was the purpose of this study to describe the development, effects and probable future trends of collective bargaining in Michigan community colleges as seen by selected faculty, administrators and trustees of these institutions. In this chapter the method employed to accomplish this purpose is described.

Sources of Data

The assumption was made that at least one year of operation under the terms of a negotiated contract was necessary before an assessment of the effects of collective bargaining could be made. Therefore, the institutions included in the study were those Michigan public community colleges that had operated under a negotiated faculty contract for at least one academic year prior to the fall of 1968.

Fifteen institutions were identified as meeting this requirement. Two of these colleges were not included in the study, one because of its distant location and the other because internal reorganization meant that the persons normally interviewed as outlined below were

not sufficiently knowledgeable about collective bargaining. Thus, the thirteen colleges listed below were included in the study:

Alpena Community College	Lake Michigan College
Flint Community Junior College	Macomb County Community College
Grand Rapids Junior College	Muskegon County Community College
Henry Ford Community College	Oakland Community College
Highland Park College	Schoolcraft College
Jackson Community College	Washtenaw Community College
Kellogg Community College	

Two of these colleges have operated under negotiated agreements since the fall of 1967. The remaining eleven colleges have operated under such agreements since the fall of 1966.

The data for the study were obtained by means of personal interviews with three persons at each of these thirteen institutions. In most cases, these people were the chairman of the board of trustees, the chief administrative officer of the institution and the chairman of the faculty negotiating committee. Certain exceptions were made in order to assure that those interviewed had been associated with the institution for a long enough period of time to answer the questions posed in the

interview. The names and titles of the persons who were interviewed are listed in Appendix A.

Trustees, administrators and faculty were included in the study in order to secure the opinions of persons representing the various component parts of the academic community. Also, it was thought important to obtain views of persons representing both sides of the adversary relationship which exists in the bargaining process.

Method of Collecting the Data

The interview was decided upon as the most appropriate method for collecting the data. This technique was chosen in preference to using a questionnaire because of the flexibility afforded in an interview.

Also, as Van Dalen writes:

Many people are more willing to communicate orally than in writing and, therefore, will provide more data more readily and fully in an interview than on a questionnaire. . . . In a face-to-face meeting, an investigator is able to encourage subjects and to help them probe more deeply into a problem, particularly an emotionally laden one. Through respondents' incidental comments, facial and bodily expressions and tone of voice, an interviewer acquires information that would not be conveyed in written replies.¹

The flexibility of the interview and the opportunity to probe in depth were seen as being particularly important because of the exploratory nature of the study.

¹Deobold B. Van Dalen, Understanding Educational Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 306.

An interview schedule (Appendix B) was developed for use in conducting the interviews. The schedule was composed of three principal topics, each of which was related to one of the three elements of the study--the development, outcomes and future of collective bargaining in Michigan community colleges.

Topic I included both open-ended and scaled-response items focusing on the question of why the faculty chose to collectively negotiate their contracts. Other questions dealing with the age and sex of the faculty who led the collective bargaining movement and the proportion of the faculty who were in favor of collective bargaining were included in this topic.

Within the second topic of the schedule, interviewees were asked to relate those outcomes of collective bargaining that, in their opinion, were the most significant. Also, they were asked to indicate what they considered to be the most desirable and the most undesirable outcomes. A final question was included in this topic to elicit a judgment of the overall merit of collective bargaining in the community college.

The future of collective bargaining was the topic of the final portion of the interview. Interviewees were asked to indicate what they thought would be the major outcomes of collective bargaining in the coming years. In addition, questions concerning the possibility of

faculty strikes, the possibility of a state-wide master contract and the future dependency on the state for operating revenue were included in this part of the interview schedule.

Interviews were arranged by telephone approximately two weeks in advance. Those to be interviewed were informed of the purpose of the study and given a brief summary of the topics to be covered in the interview. They were told that no specific preparation was necessary and that the interview would require about an hour to an hour and a half to complete. Arrangements were made to hold the interview wherever convenient for the interviewee. In most cases the preferred location was either at the college or, in the case of several trustees, at their place of business. About a week prior to the scheduled date of the interview a letter (Appendix C) was sent to the interviewee confirming the appointment and listing the topics to be discussed. This procedure resulted in 100 per cent participation of those invited to take part in the study.

With the interviewee's permission the interviews were tape recorded. This was done in order to maximize retention of the discussion and to free the investigator from taking notes, thus allowing him to concentrate on the discussion. Only one person requested that the interview not be taped.

The actual interviews ranged from one-half hour to two hours in length with the average being about an hour and a quarter. An attempt was made to create an informal atmosphere and the interviewees were encouraged to express their frank opinions in regard to the questions. The interview schedule was used as an aid to cover the salient topics. The entire interview was later transcribed and used as the basis for the data presented in Chapter IV.

Presentation of the Data

It was the plan of this study to present a verbal description of the problem using the responses of the thirty-nine interviewees as the data upon which to build this description. Van Dalen, in his book Understanding Educational Research, supports this as a logical approach to the study of new phenomena:

Qualitative data--word descriptions--may predominate in studies that examine the general nature of phenomena. Pioneer studies in a field are usually expressed in verbal terms. Verbal symbols lack precision: words do not hold the same meaning for all people, for all times, and in all contexts . . . But qualitative studies . . . help workers identify the significant factors to measure. Until these general explorations are made, measurement cannot be utilized fruitfully.²

This was the goal of the present study: to examine the general nature of collective bargaining in higher education, particularly in the community college, and,

²Ibid., pp. 205-206.

hopefully, to reveal some areas which merited further and more exacting study.

The use of the unstructured interview resulted in the expression of various viewpoints that did not always fall into specific and distinct response categories. Therefore, because of the imprecise nature of some of the data, it was not always possible to specify the number of interviewees who shared a given point of view. Where the responses were sufficiently specific, they were quantified but the focus was on portraying the relative support the various opinions were given rather than on quantifying all responses.

The unstructured interview also produced viewpoints on a wide variety of subjects. Only one or two interviewees offered opinions in regard to certain topics while nearly all interviewees expressed a viewpoint concerning others. Because of the wide variety of subjects on which opinions were expressed, a certain amount of discretion was exercised in deciding which of these subjects should be included in the findings. An attempt was made, however, to include the subject discussed if it was germane to the study regardless of the number of persons who expressed opinions about it. In any case, if a topic was included, all of the viewpoints concerning it were indicated.

Quotes from the interviewees were used to illustrate various viewpoints throughout the presentation of the data. However, to preserve anonymity, these quotes were not credited to a specific person or associated with a particular college.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

In this chapter the findings of the investigation are presented and analyzed. The findings consist of the opinions obtained through the interviews with the thirty-nine faculty negotiators, trustees and administrators associated with the thirteen Michigan community colleges studied and appear largely as verbal descriptions of the problem. Quantitative data are presented where they contribute to this description. However, no attempt is made to demonstrate differences between the responses of the three groups based on statistical tests.

The three main divisions in this chapter parallel the principal questions posed in this study. The first part is concerned with the development of collective bargaining in the community colleges studied. The second part deals with the outcomes of collective bargaining, and the final segment includes the predictions of those interviewed concerning the future of collective bargaining.

The Development of Collective Bargaining

It was the purpose of this phase of the study to investigate the reasons for the development of collective

bargaining and to provide a limited amount of information about those faculty members who were instrumental in organizing the faculty for bargaining purposes. A related question--the extent of faculty support for the movement--was also investigated.

Reasons for the Development of Collective Bargaining

In order to obtain a complete picture of why the faculties in the institutions studied chose to bargain collectively with their employers, this question was approached in two ways. First, to obtain a spontaneous response, the interviewees were simply asked why the faculty had chosen to bargain collectively. Secondly, a list of thirteen factors described by various authorities in the field as having contributed to the development of collective bargaining was developed.¹ Each interviewee was asked to rate each of these items along a three point scale based on its relative importance in contributing to the collective bargaining movement in his college. This technique was employed to further explore possible reasons that did not occur to the interviewee when he gave his response to the first question and to provide a more objective comparison of the responses given by the three groups.

¹These factors are listed on p. 55.

Spontaneous responses--faculty.--Certain responses to the open-ended question mentioned above were given by the majority of the faculty interviewed while other answers reflected the existence of unique conditions in individual colleges, or merely differences of opinions held.

Faculty tended to attribute the development of collective bargaining to several interrelated factors. First, they expressed dissatisfaction with their status prior to collective bargaining both economically and in terms of their lack of involvement in the decisions affecting the operation of the institution. In large measure they attributed their status to autocratic administrators and to boards of control that were unsympathetic to their requests. They saw collective bargaining as a means of generating enough faculty power to remedy some of the inequities in this system.

Seven of the thirteen faculty interviewees indicated that significant problems had existed between the faculty and the president prior to the time negotiations began. Two others mentioned similar problems between the faculty and the board of control.

The complaints directed at the president usually centered around charges that he made too many decisions unilaterally, that faculty were permitted little involvement in making decisions that affected themselves or the

operation of the college, and that inequities existed in making promotions and in setting the salaries for individual instructors. Those who were critical of the board said that faculty requests, especially in the area of salary and fringe benefits, had usually been ignored.

The following statement by a faculty negotiator typified the responses of many of the faculty:

For some time now faculty members in general have felt they have been left out of many policy decisions, many decisions that directly involve them and their school. When (Public Act) 379 came along, we found we were able to legally organize and bargain. It is a way for us to have a say in our working conditions and other decisions that are extremely important to us. Most of us feel that for years, whether we've been teaching in high school or in a community college, the board of trustees and administration have made arbitrary decisions and now we have a chance to be heard.

Another faculty member stressed this same theme when he said:

We felt collective bargaining was the way to get what we wanted. You don't get what you want outside of the contract. Virtually everything in the contract was something desired, needed. Faculty felt they couldn't get this in any other way besides active negotiations.

Some were far more pointed in their remarks. One faculty negotiator said "The unilateral establishment of policy by the president was the thing. Our main problem that all of this focused on was the president--the president has been the problem at this college."

The desire for higher salaries was specifically mentioned by some faculty but often it was included as a part of the overall gains that faculty hoped to make through collective bargaining. In general, however, it was made clear that, while this was not the only contributing factor, it was of prime importance.

Some faculty gave answers that revealed circumstances that were unique to their institutions. One said that the faculty in his college had been collectively bargaining for years in a slightly different form and so it was a natural step to undertake collective bargaining under the provisions of Public Act 379. In two colleges that were parts of public school systems, it was explained that the college faculty was included in the same bargaining unit as the K-12 teachers. Thus, when the K-12 teachers organized, the college faculty also found itself organized. In one of these cases it was felt that the college faculty would not have organized had it been independent of the K-12 teachers, but that it probably would have gone to collective bargaining within the next two years. The desire to establish a college bargaining unit separate from the K-12 teachers was seen as a factor in the rapid organization of the faculty in one college that was a division of a public school district.

One faculty member said that the entire political and social climate of Michigan had been affected

tremendously by the United Auto Workers and that this had led to the acceptance of collective bargaining as a fact of life. Thus, he saw this "climate" as having contributed to both the passage of Public Act 379 and to the subsequent development of collective bargaining in higher education. This, however, was not a viewpoint expressed by the majority of faculty.

Five faculty members pointed out that the feeling of the faculty after enactment of Public Act 379 was "the act is here--why not use it?" However, these same faculty followed this statement with some very definite reasons for resorting to collective bargaining. The point made was that these faculty felt no compunction about using a union type of collective bargaining to achieve their desired ends.

Spontaneous responses--administrators.--The explanations given by the administrators for the development of collective bargaining were extremely varied. There were no predominate reasons revealed as there were with the faculty.

Two of the thirteen administrators interviewed said that there had been collective bargaining or collective discussions between faculty and administration previous to enactment of Public Act 379 and once the law was in effect it was but a natural step to move into formal negotiations. Three administrators, all from colleges

in the Detroit Metropolitan area, pointed to the influence of the general labor movement as a contributing cause.

Several administrators said that collective bargaining "just happened." It grew out of the law and the idea just spread from one college to another aided by good communications between community college faculties. Efforts by the MEA and AFT were seen as assisting this development by some administrators.

The viewpoint was expressed by three administrators that the faculty did not have an effective faculty organization prior to collective bargaining and that, consequently, they saw the answer to some of their problems in collective bargaining.

Unlike the faculty who were interviewed, the administrators revealed relatively little in the way of faculty-administrative conflict as causative factors. There was, however, some mention of faculty dissatisfaction with the treatment accorded them by the board but this, too, was limited.

Three administrators reported that the low salaries received by the faculty was a strong motivating force. One of these administrators related how each year faculty salary proposals were politely listened to by the board, then put on file and ignored.

In two cases, administrators said that the college faculty was participating in collective bargaining

primarily because they found themselves part of a K-14 bargaining unit. Another administrator indicated that the faculty had been motivated by a desire to form its own bargaining unit so that it would not be a part of the K-12 unit. It was acknowledged, however, that this was not a primary reason for the development of collective bargaining but only served to hasten the process.

Spontaneous responses--trustees.--The development of collective bargaining was attributed to Public Act 379 itself more than any other factor by the thirteen trustees interviewed. It was seen as a natural outgrowth of the presence of a law which required the administration to enter into a bargaining relationship at the faculty's request. Typical comments were, "I suppose the whole idea behind collective bargaining and the reason for it was Act 379." Another trustee simply said, "The answer is the law required collective bargaining." A total of six called this a major factor and three others said it had been fairly important.

Three trustees acknowledged that salaries were low or that faculty thought they could make gains in this area through collective bargaining. The desire to present a unified method of communication with the administration and board was seen by two trustees as a reason for the development of collective bargaining.

The influence of the AFT and the MEA was mentioned as an important factor in two cases. Also, the reception of the idea of collective bargaining by the general populace in the areas in which the colleges were located was seen as a factor.

Two trustees said that the many new faculty members hired at the time Public Act 379 came into existence was a major cause of collective bargaining. As one said:

The most important factor was that we hired a lot of new faculty, younger faculty, some of whom came out of public school systems and who had a background of militancy. Apparently, they were imbued with the idea that you fought for everything you could get . . . These new, younger faculty members said "let's become the official negotiators under the state act" and they did. They grabbed control of the faculty association and of the faculty negotiating committee and started hardnosed labor negotiations . . . The militancy came from the new members of the faculty association.

The trustees reported the existence of very few problems between faculty and administration. Only three trustees hinted of such problems but their importance in the development of collective bargaining was largely discounted.

Scaled response factors.--The interviewees were asked to respond to each of thirteen factors appearing on a prepared list. They were requested to indicate whether each factor was (1) very important, (2) somewhat important or (3) not important in contributing to the collective bargaining movement in their respective

colleges. They were also given the opportunity to say that they had no opinion or were undecided as to the importance of the item. The thirteen factors in the list were as follows:

- (1) Enactment of Michigan Public Act 379 in 1965 making it lawful for public employees to collectively bargain.
- (2) Being a part of a K-12 district whose teachers wanted to collectively negotiate their contracts.
- (3) A feeling on the part of the faculty that there was a lack of communication and/or understanding between them and the administration.
- (4) A desire on the part of the faculty to be more involved in the institution's decision-making.
- (5) A feeling on the part of the faculty that teaching loads were too heavy.
- (6) A "union orientation" of faculty resulting from close proximity to strong labor unions in Detroit and other cities.
- (7) A feeling on the part of the faculty that the president was making too many unilateral decisions.
- (8) A desire for higher salaries and fringe benefits by faculty.
- (9) The assistance and encouragement of the MEA or AFT.
- (10) A very limited number of faculty who sold the idea of collective bargaining to other faculty.
- (11) Dissatisfaction among faculty with the handling of their grievances.
- (12) A desire on the part of the faculty to establish their independence from the administration.
- (13) A desire for more academic freedom in the classroom.

In order to compare the relative importance of the responses quantitatively, a weighted score was computed for each item for each group (faculty, administrators and

trustees) interviewed. A score of two was arbitrarily assigned to each "very important" response and a score of one was assigned to each "somewhat important" response. For example, if a factor earned three "very important" and two "somewhat important" responses, it was given a weighted score of eight.

The relative importance of the factors thus arrived at is shown in Table 2. The factors are ranked for all respondents and for each of the three groups interviewed.

Based on this method of arriving at the relative importance of the items, enactment of Public Act No. 379 was agreed upon by all three groups as the most important factor. Next in overall importance was item No. 8, "a desire for higher salaries and fringe benefits by faculty." However, for faculty this factor was rated equal in importance with item No. 4, "a desire on the part of the faculty to be more involved in the institution's decision-making." This latter item was ranked third and fifth respectively by administrators and trustees.

Several differences in the importance attached to each of the factors by the various groups is revealed in Table 2. For example, for faculty "a feeling on the part of the faculty that the president was making too many unilateral decisions" ranked fourth in importance whereas for administrators and trustees it ranked seventh and eighth respectively. On the other hand, item No. 12,

TABLE 2.--Relative importance of factors that contributed to the development of collective bargaining in thirteen Michigan community colleges as indicated by trustees, administrators and faculty.

Item No.*	All Respondents		Trustees		Admin-istrators		Faculty	
	Item Rank	Weighted Score	Item Rank	Weighted Score	Item Rank	Weighted Score	Item Rank	Weighted Score
(1)	1	67	1	20	1	23	1	24
(8)	2	50	2	15	2	20	2	15
(4)	3	32	5	7	3	10	2	15
(3)	4	28	7	6	3	10	5	12
(10)	5	27	4	8	6	9	6	10
(7)	6	23	8	3	7	6	4	14
(9)	7	21	3	11	7	6	11	4
(12)	8	18	8	3	3	10	10	5
(5)	9	15	8	3	10	4	7	8
(6)	10	13	5	7	10	4	13	2
(11)	10	13	13	1	9	5	8	7
(13)	12	11	11	2	13	2	8	7
(2)	13	10	11	2	10	4	11	4

*Item No. refers to number of items listed on p. 55.

"a desire on the part of the faculty to establish their independence from the administration" was ranked third by administrators compared with an eighth place ranking by trustees and a tenth place ranking for faculty.

Trustees tended to place more emphasis on the importance of the assistance and encouragement of the MEA or AFT and on the "union orientation" of faculty than either the administrators or faculty.

Discussion.--There was general agreement between the answers which the interviewees gave to the open-ended question and the responses to the factors on the prepared list. However, the quantification of responses brought the relative importance of these factors into sharper focus.

In answering the open-ended question apparently some interviewees took for granted the importance of Act 379 since several of them neglected to mention it. But on the scaled-response item there was nearly unanimous agreement about the importance of the Act itself. The importance of the faculty's desire for higher salaries and fringe benefits was also made more obvious in the scaled-response item.

The data shown in Table 2 reinforce the importance of the factors stressed in the open-ended question. Again the point was made that faculty were dissatisfied with the making of unilateral decisions by administrators and with their lack of involvement in policy-making decisions. To

the faculty, these two related conditions were as important in the development of collective bargaining as was the desire for a better economic package.

The Faculty Leaders of the Movement

The interviewees were asked the question, "Would you say that most of the leaders in the collective bargaining movement at your college were older or younger or were there some of each?" The responses to this question are discussed below.

About one-half of those in each group, or a total of sixteen of the thirty-one interviewees who responded to this question, said that most of the leaders came from among the younger faculty. Of the other fifteen respondents, six said that most of the leaders came from among the older faculty, four identified them as coming from a "middle" group and five indicated that both older and younger age-groups were represented. There was very little difference among the three groups interviewed with respect to the proportion of their responses that fell in each of these categories.

When the data were analyzed by institution there was found to be general agreement among those interviewed at the respective colleges. In seven colleges there was unanimous or majority agreement that most of the leaders had come from among the younger faculty. In two other

colleges there was majority or unanimous agreement that the leaders had come from the older faculty and in the remaining four institutions the responses were mixed.

At only four colleges was there unanimous agreement that most of the leaders could not be classified as "younger." Three of these four were longer established colleges that had relatively strong faculty organizations at the time Public Act 379 came into existence. In these cases the leadership for collective bargaining came from these organizations. Conversely, in most colleges that lacked strong faculty organization, including most of the newer colleges, the leadership role was filled by younger instructors.

A second question asked concerning the leaders was, "Were both men and women represented among the leaders?" Since women comprise only 10 to 25 per cent of most community college faculties, respondents were encouraged to indicate that women were among the leaders even if only one or two were involved.

Among each group interviewed approximately one-half replied that the leadership was comprised of men and one-half indicated that both men and women were included. No respondents indicated that the leadership was dominated by women.

When analyzed by institution, the data showed that the interviewees within the individual colleges agreed in

their responses for the most part. In only two colleges did the interviewees differ in their answers to this question.

Faculty Support for Collective Bargaining

In order to determine how much faculty support collective bargaining had when it was begun, the investigator asked the question, "About what per cent of the faculty do you think were in favor of collective bargaining when the bargaining unit was formed?" To answer this question the interviewees had to estimate the percentage in most cases since a formal "yes-no" vote was not usually taken in the process of forming the bargaining unit at the colleges. It also should be noted that majority support was not necessary for the formation of a bargaining unit.

The average of the figures indicated by the thirty-one interviewees in response to this question was 73 per cent. Faculty, administrators and trustees averaged 83, 67, and 71 per cent respectively. With regard to agreement among interviewees within the respective institutions, in nine colleges the faculty, administrators and trustees gave estimates that were within twenty percentage points of one another. Within the remaining institutions the estimates varied from thirty-five to fifty-five percentage points.

The Outcomes of Collective Bargaining

The purpose of this part of the investigation was to secure the opinions of the trustees, administrators and faculty in regard to the effects which collective bargaining had on the community colleges studied. Also, interviewees were asked to indicate the most desirable and the most undesirable outcomes. Finally, they were asked to give an overall assessment of whether collective bargaining had been a favorable development in their colleges.

Salary, Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions

There was little doubt in the minds of most people that faculty salaries and fringe benefits were improved substantially by collective bargaining. Responses of the three groups in regard to this question were nearly identical.

All thirteen faculty negotiators expressed an opinion concerning the effect on salaries. Of these, eleven agreed that salaries had increased more than they would have without collective bargaining. Estimates of the difference between the present average salary and what the average would have been without collective bargaining were made by eight different individuals. The estimates ranged from \$900 to \$2,000 with most figures between \$1,000 and \$1,500.

Computed on a yearly basis, this represented an average of \$500 difference per institution.

One faculty negotiator summed up the importance of financial gains in collective bargaining when he said:

Money is always the most important thing and money matters have improved drastically. You don't get the kind of raises we have here by asking the board to raise your pay. So, salaries are always important. You wouldn't have a powerful union over a period of years unless salaries improved drastically.

Two faculty members expressed dissenting opinions. One person, in voicing his opinion, pointed out that even though fairly sizeable raises had been granted, living costs had gone up even more in the same period resulting in a net loss of income.

Of the eleven administrators who discussed salaries, nine said that collective bargaining had caused them to increase faster than they would have otherwise. Again there were two dissenting opinions. Several administrators gave their viewpoints in regard to whether they thought the rather large salary increases were deserved. The following statement by one of the administrators is representative of the opinions voiced by several of the interviewees:

Those of us who have been in the profession realize that for many years teachers were grossly underpaid. It was encouraging for all of us to see the faculty salaries up to a point where people can afford to teach. We're very happy to see many people coming to us from business and

industry who are interested in teaching now . . .
 Many of us who went into administration did so because we couldn't live on a faculty salary. . . .
 We're all very happy with the improvement we've made not only in salaries but also in fringe benefits and working conditions.

Several administrators reported that salaries had increased on the average of about 10 to 12 per cent per year since the advent of collective bargaining. When administrators estimated the portion of the increased salaries attributable to collective bargaining, the figures averaged about \$500 per institution for each year it had operated under a negotiated contract. This was the same amount estimated by the faculty.

The consensus of the trustees was the same as that for faculty and administrators--collective bargaining had caused salaries to increase substantially. Only one of them disagreed. He contended that if other community colleges were paying higher salaries, the rates at his college would have been increased since it had always been the philosophy of the board to keep faculty salaries at the top of those paid in Michigan community colleges.

In addition to increased salaries many of those in each of the three groups interviewed reported that fringe benefits had been improved through collective bargaining. The investigator did not usually inquire as to the specific improvements made. However, initiation or improvement of such benefits as health and accident

insurance, life insurance and even sabbatical leaves were mentioned. Also, some persons mentioned more liberal policies regarding personal leave days and extended sick pay.

The interviewees indicated that most contracts specified the limits of the normal work day. For example, the contract at one college reportedly specified a maximum of six hours between the time an instructor's first and last class met. Furthermore, it specified that classes taught after 5 p.m. were extra-contractual and, therefore, required additional pay. Not only did teaching night classes command extra pay as a result of collective bargaining, but performance of other non-teaching duties was more likely to earn extra money. One administrator reported that faculty even received extra pay for committee work.

Some interviewees reported a reduction of teaching loads although the impact of collective bargaining appeared to be somewhat limited in this respect. Most contracts were said to specify teaching loads of fourteen to sixteen class hours per week with two exceptions: English instructors in some colleges were required to teach only twelve hours and instructors of certain laboratory courses were required to teach more than fourteen to sixteen hours. Standardizing the requirement at fourteen to sixteen hours in itself did not effect a reduction of teaching loads.

However, it did prevent an instructor from being assigned an extra class in "emergency" situations. From the comments made, reduction of the teaching load to twelve hours for English instructors did constitute a departure from past practice. Likewise, negotiations in some colleges resulted in reduction of teaching loads for instructors of laboratory courses to the standard fourteen to sixteen hours. Some contracts contained provisions setting maximum class size but it was reported that this had not had a significant impact on the colleges.

It was found that the amount of administrative prerogative in determining the beginning salaries and the yearly increments for instructors had been greatly reduced as a result of the provisions of the negotiated contract. The guidelines for establishing the beginning salary have been arrived at through the bargaining process and, in addition, most of the flexibility of the salary schedule has been removed.

Three interviewees reported that the merit feature of the salary schedule was eliminated as a result of collective bargaining. Faculty who made comments in regard to this feature of the salary schedules were very critical of it. As one person said, "most of merit is favoritism." Another concurred with this viewpoint when he said:

(prior to collective bargaining) the strong and the verbose did well and those that were somewhat timid didn't come out so well. Their pay

didn't seem to necessarily be based on how they performed in the classroom. I don't know that it is now but there is less inequity than before.

Thus, collective bargaining has resulted in master salary schedules requiring automatic yearly increments for all full-time faculty and with a minimum of administrative influence permitted.

Financial Impact on the Community College

As just reported, collective bargaining has caused faculty salaries to increase substantially and, to some extent, to reduce teaching loads. Since approximately seventy-five to eighty-five per cent of a college's budget is normally allocated to salary and fringe benefits, this has necessitated a sizeable increase in college operating budgets.

What has this meant in terms of the ability of the various community colleges to support this higher cost of operation? Have colleges had to cut back on new programs or essential services? Or have they had the resources to operate without serious difficulty? These questions were the subject of another important phase of the interviews with faculty, administrators and trustees.

The nearly unanimous opinion expressed was that collective bargaining had not created any serious financial problems. Some interviewees, especially presidents and

trustees, expressed concern about the future should the present salary increases persist.

Most faculty said they felt their respective institutions were not hard-pressed to finance the increased economic package. A typical statement was: "They have and have had the money to pay. The tax base is good and increasing. It is just a matter of priorities." Some faculty, however, were more cautious in their statements. One instructor indicated that his college was beginning to find it difficult to balance its budget and another voiced the opinion that, so far, the increased salaries hadn't been a burden for his college but that if an upcoming millage vote was unsuccessful they would be in trouble.

Among administrators, the responses were much the same. Several indicated that tuition and/or millage had been increased, but most were quick to point out that other cost increases contributed to this, too. One administrator said that his college had had to ask for more millage three years earlier than had been anticipated originally. Another mentioned that faculty had been instrumental in getting voter approval for increased millage. Most board members concurred with the viewpoint expressed by faculty and administrators: no real problems had resulted, as yet, from the increased costs. However, a minority opinion was expressed by one who said:

The amount of money put into operating expenses has just increased tremendously and nothing but collective bargaining has done it. We've had to vote new millage because of collective bargaining and we're straining to meet our budget now.

On the other end of the continuum, one trustee said that his college still had a surplus so there hadn't been any problem. Furthermore, he added that he was "rather dubious about other people 'crying' about lack of money to finance higher salaries." Most of the opinions expressed by trustees on this subject fell in between these two extremes.

Faculty Involvement in Decision-Making

It was reported that faculty gave as one of their prime reasons for deciding to bargain collectively that of desiring a greater voice in the college's decision-making. The question discussed here is whether this objective was accomplished through collective bargaining.

The wording of the Michigan Public Employment Relations Act was found to have important implications for the answer to this question. This law provides for bargaining "with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment." This language clearly gives faculty in community colleges the right to negotiate such matters as salaries, fringe benefits, hours of work and other personnel policies that directly affect them. The law is less clear, however, as to what constitutes "other

terms and conditions of employment." Are such matters as curriculum development, academic policy, college finance, hiring and firing and other related areas appropriate for negotiations as provided by the law? This matter of what is negotiable was found to be a very controversial and sensitive area in a number of colleges.

In short, there was little doubt expressed that faculty had achieved a greater voice in determining their salaries and other policies that directly affected them. This right extended to them by law had been effectively exercised at the bargaining table as witnessed by the rapid increases in salaries and fringe benefits previously discussed. However, in other decision-making areas that were not specifically required to be negotiated by law, the effects of collective bargaining on faculty involvement were much less clear.

Opinion on this question was divided both between institutions and within institutions. As a whole, the faculty tended to respond more positively to this question than did administrators or trustees. Of eleven instructors, eight said that faculty did have a more meaningful voice and three said there had been no change. However, of those who said there had been no change, one said that faculty involvement had been good before and remained good while the other two said that involvement was not good either before or after collective bargaining.

The administrators were more evenly divided in their opinions on this subject. Five of the thirteen interviewed said that faculty had gained a somewhat greater voice in decision-making. Three others said that faculty had been sufficiently involved before and that collective bargaining had not affected this.

On the other hand, four administrators reported that faculty had actually lost some of their participation in institutional governance. Among these people it was the general feeling that the faculty union had replaced a faculty organization which had served as a vehicle for communication between faculty and administration and, thus, there was less opportunity for involving faculty in administrative decisions.

Trustees were less cognizant of any changes in faculty involvement in decision-making outside of the area of salaries and other personnel policies. Two trustees did indicate that they thought faculty participation had increased compared with five who said there was no apparent change.

In only six colleges did the people interviewed agree concerning the effect of collective bargaining on faculty involvement in decision-making. In the case of five of these colleges there was agreement that faculty participation had increased as a result of collective bargaining and in the remaining college there was

agreement that participation had been good before and was still good.

It was mentioned by several interviewees, including both faculty and administrators, that many instructors had neither the time nor the interest in becoming involved in the affairs of the college in addition to their regular teaching responsibilities. As one faculty member expressed it:

Yes, I think we're more meaningfully involved. We're not as involved as we should be in the sense that we don't have as many faculty involved as we should have. But this is part of the growth of this and part of a development of a professional attitude by the faculty. Some just don't want to be involved in anything but their teaching.

In sum, there was general agreement that faculty had, indeed, gained a meaningful voice in those matters that most directly affected them. They were sharing with administrators and trustees in the making of decisions concerning salary, fringe benefits and other personnel policies directly affecting them.

However, no clear pattern was revealed in regard to the effect of collective bargaining on faculty participation in decisions outside of this area. The actual outcome appeared to depend substantially on the willingness of the administrator to share his power with the faculty. In any case, the increased participation gained by faculty in some institutions has not reached such proportions that

administrators and boards have abdicated the responsibility for making the final decision on major questions.

Relationships Between Faculty and Administration

In the interviews with faculty, administrators and trustees the term "the administration" was used in reference to the chief administrative officer in most colleges. In the case of the largest colleges studied, referral to "the administration" also included a limited number of second echelon administrators but still the president was identified as the principal figure in the college administration. Thus, when faculty-administrative relationships were discussed, nearly all comments were directed toward the relationships between faculty and the chief administrative officer.

The adversary relationship.--According to the persons interviewed, the relationship between faculty and administration was given a critical test by the introduction of collective bargaining. The personalities involved--the presidents on the one hand and the leaders in the faculty power structure, especially those on the faculty negotiating committee, on the other hand--were the largest determinates of whether the adversary relationship of the bargaining table detrimentally affected the total relationship between faculty and administration. Collective bargaining had the effect of magnifying and

exposing any real or imagined problems that had existed previously between faculty and administration.

Inquiry about the impact on the relationship in individual colleges elicited comments that ranged from "the rapport between faculty and administration has improved tremendously" to "it has torn our college to pieces." In those colleges where the post-collective bargaining relationship was strained or even openly hostile, the faculty negotiators attributed this to the intransigency and inflexibility of the president and not to the adversary relationship associated with collective bargaining. In these same colleges the administrators and trustees were inclined to blame the problem on the adversary relationship created by collective bargaining and/or on militant young faculty members.

One administrator made a particularly insightful comment concerning the nature of the adversary relationship when he said:

The adversary relationship is a very subtle problem. The heat generated at the bargaining table among those present tends to dissipate much more quickly than the heat passed on either to the administrative groups on the one hand or to the faculty group on the other who have not been involved. It is one thing to sit at the bargaining table and quite another to get second hand and usually only part of what is going on and not get the total story. The people sitting at the table are able to overcome the effects of this adversary relationship much more easily than the external groups. . . . You will always have some adversary relationship but this will depend on the people at the bargaining table to some degree.

To summarize, the adversary nature of collective bargaining tended to have a polarizing effect on the faculty-administrative relationship. But as one administrator pointed out, there is a difference between an adversary and an antagonistic relationship. Whether or not the relationship became openly antagonistic appeared to depend on the personalities involved in the particular college.

Flexibility of the relationship.--There was widespread agreement among those interviewed that the existence of a written and legally binding contract specifically spelling out a number of policies and practices tended to make the faculty-administrative relationship more formal and, at the same time, somewhat less flexible. Both good and bad points of the existence of the contract were seen, however.

Administrators said that negotiations had necessitated their spelling out administrative and board policies and practices and in getting them into written form. They acknowledged that this was a desirable effect. On the other hand, they expressed concern that the existence of a contract had reduced the flexibility they once had in dealing with faculty. An example used by one administrator is illustrative of this point:

I don't think there is any question about there being a loss of flexibility. This may cause problems. For example, when a faculty member

asked for approval to leave a week or two early to go to a summer institute prior to the (negotiated) contract, we discussed this with the instructor and then went ahead and did it. But now you can't do this--the contract does not allow it.

Another administrator succinctly explained the problem as follows:

The more flexible you can keep things the better. If you tie down everything, then you're going to have a strait jacket which is going to affect both administration and faculty.

Although the faculty also saw the disadvantages of the formal relationship, some were quick to point out that including policies and procedures in a legally binding contract was the only means of gaining equitable treatment for faculty. In those cases where the conflict between faculty and administration was the greatest, there was also the greatest emphasis by faculty on getting everything possible into the contract.

The consensus of opinion was that the contract played an important role in the operation of the college thus leaving less to chance or administrative prerogative and more to mutually agreed upon policies and practices. The net effect was to standardize the treatment of all faculty and, at the same time, to remove a certain degree of flexibility from the administrative-faculty relationship.

Communications.--Faculty and administrators commented on communications on several occasions. Trustees,

because they were not well acquainted with this topic, made no comment.

The main viewpoint expressed by faculty was that collective bargaining itself was a vehicle for discussing topics that had formerly been the prerogative of the administration or board. As one faculty member said:

Yes there is more communication (as a result of collective bargaining). The actual negotiating process is no more than one form of communication.

Another instructor expressed a similar opinion saying:

The administration has had to accept the fact that now we must be listened to and, for the most part, they've been very good at listening to us.

These and other similar statements made by some faculty reflected the feeling that for the first time genuine communication was taking place between faculty and administrators and, in some cases, trustees as well.

In comparison, the administrators interviewed tended to emphasize the loss of informal communications as well as the loss of communications resulting from the substitution of a union-type faculty organization for the previously existing faculty structure. The crux of this problem was outlined by one administrator who said:

Collective bargaining has affected my communications adversely because we now have formal structure. Technically, there are very few changes we can make in the every-day operation that don't affect wages, hours and working conditions within the institution and these are all subject to negotiations. I would personally like to have much more dialogue with the faculty in large faculty

meetings rather than have nearly all faculty action channeled through delegated people as it now is.

It was discovered in discussing the problem of communications that the presence of collective bargaining tended to prevent the existence of joint faculty-administrative decision-making groups where open discussion might take place. One faculty member explained this problem when he said:

We cannot allow the legislative function of the faculty to be used in conjunction with administrative personnel in a so-called faculty senate which could make decisions which conflict with those we make within our own (faculty) Association. Because as soon as we allow this, the president is going to bring bargainable issues to it. So you can't have this type of joint organization because you'll get two conflicting decisions--one which we make at the Association and the other at the faculty senate. Now what do you do with those?

There was substantial evidence, however, that the problem of communication varied from college to college. There was a definite relationship between the amount of trust and mutual respect that was present between administration and faculty and the amount of both formal and informal communication that took place between them.

Effect on Teachers and Teaching

A wide variety of opinions were expressed in regard to the direct and indirect effect of collective bargaining on the teachers and on the educational process. These

opinions are discussed under the several headings listed below.

Faculty morale.--There was no consistent pattern in the viewpoints expressed by those interviewed. Opinion was divided within both faculty and administration. Most trustees were not familiar enough with this subject to venture an opinion.

In general, faculty expressed the feeling that where gains had been made the faculty morale was improved but where faculty efforts had been frustrated their morale had suffered. Listed below are some representative comments:

--The faculty is far more content and the morale of the faculty has improved. The benefits received are very important but money is not the only reason.

--The faculty has been frustrated. A third of them don't give a damn because they've been frustrated in their attempts to change educational policies and to try to better the educational program.

--There has been no change in morale.

Administrator opinion was also about evenly divided, as represented by the comments below:

--There has been no clear effect either way--some are happy with it and some are very unhappy with it.

--The contract builds an attitude, a kind of independence of spirit that I think is kind of healthy. They feel that they are coequals now.

--Teacher morale has not been affected by collective bargaining.

It was reported that in two colleges the fight for control of the bargaining unit by members of the MEA and AFT had caused some antagonism within the faculty and this had hurt morale.

Attracting and keeping teachers.--Several faculty and administrators commented that the higher salaries and improved benefits had had a modest effect in helping community colleges to attract and retain better instructors. One administrator said that salaries had been improved to the extent that for the first time they were attracting instructors from business and industry. Another reported that he had received over forty applications for each teaching vacancy and added, "People want to come to Michigan." A dissenting opinion was expressed by an administrator who said, "higher salaries don't attract better teachers because everybody else has higher salaries, too."

Teacher interest and effort.--There was general agreement that the total impact on the teaching function was relatively small although there were a few dissenting opinions. On the whole, faculty were of the opinion that there was no change or that teacher performance had improved somewhat. Two instructors said that reduced teacher loads had helped their staff to improve its teaching.

Those administrators who expressed an opinion on this subject suggested that instructor interest and effort either had not been noticeably affected or that it had suffered somewhat from collective bargaining. There was some feeling that instructors were putting forth less effort outside of the classroom and that some faculty tended to do only as much as that which was required by the contract. As one administrator stated:

The dedicated teacher is less in evidence. The job is spelled out in the contract and what is spelled out is considered to be the maximum not the minimum, so something is lost. This hasn't affected what goes on in the classroom but has made a difference in contact with students outside of the classroom and it has made a great deal of difference in terms of the individual teacher's contribution to the growth and support of the institution itself, including committee work.

The majority opinion of trustees was that collective bargaining had little if any effect on teaching. However, a limited number expressed the feeling that some teachers were doing only the minimum required by the contract.

The extent to which administrators and trustees expressed the opinion that collective bargaining had had a deleterious effect on the quality of instruction should not be over emphasized, however. The majority opinion was that the teachers were professionals and that regardless of collective bargaining they put forth their best effort.

Innovation.--The question of whether collective bargaining has affected the ability to innovate within the educational institution was explored with some of the interviewees. Those administrators who expressed an opinion on this subject said there had been no problem so far although there might be a little more red tape involved in initiating changes. One trustee said he saw no problems along this line and another voiced some concern about "having so many rules and regulations that innovation could be stifled."

Among faculty who commented on this topic the general feeling was that collective bargaining did not inhibit innovation and may even have stimulated it. One instructor explained that the feeling of security generated by the existence of the contract gave instructors the confidence to not only propose new ideas to administrators, but to refuse to accept an arbitrary "no" answer. Another said that the removal of the merit feature of their salary schedule made teachers less reluctant to try new approaches that might fail. This person said that the merit feature had tended to encourage conformity and to discourage innovative efforts.

Taken as a whole, the comments of the administrators, trustees and faculty indicated that the impact on innovation had not been great.

The President's Role

How have the chief administrative officers of the institutions studied been affected by collective bargaining? This question elicited a wide variety of responses from the trustees, administrators and faculty interviewed.

Since the time collective bargaining was initiated at the thirteen institutions studied, the presidency at four of these colleges had changed hands. Strong inferences were made in the interviews that the turmoil and conflict caused by collective bargaining had contributed to the departure of at least two of these people.

Several faculty, especially those in the larger institutions, reported that collective bargaining had not appreciably affected the president's role. In some cases this was attributed to the fact that the president had not let himself become involved in negotiations.

In those instances where the president was perceived to have operated in an autocratic fashion, the common faculty response was that his role had changed because the contract had required it to change. The most common change noted was that he had to increasingly share his power with faculty.

In the opinion of some instructors the refusal of certain chief administrators to change their modus operandi had led to a great deal of conflict and confrontation. One faculty member said:

Deep-seated emotions are involved; collective bargaining is a challenge to his position--his authority. It is very difficult for a man with his experience and age to change. He just doesn't want to accept collective negotiations.

The responses of administrators ranged from, "The president's job is easier because of the contract," to "It makes the job almost impossible." The majority, however, indicated that there had not been a major impact on the president's job. Two presidents who have been involved in the negotiating process said that it was taking more and more of their time and another mentioned that paper work had increased tremendously.

One president described his job as becoming "increasingly that of the chairman of a debating society." He continued:

More and more it is governance by joint agreement. More people are involved; we used to be able to see something that needed doing and within six weeks we'd get it done. But now you work six weeks just getting it to a committee. And I'm not so sure the results are any better. It may be better in that the staff will accept it; they have helped you get it. If you could only get their opinion . . .

At least three presidents either said or strongly inferred that collective bargaining had "taken the fun out of the job." They clearly were not comfortable or happy with the existence of collective bargaining.

A president of an institution where faculty-administrative relationships were very good offered the comment that "Presidents in general are going to have to

be much more concerned with faculty problems, interests and desires if they are to effectively lead the institution."

The number of trustees who commented on this topic was limited. The general feeling expressed was that the president now had to consult and involve faculty to a greater extent. As one trustee expressed it:

He will continue to be the "captain of the team" but he's going to have to involve the faculty earlier in the process of determining policy . . . in other words, have them in on his early thinking. He is realizing that you have to involve people from the start. If they are going to be enthusiastic supporters of policies, they're going to have to help generate them.

Another trustee made a significant observation when he said:

The president's leadership now depends not so much on his position as on his personality as well as his abilities. This definitely represents a change.

The Board of Trustees' Role

The opinion most often expressed was that the board's role had not been noticeably affected. However, almost as many said that collective bargaining had caused the board to become more interested and informed about the college and more sensitive to the problems and needs of the faculty.

This latter viewpoint gained particular support in those colleges that were divisions of public school systems. In several instances boards in these systems were

reported to have initiated a policy of devoting all or a part of a regular meeting to college matters where in the past college officials had often had a difficult time fitting college affairs into the board's busy agenda.

Those who expressed the opinion that the board's role had been affected very little said that the trustees had detached themselves from negotiations except for keeping informed of their progress and ratifying the final contract. Only one board was still actively involved in negotiations and this was reported to be a very time consuming activity.

Also, it was pointed out by some that the board's role was better defined and that trustees understood their responsibilities more fully. Another mentioned that the board no longer could make decisions directly affecting faculty without consulting them and that, to some extent, their power was being shared with faculty.

Two trustees related that the existence of collective bargaining had been upsetting to the board. One said that collective bargaining had been so disruptive in this college that it was impossible for the board to function effectively and that trustees had lost interest in serving on the board.

In general, there was little difference between the comments of the three groups in regard to the impact of the board.

Community Reaction

Because the community college is an institution which depends on local tax support for a considerable amount of its budget, it seemed important to determine whether the advent of collective bargaining caused any particular reaction within the community served by the college.

There was near unanimous agreement among those interviewed that there had been very little reaction of any kind from the community to the introduction of collective bargaining. However, one faculty member said that the community reaction was generally favorable and that "the community felt teachers had the gains coming to them." Two trustees reported some negative reaction to the idea of professional people organizing and becoming involved in negotiations.

On the other hand, there was near unanimous agreement that strikes did result in a response from the community. In most cases the response was one of concern, especially from parents of students. Apparently, the attitude of the community toward the faculty during strikes was usually divided with some supporting their actions and others opposing them. The following comment made by an administrator exemplifies a viewpoint expressed by several:

The strike is the thing that brought publicity. They weren't sure what was wrong but "if the college is on strike then something is wrong at

the college." They didn't know enough about it to place the blame but they knew "something was wrong."

Most Desirable and
Undesirable Outcomes

In order to summarize the positive and negative aspects, the interviewees were asked to name the most desirable and most undesirable outcomes of collective bargaining. A total of eighteen different answers in the "most desirable" category were given. However, only six of these answers were mentioned by two or more persons.

The responses given most frequently was related to the increased involvement of faculty in decision-making and the increase in joint discussions between faculty and administration. The outcome mentioned second most often was that of higher salaries and fringe benefits. Several administrators who mentioned this item said that the higher salaries had helped them to recruit and/or retain better teachers. Another outcome that merited relatively frequent mention was the improved morale, security and cohesiveness of the faculty.

Other outcomes deserving mention were the defining of the respective roles and relationships between faculty, administration and board and the improved relationships between faculty and administration.

Three persons--two trustees and one administrator--said that they saw no desirable outcomes. One of these

trustees explained that collective bargaining was not responsible for any changes, good or bad, and the other trustee said that collective bargaining "just hadn't worked so far."

In response to the request to name the most undesirable outcomes, the interviewees gave answers that fell into twenty different categories. Many of the answers given reflected problems or conditions unique to individual colleges. The answers given were marked by their diversity; only six outcomes were mentioned by more than one person.

The only response earning fairly general support was the increased division created between faculty and administration. Other items mentioned by more than two persons were the emerging financial problems and the excessive amount of time required of both faculty and administration who were actively involved in collective bargaining. Several persons said they knew of no undesirable effects.

Net Evaluation of Collective Bargaining

After discussing the various effects of collective bargaining, the investigator asked the following question: "All things considered, do you think collective bargaining in your college is a good thing?" This question elicited the responses indicated in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3.--Net evaluation of the desirability of collective bargaining.

Responses	Number of Responses By:			
	Faculty	Adminis- trators	Trustees	All Inter- viewees
Yes, definitely a good thing.	13	4	3	20
Qualified yes.	0	2	1	3
Neither good nor bad.	0	1	4	5
Qualified no.	0	2	2	4
No, definitely a bad thing.	0	2	2	4
No answer or undecided.	0	2	1	3
Total	13	13	13	39

Not surprisingly, all thirteen faculty responded that it definitely had been a desirable development. Some acknowledged that there had been detrimental outcomes but there was no reservation in their minds that the net effect was good.

Administrators and trustees were nearly evenly divided in their responses which ranged from a very definite "no" to an enthusiastic "yes." Most, in giving their judgment, however, said they saw some good and some bad outcomes. Some responses can best be described as a stoic acceptance of collective bargaining. Others adopted

a "wait and see" attitude. Listed below are three representative responses of trustees and administrators:

--It is a burden for administrators and it puts on economic pressure but it is not an unhealthy situation. Good collective bargaining with good faith on both sides is a good thing.

--Yes, I think it's a way of life; it's something we're all going to have to go through.

--I'd like to see collective bargaining thrown out so that we could sit down in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect and work out the problems of the institution.

Future of Collective Bargaining

In order to obtain the opinions of the interviewees regarding the future trends in collective bargaining, the following question was asked: "In your opinion, what will be the major outcomes of collective bargaining in your college within the next three to five years?" The answers given to this question are discussed below.

The respondents made it clear that the principal issues of the past--salaries and faculty participation in governance--would be the principal issues of the future. Some interviewees, however, saw some shift in emphasis in faculty demands from economic issues to increased participation. Little doubt was expressed that faculty would continue to demand higher salaries and improved fringe benefits. There was less agreement, however, on the future salary trends with faculty supporting the belief that they would continue to increase at the present rate,

at least in the immediate future, and trustees and administrators saying that the increases would begin to level off.

Several persons, especially trustees, foresaw increasing financial difficulties for some colleges. Many commented that, although the college had not been hard-pressed to pay the higher salaries, the college was not in a position to continue these rates of increase. It was pointed out that the entire financial picture included so many variables that it was difficult to predict the future financial condition of the college. Included in these variables were the amount of legislative appropriations, voter approval of millage increases, general economic trends and, for some colleges, voter approval of proposals to transfer the college from a part of the public school district to an independent status.

Some foresaw increased voter resistance to higher taxes, although in some districts it was reported that the tax base was expanding at a sufficient rate to preclude such problems from developing.

There was a moderate amount of support for the belief that as faculty continued their demands for higher salaries, lower teaching loads and fewer hours, increased state support would be necessitated. This increased support was also seen leading to a definite increase in state control with a corresponding decrease in local control.

This was a possibility that was not looked upon with favor.

Many predicted that the principal issue in the immediate future would be that of faculty participation in making institutional decisions outside of the classroom. An increased emphasis on actual participation rather than acting in a recommending role was seen. Several faculty predicted they would achieve increased participation while trustees and administrators did not make a prediction as to what the outcome would be.

Interviewees in several colleges predicted that the tensions and friction created by collective bargaining would lessen in the years ahead. It was acknowledged that those on both sides of the bargaining table still had a great deal to learn and, as they became more sophisticated about the process, they would avoid the common pitfalls of the adversary relationship. As one administrator said:

Collective bargaining will become a continuing ongoing process. More of a partnership will be formed between faculty and administration. We're going to be sitting down more often on a professional basis and saying "Okay, here's a problem--how can we solve it?" rather than bringing in a set of demands.

Signs of this prediction already coming true were seen in some colleges. Many were exploring ways of establishing year-around discussion between administrators and faculty instead of waiting for the official negotiating sessions to begin.

Pressure for reduced teaching loads was mentioned as a continuing issue by several interviewees. One faculty member indicated that preliminary agreement had already been reached that the standard teaching load would be reduced to twelve hours from the current fifteen.

A need to change the law was mentioned by several persons, especially trustees. However, most persons who commented on this subject did not actually predict that the law would be changed. Changes that were suggested were inclusion of a provision for binding arbitration, allowance for employers to initiate an unfair labor practice against employees and an effective way to prevent strikes.

The existence of collective bargaining in the college setting was seen as a sign of the times. The belief that it would develop in other Michigan colleges and in other states was stated by a number of those interviewed.

In order to secure additional faculty opinion in regard to future developments, four specific questions were asked at the end of the interview. Two of these questions concerned faculty strikes which, by law, were expressly prohibited. However, at the time of this study, six of the thirteen colleges had experienced a faculty strike or, as some prefer to call it, a "withholding of services." A third question related to a state-wide

master contract for all community college instructors and the final question concerned the future need for state financial support.

Probability of Faculty Strikes

The interviewees were asked to give their opinion of the chances of a faculty strike occurring in their college within the next three to five years. Following this question, they were asked to indicate whether the changes of strikes were lessening, increasing, or not changing. The responses are included in Tables 4 and 5.

TABLE 4.--Chance of faculty strike occurring within the next three to five years.

Response	Number of Responses By:			
	Faculty	Adminis- trators	Trustees	All Inter- viewees
Definitely will occur.	1	1	0	2
A good chance.	2	1	1	4
A fair chance.	1	0	1	2
Probably will not occur.	1	7	6	14
Always possible--not predictable.	7	3	3	13
No comment made.	1	1	2	4
Total	13	13	13	39

The majority opinion was that "it depends on the circumstances, but it's always possible." Even most of those who replied that a strike probably would not occur conceded that the possibility was always present. No one ventured the opinion that the faculty lacked the will to strike given the right issue.

The second question asked regarding faculty strikes was, "Do you think the chances of a strike are lessening or increasing or is there no change?" The majority opinion was that the chances of a strike taking place would remain about the same. The number who said the chances of a strike were lessening outnumbered those who said they were increasing by a nine to three margin. However, again it was pointed out that predicting the probability of a strike is very risky.

TABLE 5.--Are chances of a strike lessening, increasing or is there no change?

Response	Number of Responses By:			
	Faculty	Adminis- trators	Trustees	All Inter- viewees
Lessening.	2	3	4	9
Increasing.	1	2	0	3
No change.	6	7	8	21
Too unpredictable.	3	1	0	4
No comment made.	1	0	1	2
Total	13	13	13	39

The faculty interviewed were in agreement that a strike or a "withholding of services" is not a pleasant thing for faculty to take part in. But at the same time several acknowledged that the threat of a strike is an indispensable weapon. As one faculty negotiator explained:

I don't think the majority of teachers anywhere like to strike. I would warn, however, that that shouldn't be taken to mean that they wouldn't strike . . . A strike is not to be desired, but the threat of a strike is essential to negotiations--it is the only real threat (faculty) have.

Probability of State-Wide Master Contract

At the time this study was conducted there was some discussion of a state-wide master contract for community college instructors growing out of collective bargaining. Opinion concerning the possibility of a master contract was included in the interviews.

The likelihood of a common state-wide contract was seen as being rather remote. Only six of thirty-six persons who commented on this subject thought that such a contract would definitely or probably evolve in the next three to five years. On the other hand, seventeen said that it probably or definitely would not evolve. Five trustees replied that they had not even heard this matter discussed.

Regardless of the answer given, many said that they certainly hoped this would not come. They saw a state-wide master contract as meaning the replacement of local control with state control. In rather straight forward language one administrator summed up the opinion of the majority:

I think a state-wide contract is a rotten possibility (to contemplate). State-wide bargaining isn't going to solve anything. This type of contract would be dependent on the State Board operating all community colleges.

TABLE 6.--Chance of state-wide master contract for community college instructors in the next three to five years.

Response	Number of Responses By:			
	Faculty	Adminis- trators	Trustees	All Inter- viewees
Yes, definitely.	0	1	0	1
Yes, probably.	2	0	3	5
Possibly.	0	3	0	3
Probably not.	5	3	1	9
Definitely not.	3	3	2	8
Too many variables-- can't predict.	3	2	0	5
Haven't heard any discussion.	0	0	5	5
No answer given.	0	1	2	3
Total	13	13	13	39

Dependency on
State Funds

The question was asked, "Do you think it will be necessary to depend on the state for an increased portion of your college's operating funds in the next five years?" The responses given are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7.--Will it be necessary to depend on the state for an increased portion of operating funds?

	Number of Responses By:			
	Faculty	Adminis- trators	Trustees	All Inter- viewees
Yes, definitely.	5	7	3	15
Yes, probably.	6	2	2	10
Probably not.	1	2	1	4
Definitely not.	1	1	1	3
Too many variables-- can't predict.	0	0	3	3
No answer given.	0	1	3	4
Total	13	13	13	39

A total of twenty-five said that they felt they would definitely or probably have to depend on the state for more of their revenue compared with only seven who said they probably or definitely would not have to. In giving their answers, many pointed out that this was a

difficult prediction to make because their financial picture was dependent on so many variables. In addition, they stressed that, in the final analysis, the amount of state support received was determined by the legislature and was not necessarily based on need. Most, however, expressed the feeling that salaries as well as other costs would increase faster than revenue from local taxes and student tuition, thus necessitating greater state support.

Summary

In this chapter the opinions of the thirty-nine administrators, trustees and faculty interviewed have been presented. The areas of agreement and disagreement among these three groups were identified.

Most interviewees saw the development of faculty collective bargaining in community colleges as having resulted from a combination of factors. Those factors identified as having been the most important were enactment of the 1965 Michigan labor legislation providing for collective bargaining by public employees, faculty desires for higher salaries and improved benefits, and a desire by the faculty to be more involved in the institution's decision-making.

Faculty particularly emphasized their desire to have a greater voice in the decision-making process and

especially in deciding the policies that most directly affected them. A closely related factor in the development of collective bargaining that was stressed by some faculty was the excessive amount of unilateral decision-making practiced by the president.

Trustees and administrators tended to emphasize that collective bargaining was a natural consequence of the enactment of the law. The importance of the influence of the MEA and the AFT was seen as being greater by the trustees than by either of the other groups.

The age and sex of the faculty who led the movement varied from college to college. However, younger male instructors were identified as the leaders more than other age groups, or women. In any case, it was reported that these leaders usually had the support of a substantial majority of the faculty at large.

It was generally agreed between the administrators, faculty and trustees that among the major outcomes of collective bargaining were higher salaries and fringe benefits and a greater voice for faculty in deciding questions of salary and other matters that most directly affected them. Opinion was divided, however, in regard to whether faculty had achieved greater participation in matters outside of this area.

The existence of a legally binding contract was seen as having certain effects. Faculty stressed the

desirable aspects of the contract pointing out that it assured equal treatment for all faculty and protected them from arbitrary administrative decisions. Administrators, while conceding that the contract did clarify the responsibilities and relationships between faculty, administration and trustees, pointed out that it also removed a valuable degree of flexibility from the relationships.

Various positions were taken in regard to the effect of collective bargaining on communications. Some faculty said that communications between them and the administration and board were actually improved in that for the first time faculty opinion was really being listened to. Administrators as well as some faculty, however, expressed concern that collective bargaining tended to prevent open discussion and debate between faculty and administration. There was general agreement by all that at least the patterns of communication had been changed.

The three groups interviewed agreed that the most undesirable effect of collective bargaining was to increase the gap between administration and faculty. The actual degree of conflict, however, appeared to vary widely from one institution to another.

Comments concerning future trends made it clear that the present issues would not change. The predominate viewpoint was that faculty would continue to demand

a better economic package and that in some colleges increased faculty participation in governance would become an even more important issue than it had been. There was some expression of concern for the ability of certain colleges to meet the future financial demands of the faculty. Also, there was considerable support for the prediction that the problems associated with collective bargaining would be gradually resolved thus resulting in a reduction of the tensions and friction presently existing.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Faculty collective bargaining is a new phenomenon in higher education. Virtually all such activity has taken place since 1965 and is still limited to only a very few states.

In Michigan, the Public Employment Relations Act which provides for collective bargaining by public employees became law in 1965. This event was followed by the rapid organization of faculty bargaining units in public community colleges and subsequent collective bargaining between these units and the boards of control. However, some community colleges and all four-year colleges in the state have remained unaffected by collective bargaining.

Because of the recent advent of collective bargaining on the higher education scene, no research in this area has yet been completed. This study, then, represents a pilot investigation of bargaining in higher education. Specifically, this study was concerned with faculty collective bargaining in Michigan community colleges and was designed to answer the questions listed below:

In the opinion of faculty, administrators and trustees:

1. Why have the faculties in the institution included in the study chosen to bargain collectively with their employers?
2. What are the most significant outcomes of collective bargaining in these institutions?
3. What outcomes are likely to result from collective bargaining in these colleges in the next three to five years?

Two secondary questions were:

1. Which of the outcomes were seen as being most desirable and most undesirable by the interviewees?
2. What were the similarities and differences between the opinions of trustees, administrators and faculty in regard to the problem under investigation?

Thirteen Michigan community colleges, all of which had operated under a negotiated contract for at least one academic year prior to the fall of 1968, were selected for inclusion in the study. For each of these thirteen institutions, the investigator interviewed three persons: the chairman of the faculty negotiating committee, the chief administrative officer of the college or his representative, and the chairman of the board of control or another trustee knowledgeable about negotiations. The interview was largely unstructured but followed a standard format outlined in an interview schedule. Most of the interview consisted of open-ended questions although one scaled-response item and several multiple-choice questions

were included. The discussions with trustees, administrators and faculty were held at the college or at the trustee's place of business. They were tape-recorded and were later transcribed for subsequent analysis.

The results of the study were presented principally in the form of a verbal description of the problem. Quantitative data were presented where they contributed to this description.

Conclusions

The conclusions listed below were reached from the discussions with faculty, administrators and trustees.

The Development of Collective Bargaining

A combination of factors which varied somewhat from one institution to another was responsible for the development of collective bargaining in the colleges studied. The faculties in these institutions had two principal objectives which they felt could be accomplished through the power generated by collective action: (1) to increase their salaries and improve their fringe benefits, and (2) to gain a greater degree of participation in making decisions which affected them and the educational program of the college. In addition, other factors were operating in almost every college which also contributed to the development of collective bargaining. However, these

factors were so varied that it is impossible to make meaningful generalizations about them.

The enactment of the Michigan labor legislation in 1965 was very definitely a facilitating factor in the development of collective bargaining in community colleges. However, it alone was not responsible; other conditions had to be present to cause faculty to organize for collective bargaining.

The Outcomes of Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining resulted in some relatively uniform outcomes for all the institutions studied but at the same time resulted in unique outcomes in each institution.

The most widely agreed upon effects were the greater increases in salaries and fringe benefits and the greater participation which faculty gained in making the decisions which most directly affected them and their conditions of employment. There was less agreement, however, in regard to the gains made by faculty in participating in the larger institutional decisions. The outcome in this regard apparently varied from one college to another. It did not appear that instructors were assuming a major role in decision-making areas normally reserved to administrators and trustees.

The point of view that collective bargaining created a greater gap between faculty and administration was widely supported by the interviewees and was named as the most undesirable outcome more than any other item. However, whether the adversary relationship became an openly antagonistic one appeared to depend largely on the personalities involved in the given institution.

Because of the two-sided adversary nature of collective bargaining, certain communication problems were created. A need was found in most colleges to reestablish the joint decision-making functions of faculty and administration outside of collective bargaining on "non-negotiable" matters. However, a continued problem in these efforts has been that of deciding just what is negotiable.

The existence of a legally binding contract tended to remove a certain degree of flexibility from the faculty-administrative relationship. Certain decisions had to be made according to the provisions of the contract and exceptions to the normal policy were more difficult or impossible to make. Faculty, however, saw this as protecting themselves from arbitrary decisions and assuring equal treatment for all.

According to those interviewed, collective bargaining had little effect on either teachers or their commitment to teaching. The ability to innovate had not been

negatively influenced. It is probable that the increased salaries had a modest effect in helping the community colleges to attract and retain better teachers.

Most institutions had not yet found it difficult to finance the higher salaries and fringe benefits paid instructors. In some cases this has meant an internal shift of resources and some institutions are now reaching a point where there is concern about meeting the future faculty demands.

The role of the president has not been greatly altered in most colleges. Presidents were, however, forced to "go by the contract" to a greater extent and some have shared their decision-making responsibilities to a greater degree with faculty. Also, for some chief administrators, collective bargaining has reduced the amount of personal satisfaction derived from their job.

The most desirable effect of collective bargaining as seen by those interviewed was the increased involvement of faculty in decision-making and their increased interest in contributing their expertise to that of administrators in solving problems of mutual interest. Community college instructors were seen as moving away from their traditional role as solely classroom teachers. The improved economic status of these instructors was also looked upon as being a positive outcome of collective bargaining by the majority of those interviewed.

The Future of Collective Bargaining

The consensus of opinion was that the primary issues of the past will continue to be the issues of the future. However, emphasis may shift somewhat from economic issues to increased faculty participation. It is also likely that there will be continued pressure for fewer teaching hours. If faculty continue to demand financial increases as great as those of the past, there will be added pressure on the state to increase its support of the financially less able colleges. Increased state control would, in all probability, accompany increased financial support.

There was considerable evidence that the initial shock has been overcome and that most colleges are learning how to live with collective bargaining. While inter-group conflict will not be eliminated, the amount of tension and friction surrounding bargaining will probably be reduced. This, however, would appear to depend on the ability and willingness of administrators to involve faculty in college affairs in imaginative and creative ways. The autocratic administrator who continues to emphasize his power at the expense of faculty participation will not function well in the environment of collective bargaining.

Implications for Further Research

This investigation as an early study of collective bargaining in higher education has taken a very broad approach to the study of the problem. In conducting this study some aspects of the problem were discovered to need more detailed study. Additional in-depth research in the areas indicated below would materially add to the understanding of collective bargaining in higher education.

1. A detailed analysis of the financial impact of collective bargaining on the respective colleges should be made. Included in such a study should be its effect on the cost per student credit hour, and the extent of reallocation of financial resources within the institution.

2. A study to determine the reasons for the variation in the amount of friction between faculty and administration that exists among the respective colleges operating under a negotiated agreement should be conducted. Particular attention should be given to the effect of the attitudes of the president toward faculty involvement in decision-making and to the effect of the style of operation practiced by the president.

3. An in-depth study of collective bargaining's effect on the role of the chief administrator is needed.

4. A study of the nature of the faculty union as a political organization would be helpful in gaining a better

understanding of the role played by this organization and its leaders in negotiations. A related study of its faculty leaders and the forces motivating them to spend hundreds of hours each year in bargaining activities would compliment this study.

5. The entire question of faculty involvement in decision-making needs to be studied. A determination of the current status of faculty in making different types of decisions should be made. Also, an analysis of the organizations in which faculty are involved in making decisions outside the bargaining context is needed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

A Position Paper by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges. Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1967.

Act No. 379 of the Public Acts of 1965, State of Michigan.

Adair, J. Warren. "Keeping Teachers Happy." American School Board Journal (January, 1968), 28-29.

Adams, Richard. "A Must: PN Legislation for Michigan." Michigan Education Journal, XLII (February, 1965), 18-19.

"At Kellogg Community College--Contract Fumbled, MAHE Takes Over." Michigan Education Journal (October, 1968), 20-21.

Bentley, Alvin M., et al. "Community Colleges Strive to Keep Pace." Michigan Education Journal, XLI (February, 1964), 9-10.

Blocker, Clyde E. "Community Colleges Must Meet Demands." Michigan Education Journal, XXXVIII (March, 1961), 474-477.

Blocker, Clyde; Plummer, Robert H.; and Richardson, Richard C., Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Brown, Ralph S., Jr. "Representation of Economic Interests: Report of a Conference." AAUP Bulletin, LI (September, 1968), 374-377.

Cosard, Joseph P. "Faculty Organizations--Faculty-Administrator Relationships." North Central Association Quarterly, XLII (Winter, 1968), 256-258.

Davis, Bertram H. "Unions and Higher Education: Another View." Educational Record, IL (Spring, 1968), 139-144.

Day, James, and Fisher, William. "The Professor and Collective Negotiations." School and Society, XCV (April, 1967), 226-229.

Doherty, Robert E., ed. Employer-Employee Relations in the Public Schools. Ithaca: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1967.

_____. The Changing Employment Relationship in Public Schools. Ithaca: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1966.

Doherty, Robert E., and Oberer, Walter E. Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining: A Changing of the Guard. New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University. Ithaca: Cayuga Press, 1967.

ERIC/CEA Supplement--Collective Negotiations in Education. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968.

Erickson, Donald A. "A Fast Express Named 'Militance.'" The North Central Association Quarterly, XLII (Winter, 1968), 229-230.

Ferguson, Tracy H. "Collective Bargaining in Universities and Colleges." Labor Law Journal, XIX (December, 1968), 778-804.

Furr, Robert N., and Welsh, Huber M. "Board Members View PN." Michigan Education Journal (February, 1969), 18-19.

Garrison, Roger. Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Giese, Don, and Simmons, Gerald. "PN Accord Gained by Fourteen Schools." Michigan Education Journal, XLII (December, 1964), 6-7, 41.

Good, Carter V. Introduction to Educational Research. 2d ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Grant, Philip A., Jr. "Unionism in Higher Education." Labor Today, VII (Fall, 1968), 24-28.

Hannan, Cecil J. "Professional Negotiations for Improving Education." NEA Journal, LV (December, 1966), 56-57.

Heim, Peggy. "Growing Tensions in Academic Administration." North Central Association Quarterly, XLII (Winter, 1968), 244-251.

Howe, Ray A. "Collective Bargaining and Its Portents for Higher Education." Address delivered at the 1968 conference for community college leaders sponsored by the Midwest Community College Leadership Council, East Lansing, Michigan, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "Collective Bargaining for Teachers." North Central States Quarterly, XLII (Winter, 1968), 252-255.

_____. "Faculty Administrative Relationships in Extremis." Junior College Journal, XXXVII (November, 1966), 14-15.

Howe, Ray, and Wildman, Wesley A. Collective Bargaining on the Campus: Two Views. Michigan Association of Colleges and Universities, 1967.

Johnson, George M. Education Law. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1969.

Kadish, Sanford H. "The Strike and the Professoriate." AAUP Bulletin, LIV (June, 1968), 160-168.

Kanzler, William H. "Professor, You Had Better Get With It." Michigan Education Journal (February, 1969), 22-23.

_____. "Why Shouldn't Professors Organize?" Michigan Education Journal (March, 1969), 22-24.

Keck, Donald. "Community College Issue No. 1: Education Decision-Making." Michigan Education Journal (October, 1968), 21-22.

Kugler, Israel. "The Union Speaks for Itself." Educational Record, IL (Fall, 1968), 414-418.

"Legal Tools for Educators: Acts 282 and 379." Michigan Education Journal, XLIII (October, 1965), 3-4.

"Legislative Gains: More School Support, Professional Recognition." Michigan Education Journal, XLIII (September, 1965), 18-19.

Lieberman, Myron. "Collective Negotiations: Status and Trends." The Education Digest, XXXIII (December, 1967), 24-26.

- Lieberman, Myron, and Moskow, Michael H. Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1966.
- Livingston, John C. "Collective Bargaining and Professionalism in Higher Education." Educational Record, XLVIII (Winter, 1968), 79-88.
- Lombardi, John. "Faculty in the Administrative Process." Junior College Journal, XXXVII (November, 1966), 9-16.
- Lutz, Frank W., and Azzarelli, Joseph J., eds. Struggle for Power in Education. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.
- Mabray, Bevars D. Labor Relations and Collective Bargaining. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1966.
- "Magazine Report on Militant Teachers." Michigan Education Journal (October, 1968), 52.
- Marmion, Harry A. "Unions and Higher Education." Educational Record, IL (Winter, 1968), 41-48.
- Michigan Association for Higher Education 1968-69 Directory. East Lansing: Michigan Education Association, 1968.
- Miller, William C. "Curricular Implications of Negotiating." Educational Leadership, XXIII (April, 1966), 533-536.
- Moskow, Michael H. Teachers and Unions. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, 1966.
- Moyess, Clyde, and Pinson, Gerald. "Collective Negotiations in Colleges and Universities." School and Society (November, 1966).
- Patterson, Thomas. "PN Spreads Across the Country." Michigan Education Journal, XLIII (September, 1965), 2.
- Perry, Charles R., and Wildman, Wesley A. The Impact of Teachers Bargaining on the Schools. Vol. IV: Collective Action by Public School Teachers. Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968.

Rarig, Emory W., Jr., ed. The Community Junior College: An Annotated Bibliography. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1966.

Rehmus, Charles M., and Wilner, Evan. The Economic Results of Teacher Bargaining: Michigan's First Two Years. Ann Arbor and Detroit: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, The University of Michigan and Wayne State University, 1968.

Roberts, Harold S. Labor Management Relations in the Public Service: Part 6. Hawaii: Industrial and Relations Center, University of Hawaii, 1968.

Schmidt, Charles T., Jr.; Parker, Hyman; and Repas, Bob. A Guide to Collective Negotiations in Education. East Lansing: Social Science Research Bureau, Michigan State University, 1967.

School Administrators View Professional Negotiations. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1966.

Shils, Edward B., and Whittier, C. Taylor. Collective Bargaining in Private Industry in the United States Compared to the Present Status of Collective Negotiations in Public Education. New York: Crowell Company, 1968.

Stanbury, Donald E. "A Study of the Administration of Michigan Junior Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

"Summary of Bills." Michigan Education Journal, XLIII (September, 1965), 20-21.

Summary of Community College Salary Schedules and Selected Provisions from Community College Agreements: 1968-1969. East Lansing: Michigan Education Association, 1968.

Swenson, Norman, and Novar, Leon. "Chicago City College Teachers Strike." Junior College Journal, XXXVII (March, 1967), 19-22.

"Talking It Out." Newsweek, December 2, 1968.

Teacher-School Board Negotiations: A Bibliography. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappan, Inc., 1968.

"Teachers Will Negotiate." Michigan Education Journal,
XLIII (September, 1965), 5.

Trenholm, Ronald B. "The Superintendent's Role in Teacher Negotiations as Perceived by School Board Chairmen and Representatives of Teacher Groups." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Colorado State College, 1968.

Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1966.

Warner, Kenneth O., ed. Collective Bargaining in the Public Service: Theory and Practice. Chicago: Public Personnel Association, 1967.

"Where the Action is Now--Junior and Community Colleges." Michigan Education Journal (March, 1967), 10-13.

Wildman, Wesley A. "What's Negotiable?" The American School Board Journal (November, 1967).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PERSONS INTERVIEWED FOR THE STUDY

APPENDIX A

PERSONS INTERVIEWED FOR THE STUDY

Alpena Community College

Maynard N. Cohen, President
Board of Education

E. Jack Petoskey, President

Charles Newman, Chairman
College Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Flint Community Junior College

Elmer A. Knopf, Member
Board of Education

Charles R. Donnelly, President

William Bednar, Chairman
College Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Grand Rapids Junior College

David E. Post, President
Board of Education

Francis J. McCarthy,
Dean

Harvey Meygaard, Chairman
Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Henry Ford Community College

Frank S. Gallagher, Member
Board of Education

James O. McCann, President

George Yee, Chairman
Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Highland Park College

Kathleen Bright, President
Board of Education

Paul H. Jones, Dean

James K. Shirley, Chairman
College Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Jackson Community College

Robert D. Gifford, Vice-
President, Board of Educa-
tion

Richard F. Whitmore,
Director

Clayton Hallett, Chairman
Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Kellogg Community College

Robert D. Gifford, Vice-
President, Board of Education

Richard F. Whitmore
Director

Robert Secrist, Chairman
Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Lake Michigan College

Robert P. Small, Chairman
Board of Trustees

James L. Lehman, President

Wendell Yale, Chairman
Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Macomb County Community
College

Max M. Thompson, Chairman
Board of Trustees

John R. Dimitry,
President

Ildi Knott, Chairman
Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Muskegon County Community
College

Lionel L. Booth, Chairman
Board of Trustees

Ralph A. Austermiller,
President

Mark Gustafson, Chairman
Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Oakland Community College

George R. Mosher, Chairman
Board of Trustees

Stanley Hergenroeder,
Provost

Gerald Faye, Chairman
Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Schoolcraft College

Harold E. Fischer, Chairman
Board of Trustees

Eric J. Bradner, President

Fernon Feenstra, Chairman
Faculty Negotiating
Committee

Washtenaw Community
College

Evart W. Ardis, Chairman
Board of Trustees

Frank Dypold, Head Nego-
tiator Administration

Merrill McClatchey, Chairman
Faculty Negotiating
Committee

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

FACULTY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

TOPIC I - DEVELOPMENT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

1. In your opinion, why did the faculty at your college decide to collectively negotiate their contracts?

2. I have a list of factors which may or may not have contributed to this development. Would you please indicate whether you think each of these was:

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Very important | 3. Not important |
| 2. Somewhat important | 4. No opinion or undecided |

in contributing to the collective bargaining movement in your college.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| (1) Enactment of Michigan Public Act No. 379 in 1965 making it lawful for public employees to collectively negotiate. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (2) Being a part of a K-12 district whose teachers wanted to collectively negotiate their contracts. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (3) A feeling on the part of the faculty that there was a lack of communication and/or understanding between them and the administration. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (4) A desire on the part of the faculty to be more involved in the institution's decision making. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (5) A feeling on the part of the faculty that teaching loads were too heavy. | 1 2 3 4 |

- | | |
|---|---------|
| (6) A "union orientation" of faculty resulting from close proximity to strong labor unions in Detroit and other cities. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (7) A feeling on the part of the faculty that the president was making too many unilateral decisions. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (8) A desire for higher salaries and fringe benefits by faculty. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (9) The assistance and encouragement of the MEA or AFT. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (10) A very limited number of faculty who sold the idea of collective negotiations to other faculty. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (11) Dissatisfaction among faculty with the handling of their grievances. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (12) A desire on the part of the faculty to establish their independence from the administration. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (13) A desire for more academic freedom in the classroom. | 1 2 3 4 |
| (14) | 1 2 3 4 |
| (15) | 1 2 3 4 |
| (16) | 1 2 3 4 |
| (17) | 1 2 3 4 |

3. Were most of the leaders in the movement:

- | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| ____(a) older | ____(a) men |
| ____(b) younger | ____(b) younger |
| ____(c) mixed | ____(c) some of each |

4. About what proportion of the faculty do you think were in favor of collective bargaining when the bargaining unit was formed?

TOPIC II - OUTCOMES

1. In your opinion, what have been the most significant outcomes of collective bargaining in your institution?

- (1) Affect on Faculty
- (2) Faculty working conditions
- (3) Faculty professional growth
- (4) Faculty involvement in decision making
- (5) Faculty - Administrative Relationship
- (6) Financial - Faculty
- (7) Financial - College
- (8) President's role
- (9) Board's role
- (10) Community reaction

2. In your opinion, what are the most desirable outcomes of collective bargaining at your college? If you feel there are no particularly desirable outcomes, let me know and we will go on to the next question.

☐ No desirable outcomes

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

3. In your opinion, what are the most undesirable outcomes of collective bargaining at your college? If you feel there are no particularly undesirable outcomes, let me know and we will go on to the next question.

☐ No undesirable outcomes

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

4. All things considered, do you think collective bargaining in your college has been a good thing?

TOPIC III - FUTURE OF COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

1. In your opinion, what will be the major outcomes of collective bargaining in your college within the next three to five years.

(1)

(2)

- (3)
- (4)
- (5)
- (6)
- (7)
- (8)
- (9)
- (10)

2. What do you think are the chances of a faculty strike occurring in your college within the next three to five years?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Definitely will occur | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. A fair chance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. A good chance | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Probably will not occur |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Undecided | |

3. Do you think the chances of a strike are lessening or increasing or is there no change?

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Lessening | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. No change |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Increasing | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Undecided |

4. Do you think there will be a state-wide master contract for community college instructors within the next five years?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes, definitely | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Probably not |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes, probably | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Definitely not |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Undecided | |

5. Do you think it will be necessary to depend on the state for an increased portion of your college's operating funds in the next five years?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes, definitely | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Probably not |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes, probably | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Definitely not |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Undecided | |

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW CONFIRMATION LETTER

2704 Rockwood Drive
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

January 17, 1969

Mr. John Smith
Glendale Community College
Glendale, Michigan

Dear Mr. Smith:

I am pleased that you have agreed to participate in the study I am conducting on faculty collective negotiations in Michigan Community Colleges.

Although no particular preparation is needed ahead of time, the following questions will give you a general idea of the kinds of topics I plan to discuss with you. The information which you give me will be held in strictest confidence and will not be identified with you or the college.

In your opinion:

1. Why did the faculty at your college decide to collectively negotiate their contracts?
2. What have been the most significant outcomes of collective negotiations in your institution? What do you feel are the most desirable and the most undesirable of these outcomes?
3. What will be the major outcomes of collective negotiations in your institution within the next three to five years?

To confirm our appointment, we will meet at 10:30 a.m., January 21, in your office. I hope you can reserve about an hour for the interview. If for any reason you find it impossible to meet with me at that time, please call me collect. My telephone number at work is A.C. 517 373-3820 and at home you may contact me at A.C. 517 351-6356.

Again, I am most appreciative of your cooperation and I look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely yours,

Charles A. Shoup