September 11, 2001—a date we will always associate with the trauma inflicted on our nation and its social institutions. The casualties of the terrorist strikes included our students, alumni, and colleagues. Institutional casualties included colleges contiguous to Ground Zero. The reverberations affected us all. Students grieved, helped in rescue efforts, and gave blood, supplies, money, and service to their communities.

Some of us brought subject expertise to bear on the events of that fateful morning; others counseled students and altered service obligations. Staff and administrators worked with student and faculty leadership, and reevaluated campus security. We also reiterated our commitment to diversity. Higher education unions and associations contributed resources and expertise; NEA and AFT established the NEAFT September 11 Fund to help families of the victims, including support for the college education of their children.1

The long-term effects of September 11 on students may include shifts in courses, majors, and professions. Our foreign students pondered the effects of proposed legislation to restrict access to American campuses. Colleges may strengthen programs to protect minority students. Faculty may alter their teaching and research agendas. September 11 also affected the fiscal strength of many colleges. Post-attack budget reductions came on top of recession-related cuts.

Above all, September 11 led us to reaffirm our mission. “The academy both embodies and imparts democracy’s finest principles of intellectual freedom, reasoned inquiry, civil liberties, openness to a full range of views and experiences, and determination to comprehend issues in all their complexity,” stated the Association of American Colleges and Universities shortly after the September 11 attacks. These difficult times provide an opportunity and an obligation for us to recall and reassert these principles. Students, faculty, and staff must work to make “strength out of adversity” more than a platitude.

This year’s Almanac examines many difficult issues facing colleges and universities. How did faculty compensation fare during the 1990s? In “Faculty Salaries: Recent Trends,” Suzanne B. Clery and John B. Lee use the 1999 National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty, conducted by the US Department of
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Education, to examine determinants of salary levels. Clery and Lee explore differences in faculty salaries by gender, employment of part-time faculty members, trends in outside earnings, and the effect of collective bargaining representation on faculty salaries.

Marilyn J. Amey and Kim E. VanDerLinden, in “Merit Pay, Market Conditions, Equity, and Faculty Compensation,” provide in-depth analysis of these determinants of faculty salaries. Among their concerns: managerial discretion, faculty participation in decision-making, and maintaining faculty morale. Faculty in unionized institutions, Amey and VanDerLinden conclude, are more likely to secure salary adjustments that compensate for inequities such as salary compression where senior colleagues receive lower salaries relative to new hires—and inversion-instances where faculty of lower rank receive higher pay.

How should unions address these salary determinants? Gary Rhoades and Christine Maitland assess bargaining trends and analyze relevant clauses in NEA’s Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS). Rhoades and Maitland also update contract negotiations between the California Faculty Association and California State University and between the University of Hawaii Professional Assembly and the University of Hawaii.

Declining tax revenues, William Zumeta notes in “Higher Education in the States: Teetering on the Brink Once Again,” will result in substantial cutbacks in the budgets of public colleges and universities; many states had already cut their FY 2001 budgets by last Spring. Zumeta also discusses trends in student aid, including the shift in some states from need-based to merit-based support.

Henry L. Allen examines the effect of institutional characteristics on a central condition of faculty work in “The Organizational Demography of Faculty Tenure: 1980–2000.” Changes in key characteristics, including the size of the instructional faculty and mean operating revenues, may help to explain why colleges and universities strengthened or weakened their tenure policies during the past 20 years.

Is the faculty role in governance robust or moribund? Michael T. Miller, in “Faculty Governance Units and Their Leaders: A National Profile,” reports on a survey of faculty members and governance unit leaders. Faculty members, Miller concludes, “need to see a rational structure for involvement; faculty need to be cultivated, and faculty need to be rewarded and valued for their involvement.” With these elements in place, “faculty can take responsibility and collective action, leading to empowerment.”

Employer contributions to faculty benefits barely changed during the past four years, writes William D. Crist in “Faculty Benefits and Retirement: Fighting off the Bears.” Crist details measures NEA units and members can take to secure better benefits and retirement packages. He also discusses effects of proposed changes in Social Security on retirement planning and intergenerational competition for compensation within colleges and universities.

In “Higher Education Support Staff: The Impact of Technology,” Linda Johnsrud examines salary data for ESP’s during the mid-1990s. She then explores the ways union contracts address the impact of technology on the working conditions of these ESP’s in four areas: training, health and safety, position reclassification, and job security.

Note 1. Checks can be sent to NEA (attention Dennis Van Roekel) and made out to the NEAFT September 11 Fund. The address is 1201 16th St. NW, Washington, DC 20036. NEA also contributed the expertise of its members and staff to a September 11 website: http://www.neahin.org/september11.