

AAUP NEWS

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS - INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON CHAPTER

Number 4

January, 1977

AAUP REPORT ON PROMOTION AND TENURE

Part I - The Present System at I.U., Bloomington

[Part II - Recommendations for Reform - will be published in the next newsletter]

1. Sources - The principal sources for the standards and procedures applicable to promotion and tenure decisions are the Academic Handbook, memoranda issued by administrative officers such as the Vice President and Dean of Faculties, and the "Statement on Criteria for Tenure", adopted by the Faculty Council in 1974. Each department (or, in the case of small schools, each school) has its own standards, sometimes largely a matter of practice. Pursuant to Faculty Council resolution, all chairpersons and deans are required to "describe in writing the procedures used in that department, school, or college to implement the Handbook guidelines in arriving at regulations concerning tenure." Descriptions of each unit's procedures and criteria are on file at the Reference Desk of the Graduate Library, and faculty members are entitled to obtain a copy from their chairperson or dean for their own use.

[continued on page 2]

THIRD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING WORKSHOP
SCHEDULED FOR JAN. 18, 8 P.M. IN
BALLANTINE HALL ROOM 148

The third workshop on collective bargaining this academic year will be held Tuesday, Jan. 18, 1977 at 8 p.m. in Ballantine Hall, room 148. The main topic for discussion concerns prospects in the Indiana state legislature for a law providing for collective bargaining by university faculties. Like previous workshops, this coming one will be open to all interested people.

EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING

The Executive Board of the AAUP will meet following the collective bargaining workshop. Board meetings are open, and anyone is invited to attend and to make suggestions for topics to be considered.

HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION RECOMMENDS FACULTY BEAR BRUNT OF BUDGET CUTS

Last month the State Budget Committee recommended that the legislature appropriate \$576 million for operation of the six state-supported institutions of higher education during the next two years. This amount is considerably less than the sum of the figures proposed by the universities. It is also less than the amount recommended earlier by the Indiana Higher Education Commission (IHEC).

Working with the figure of \$576 million, IHEC made new recommendations as to how the money should be spent. If IHEC's proposals are adopted, Indiana University would get an average increase of about 8.4% per year for so-called fixed costs, but faculty salaries would go up only an average of about 2.3% per year for the two years. In

[continued on page 5]

2

AAUP REPORT ON PROMOTION AND TENURE [continued]

2. Application of standards - At IU there are no quotas as to the number of persons who can be granted tenure or promotion to any rank. The Handbook states that, to attain tenure and promotion, the faculty member "should normally excel" in one of the three areas of "teaching," "research/creative activity," and "service" and must be "satisfactory" in two of such areas.

a. Variations in application of criteria - The Handbook contains rather general descriptions of "criteria for promotion" under the three areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service (pp. 57-8). The 1974 Faculty Council "Statement" provides that these sections also apply to the faculty member being considered for tenure. The 1976-77 "Guidelines, checklist, and resolutions pertaining to Promotion and Tenure" from the Dean of Faculties states that "all non-tenured faculty members should remember that no dean or chairperson may abrogate the basic requirements for tenure and promotion which have been established." However, the Handbook and Faculty Council resolutions have made clear that the individual mission of the department or school must be taken into account in applying the criteria.

b. Need for candidates to inform themselves of standards - It is up to individual faculty members to find out what the department's or school's missions are and what it stresses and expects in the way of excellence and adequacy. Recent information is essential; a department or school that in the past has placed emphasis on teaching may now emphasize research or service. The faculty member should also find out how the department gets along with higher echelons in the university system. For example, if the department has not been successful in recent years in its recommendations for promotion and tenure, the faculty member should attempt to discover why (and, again, from reliable authority).

3. Evaluation of teaching - The Handbook provides that "recommendations for an individual's promotion should include evidence drawn from such sources as the collective judgment of students, of student counselors, and of colleagues who have visited other classes or who have been closely associated with his or her teaching as supervisor or in some other capacity, or who have taught the same students in subsequent courses." (pp. 57-8) Candidates should inquire of their chairperson or dean as to the sources to be used and suggest additional sources which they believe will provide an accurate picture of their teaching record and potential.

a. Colleague evaluation - Visitation to classes and public lectures is one method of colleague evaluation. However, video tapes of classes are increasingly being relied upon since they provide a permanent record which can be viewed by all colleagues and can be rechecked in case of differing recollections. They also provide a mechanism for having professors or experts outside of the department or the university evaluate teaching. Requests by candidates to send tapes of their classes for outside evaluation should normally be complied with. Teaching outlines and materials may be fruitful sources of colleague evaluation of teaching potential. The 1976 "Comments about Dossiers" from the Dean of Faculties, discussing factors deemed important by the Campus Promotions and Tenure Committees, stated that "curricular developments and innovative pedagogical methods often were described." It also noted that diversity of teaching experience both as to class size and course type/level was often found when an outstanding rating was given.

b. Student evaluation - A readily available source of student evaluation is the end-of-course evaluation used in many departments and schools. However, this is not the definitive word on teaching and should normally be supplemented by other sources. Methods of sampling student opinion have included interviews with students selected randomly or according to criteria designed to obtain a representative cross-section; responses to letters sent to all students (past and/or present) enrolled in a particular course or all of the candidate's courses; and letters which have resulted from a routine request by the chairperson or dean to all graduating seniors that they write evaluations of faculty members they have had while in school.

4. Evaluation of research - In some schools creative activity and performances are an important aspect of research; in others, research is essentially synonymous with publications. (However, certain publications which are closely related to teaching or service functions may be considered under those categories rather than research). The Handbook provides: "In most of the fields represented in the program of the University, publications in media of quality are expected as evidence of scholarly interest pursued independently of supervision or direction." (p. 58) It further states that "an original contribution of a creative nature" is as significant as a scholarly publication. (p.58)

a. Quantity of publications - The Handbook notes that "quality of production is considered more important than mere quantity" and that "significant evidence of scholarly merit may be either a single work of considerable importance or a series of studies constituting a general program of worthwhile research." (p. 58) However, a single work that is short of a "magnum opus" is not likely to suffice. Candidates should be aware that departments and schools generally have notions as to how many publications satisfy minimal requirements for research and that one of the most frequently given reasons for denials of promotion and tenure has been paucity of publications. The Dean of Faculties "Comments About Dossiers" stated that the "committees did expect a correlation between the number of years in rank and the total volume of research." Although the Handbook does not so state, promotion and tenure committees seem to apply the following rule of thumb: When considering candidates for promotion, only research since the last promotion will be considered, and only that which has been completed and accepted for publication at the time of the committee's review. On the other hand, when the consideration is for tenure, all research during the candidate's full tenure track career, including research in progress, will be considered.

b. Quality of research - Quality of research is generally based on evaluations by colleagues and outside referees in the same field. The status and reputation of the publication, and whether or not it is "refereed", is also an important consideration. In cases of tenure and promotion to full professor on the Bloomington campus, candidates are asked to suggest names of qualified persons in the field, and the dean will write a number of these persons, plus additional persons, to request confidential evaluations of the research. Candidates should insure that the names of evaluators they provide have sufficient reputation or qualifications that their opinion will be accorded weight by their colleagues. Candidates should also request that evaluations be obtained from colleagues who are in the same field or are familiar with their work. A significant evaluation of the quality of research is that made by one's own colleagues in the vote of the faculty (or tenured faculty). It is a fact that only rarely is a negative vote of a faculty overturned at the university level.

5. Evaluation of Service - Service seems to be the least consistent criterion. To faculty in Arts and Sciences, it is often satisfied by taking one's turn on departmental, college, and university committees. In other schools, such as Business, Education, HPER, and Law, it may involve a regular, and time-consuming relationship with private, governmental or professional organizations. The Dean of Faculties' "Comments About Dossiers" stated that "busy work did not impress the committees" and that the quality of the service contribution was also stressed. Leadership positions, editorships, and "noteworthy consultative and educational efforts for professional groups" were specifically mentioned. Although it is often said that an outstanding in service alone is not sufficient for tenure or promotion to full professor in many departments and schools, favorable decisions have been based on only an outstanding in service. But candidates should understand that the other two categories must be adequate and that service activities can be a drain on time and energy needed to achieve adequacy in other categories.

6. Preparation of Dossier - A checklist provided by the Dean of Faculties serves as an important guide to the candidate and the unit as to what materials should be contained in the dossier. The Handbook states that candidates should be notified that they may, within a properly specified and reasonable period of time, submit materials relevant to the consideration of their professional qualifications. (p. 25, ¶13.a.) The dossier is the heart of the evaluation process. A 1976 memorandum from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences states that the college promotion and tenure committee "is obliged to base its recommendation to the Dean in each case only on the written information contained in the dossier." The candidate should not remain passive during the preparation of the dossier and should be actively involved in its preparation at all stages. Our recommendation is that candidates personally keep a file for possible inclusion in their dossiers, to such records as bibliographies, students' and colleagues' evaluations of teaching, syllabi and exams, letters of support regarding service, published articles and books, papers in typewritten script delivered at conferences, praise or evaluation of publications, and expressions of recognition of their reputation.

7. Procedures upon adverse recommendation for tenure - The Handbook provides that the candidate shall be notified "as soon as possible of any decision by a department, school, program, or division not to recommend reappointment or tenure." (p. 25, ¶13.b.)

a. Right to be notified of reasons - Upon the first receipt of notice of a negative recommendation, whether at the departmental or school level, the candidate may request "an oral explanation from his or her principal administrative officer." (p. 25, ¶14.a.) This is perhaps the most crucial moment in a negative tenure case, and candidates should seek a comprehensive explanation of the reasons so they can make a reasoned judgment as to whether to request further supplementation of the dossier or reconsideration. The Dean of Faculties office interprets an ambiguous provision in the Handbook providing that candidates may request a written statement of reasons "within 30 days of notification of non-reappointment" as applying when the first notice of a negative recommendation at any level is received. (p. 25, ¶13.b.c.) Thus candidates can request written reasons, which must reflect their qualifications and the unit's needs (¶13.c.), if they have first sought the reasons orally.

b. Supplementation and reconsideration - The Handbook provides that "the faculty member who believes that a recommendation or a decision that he or she not be reappointed has resulted from inadequate consideration of professional competence or erroneous information may offer corrections and request reconsideration at the level at which the decision not to recommend reappointment was first made." (p. 26, ¶4.d.) Experience has shown that reconsideration can result in reversal of a negative decision. Favorable information may not have been adequately brought to the attention of the candidate's tenured colleagues, and thus a more effective case may be made on reconsideration. The Handbook provides no specific procedures for the conduct of a reconsideration. However, in order for it to be more than a mere formality, it should be a full and complete rehearing by all faculty members who participated in the original decision.

c. Right to notification and reasons upon adverse decision by the University - The Handbook provides that a candidate "shall be notified within stated deadlines of a decision by the University not to reappoint him or her." (p. 25, ¶3.b.) Within 30 days after being notified of the university's decision, the candidate may request a written statement of reasons for non-reappointment from "the appropriate administrative officer." (p. 25-6, ¶4.a.) "The statement of reasons should reflect careful consideration of the qualifications of the faculty member in terms of the professional standards and needs of his or her department, school, program, or division, or of the University." (p. 26, ¶4.c.) A conclusory statement of reasons which simply states that the candidate was not outstanding in certain categories or paraphrases the criteria for tenure in the Handbook would not seem to satisfy this requirement.

d. Petition to the Faculty Board of Review - The Handbook provides that a faculty member may petition the Faculty Board of Review for a review of the procedures followed in his or her case." (p. 26, ¶4.g.) This apparently only contemplates petition to the Faculty Board of Review in a tenure case after all of the administrative channels (i.e., department, school, and university) have acted on the case. The provisions in the Bloomington Faculty Constitution concerning the Faculty Board of Review have been supplemented by provisions adopted by the Faculty Council in 1975 and 1976 and by provisions in the Academic Handbook. (p. 26-7, ¶4.e.-j.) In several cases since 1974, the Board recommended that the petitioner be allowed to see material in the dossier, and copies (including letters of recommendation and evaluation with names and other identifying information excised) were shown to petitioner's counsel. Although the Handbook provides for Board "review of the procedures employed in the decision" (p. 26, ¶4.e.), the Board in some cases has considered claims that the denial of tenure and findings in support thereof were not supported by "substantial evidence" in the dossier.

IEEC RECOMMENDS FACULTY BEAR BURST OF BUDGET CUTS [continued]

other words, faculty salaries are regarded as the principal flexible item in IU's budget. For this reason, when a cut has to be made somewhere, it usually is made at the expense of the faculty.

In these inflationary times, a 2.3% increase for faculty members is a

cut in their real incomes. For several years now, faculty income at IU has failed to match the rise in the cost of living. Unless faculty members unite to protest the fact that their salaries are among the lowest priority items of the budget, they can look forward to continued erosion of their standard of living.

Indiana University, Bloomington Chapter

[Members must be members of the National AAUP]

To: Oleg Kudryk, Library E350

Enclosed are my \$5.00 dues for membership in the IU, Bloomington Chapter of the AAUP.

Name: _____

Department/School: _____

The American Association of University Professors

National Office: One Dupont Circle, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20036

Application for Membership

For AAUP Use

--	--	--	--

I AM APPLYING FOR

ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

GRADUATE STUDENT MEMBERSHIP

THIS IS A

NEW APPLICATION

APPLICATION FOR REINSTATEMENT

Name _____
Last First Middle

Institution _____ Department _____

Institutional Address _____

Preferred Mailing Address _____

Street and Number, or Postoffice _____
City State Zip

For AAUP Use

--	--	--	--

Academic Field _____

(Membership dues in the AAUP are normally tax deductible for members of the profession.)

On the basis of my academic year salary, my annual dues are (check one)

\$17.00 (below \$8,000) \$30.00 (\$7,000-\$14,999)

\$18.00 (\$8,000-\$9,999) \$36.00 (\$15,000 and above)

\$24.00 (\$10,000-\$11,999) \$ 5.00 (Graduate Student Membership)

PLEASE INCLUDE PAYMENT WITH APPLICATION, AND MAKE CHECK PAYABLE TO THE AAUP

FOR ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP OR REINSTATEMENT:

Academic Rank _____

Date of Appointment _____

FOR GRADUATE STUDENT MEMBERSHIP:

Please indicate graduate degrees already awarded and any expected.

Institution	Degree	Date

Signature _____

This Mailing Sponsored By A.A.U.P.