

# AAUP NEWS

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS - INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON CHAPTER

Number 5

March, 1977

## DOES INDIANA UNIVERSITY REGARD YOUR YEARS OF SERVICE AS MERITORIOUS?

"Now here, you see, it takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place."

Lewis Carroll in  
Through the Looking-Glass

The 1976 edition of the Academic Handbook contains the sentence, "salary adjustments are based on merit; across-the-board increases are not utilized at Indiana University."

To discover whether Indiana University regards your service as meritorious, you presumably need only look at your salary from year to year to see whether it goes up or down, and by how much. Unfortunately, because of inflation, this is not as easy as it seems. For example, a 1967 dollar was worth only 59 cents in 1976. To aid you in deciding whether Indiana University thinks you have served with merit, we present the following deflator to take into account the change in the value of the dollar during the last 10 years.

| Multiply your 1967-68 salary _____ | by 1.00 equals _____ |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 68-69 _____                        | x .96 = _____        |
| 69-70 _____                        | x .91 = _____        |
| 70-71 _____                        | x .86 = _____        |
| 71-72 _____                        | x .82 = _____        |
| 72-73 _____                        | x .80 = _____        |
| 73-74 _____                        | x .75 = _____        |
| 74-75 _____                        | x .68 = _____        |
| 75-76 _____                        | x .62 = _____        |
| 76-77 _____                        | x .59 = _____        |

(Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Labor Review. The numbers given are the reciprocals of the consumer price index for the years 1967 through 1976.)

A raise in salary which does not exceed the increase in the cost of living is clearly not a real increase in income. All faculty and librarians who are doing their jobs in a satisfactory way should get cost-of-living increases. A merit increase should be regarded as an increase in salary beyond what is necessary to keep up with the cost of living. The AAUP is working for this goal. If you agree with our position, join us and help make our voice stronger. Application form on page 8.

NEWS OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND OTHER  
NEWS STORIES [See p. 2]

AAUP REPORT ON PROMOTION AND TENURE -  
PART II - RECOMMENDATIONS [See p.3]

#### BUTLER FACULTY TURNS DOWN UNION

The faculty of Butler University voted two-to-one against a proposal to be represented by a union. A few days before the vote, university president Alexander Jones suddenly resigned. The new acting president Paul Stewart appealed to the faculty to vote against the union, promising to work to improve conditions at Butler. Some faculty members said they voted against the union to give the new administration a chance. It will be at least one year before another bargaining election may be held. Votes on collective bargaining at Butler, a private institution, are conducted under rules of the National Labor Relations Board.

#### ARTS AND SCIENCES LOSES 22 FACULTY POSITIONS

It was recently announced that the College of Arts and Sciences is losing 22 full-time faculty positions. The reason, we are told, is that actual student enrollment in the College this year was less than the projected enrollment. The AAUP takes the position that an excellent College of Arts and Sciences is central to the university. The number of faculty should not be tied strictly to enrollment, but should also take into account important teaching and research programs of the College.

However, even the enrollment argument cannot be used to justify the latest cut in the number of A and S faculty. Last year, when enrollment was projected to increase, the number of faculty was increased less than a proportionate amount. But when the projected enrollment increase failed to materialize, the faculty was cut proportionately, leading to a net decline in the number of faculty without a net decline in the number of students. It appears as if two-way fluctuations in projected enrollments are being used as an excuse to change the number of the A and S faculty in one way only--down.

#### WEAKENED COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BILL REPORTED FROM HOUSE COMMITTEE

The bill to permit collective bargaining for faculty members at public universities in Indiana was recently sent to the floor by the House Education Committee after a series of weakening amendments. One of these would limit bargaining units to only one for each institution. This amendment was supported by IU President John Ryan, but opposed by the AAUP.

Another amendment limits bargaining to wages, salaries, hours, and pay-related fringe benefits. The AAUP believes that there should be the right to bargain over "other conditions of employment," as specified in the original version. Still another amendment outlaws strikes. The AAUP does not oppose this amendment, as it believes that no bill permitting strikes could be passed.

In regard to the bargaining unit, President Ryan has argued that bargaining on individual campuses would jeopardize

[continued on page 8]

#### SHERMAN CALLS FOR HIGHER FACULTY MINIMUM SALARIES

The Bloomington AAUP advocates that the minimum salaries in faculty and librarian ranks be raised. Ed Sherman, President of the Bloomington chapter, in a letter to the Budgetary Affairs Committee of the Bloomington Faculty Council, stated that present minima are too modest to provide a realistic starting point for the calculation of individual salaries--especially since present administration policy provides for exceptions to the minima. Sherman further stated that although some portion of next year's and every year's salary should be devoted to merit increases, a portion should also be earmarked for the purpose of raising minimum salaries to levels appropriate for professional persons.

## AAUP REPORT ON PROMOTION AND TENURE

## Part II - Recommendations for Reform

The AAUP believes that the Academic Handbook, administrative directives, and practices followed at various levels of the campus which govern promotion and tenure are insufficient to provide fair standards and procedures. We therefore propose the following recommendations for reform.

1. Maintenance of files and preparation of dossiers

a. Access to files and records in chairperson's or dean's office - We believe that faculty members should have access to all files or records relating to them in a chairperson's or dean's office. There would seem to be no reason to keep the memos, letters, or other materials in a file which would not be available to the faculty member whom they concern. If the material is favorable, it would surely do no harm for faculty members to see it. If it is unfavorable, faculty members should have knowledge of it so that they may make an appropriate response, if they desire to do so. Only in this way can faculty members be protected against the possibility that adverse decisions might be made on the basis of incorrect information.

b. Denial of access as to appointment file and recommendation letters requested under expectation of confidentiality - We believe that a chairperson or dean may exercise the discretion to deny a faculty member access to a file prepared in connection with that member's initial appointment and to copies of any letters of recommendation concerning that member written by the chairperson or dean at the member's request under the shared expectation that they would be confidential. However, these materials should not be used for any purpose other than that for which they were created.

c. Notification of unsolicited negative communications - Sometimes unsolicited letters or other communications--from students, other faculty members, or third parties--are received by a chairperson or dean. Faculty members should be notified immediately as to the contents of any such communications and be given full opportunity to respond. However, we would distinguish between non-written negative comments of a general nature--such as the comment of a student that a teacher is "dull" or "a poor lecturer"--and written or oral complaints of a particular nature deemed to have significant adverse potential in the consideration of tenure, promotion, or salary--such as that a teacher has "not met classes" or has "made sexual advances towards a student." In the latter case, it is important that the teacher know of the accusation immediately and have an opportunity to respond to it. In the former case, a conscientious chairperson would probably be wise to inform the faculty member, who may then attempt to improve, but it is less critical that notice and an opportunity to respond be given immediately.

A difficult issue is whether a faculty member should be informed as to the identity of the accuser. Our society does not look with favor on anonymous accusers, and the identity of the writer may be essential for the faculty member to be able to evaluate the charge and respond to it adequately. However, the possibility that a faculty member could attempt to retaliate against a student

for submitting such a letter might prevent many students from bringing important information to chairpersons and deans if their names were disclosed. For this reason, we favor not revealing the identity of the writer of a negative communication if that person is a student, but revealing such identity in all other cases.

d. Annual Review - The Academic Handbook provides that all non-tenured faculty members "shall receive an annual review of professional performance" by the "principal administrative officer of the department, school, program, or division" as to "all matters relevant to eligibility for reappointment and the award of tenure" (p. 25). It also provides that the faculty member shall cooperate "to insure that the file on which such a review is based contains all relevant materials." The annual review letter, which must be in writing with a copy given to the faculty member, is an important document; from it the faculty member begins to know the relationship between individual potential and departmental expectation. The quality of the annual review has varied widely among department chairpersons and deans. Given the natural human reluctance to convey unfavorable information to a subordinate, some administrators have not provided the kind of candid and comprehensive review which is necessary both to give faculty members notice so that they can attempt to improve and to enable them to respond, if desired, to negative evaluations which they consider unfair.

Unfortunately, a consequence of placing greater emphasis upon the annual review may be that chairpersons or deans will tend to be more cautious in the wording of their review letters. If they praise a faculty member highly in an early review letter, it may be more difficult to support a later negative decision as to promotion or tenure. The result may be that annual reviews will contain fewer glowing generalities and more negative information than in the past. However, the annual review need not degenerate into simply a preparation of legal support for future negative action. A sensitive chairperson will attempt to give a fair and objective assessment of both strengths and weaknesses. We believe that the Dean of Faculties' office should establish procedures for monitoring compliance with annual review requirements which go beyond the present requirement that chairpersons certify that the reviews have been conducted.

e. Access to promotion or tenure dossier during preparation - We believe that candidates should have access to the dossier at all reasonable times during its preparation, with the exception of letters of evaluation or recommendation which were solicited under a promise of confidentiality. It is important that candidates actually see the physical documents, for this will give them a sense of how the dossier will be perceived by others and could remind them of other materials which would be persuasive. Candidates obviously have the best knowledge of their own records and are in the best position to appreciate whether the dossier adequately presents the case. No matter how well-meaning another faculty member is in preparing a dossier, the assistance and supervision of the candidate is necessary.

f. Right to respond to or augment material in the dossier - Access to the dossier will acquaint candidates with any misleading, incomplete, or negative information (through all sources other than evaluations solicited under promise of confidentiality, which may not be seen by the candidate). Candidates then should be entitled to add their responses to anything contained in the dossier.

g. Access to the dossier upon its completion at the departmental level and at all times when material is added - Candidates should be allowed to see the final product of the dossier preparation when it is completed at the departmental level and is ready to be viewed by faculty members. They should also be allowed to see any additional materials added at any future time at any level (again, with the one exception of evaluation letters solicited under a promise of confidentiality).

2. Procedures at the departmental or school level for promotion or tenure

a. Application of Handbook provisions to promotion, as well as tenure, cases - The provisions as to notice and review of tenure and nonreappointment decisions now contained in the Handbook (p. 26-8, ¶3-4) should be made expressly applicable to promotion cases.

b. Requirement that faculty members have read the file as a pre-requisite for voting - There have been complaints in the past that individual faculty members have not read the file prior to voting. Familiarity with the file, including a reading of key letters and memoranda, should be a prerequisite for voting.

c. Giving of reasons for their vote by faculty members - Some departments have adopted procedures requiring each voting member to give his or her reasons in writing to the chairperson or dean within a certain period of time after the voting, for example 24 hours. An advantage of this procedure is that each member is forced to justify his or her vote, thus reducing the possibility of an arbitrary or capricious decision. It also provides a check against decisions being based on incorrect information, improper considerations, or prejudicial or discriminatory factors. On the other hand, there are also drawbacks to the procedure. It would require each member to submit a sort of judicial opinion which would be time-consuming, and when the reasons given differ from member to member, the total vote might be suspect. It could also lead to giving of reasons which are not the real reasons for the vote, creating a sham formality. In balance, we believe that requirement of reasons by voting members should be left up to each department or school. However, it is desirable that faculty members provide an explanation for their view of the case, and thus individual faculty members should be encouraged to provide memos which would be placed in the file. These memos should be given the same protection as evaluations solicited under a promise of confidentiality. They should not be used for any personnel action other than the immediate one for which they were intended.

d. Notification of negative faculty vote or a sizable number of negative votes by the faculty - We believe that a candidate should be notified as soon as is reasonably possible of either a negative faculty vote or a favorable vote with a sizable number of negative votes. In either case, it is important that candidates know of this development so that they can appraise the situation to determine whether to supplement the file or request a reconsideration. Notification should be given even if the chairperson or dean recommends favorably.

e. Access to the file upon negative faculty vote or a sizable number of negative votes - We believe that the candidate should have access to his complete file upon notification of either a negative faculty vote or a favorable vote with a sizable number of negative votes. Such access should include letters of evaluation solicited under a promise of confidentiality, but with names and other identifying information inked out to protect confidentiality. If

confidentiality cannot be maintained by taking out names and other identifying information, the chairperson or dean may instead provide a summary of the information in any such letter. It is to be noted that excised copies of confidential letters may be obtained by the candidate at the Faculty Board of Review level and, most likely, through discovery in a federal court action. We believe that candidates should also have access to such material upon notice of a negative faculty vote or a sizable number of negative votes in order that they may take appropriate steps to supplement the file or respond to adverse information. If this were the rule, schools and departments might want to inform persons from whom evaluations are requested of the degree of access under our regulations.

f. Statement of reasons for negative recommendation - Upon receiving notice of a negative recommendation at the lowest administrative level, the candidate may request "an oral explanation from his or her principal administrative officer." (p. 26, ¶4.a.) The oral giving of reasons by a department chairperson has often proved to be unsatisfactory. The candidate and chairperson often have different recollections of what is said, creating unresolvable issues at any later review. The Dean of Faculties office interprets the provision in the Handbook which provides that candidates may request a written statement of reasons "within 30 days of notification of non-reappointment" (p. 26, ¶4.b.) as also applying when the first notice of a negative recommendation at any level is received so long as an oral explanation has been sought. We favor a change in the Handbook to provide an absolute right to written reasons upon notice of a negative recommendation. It should also be expressly stated that reasons should relate the factual evidence to the criteria and that mere conclusions or paraphrases of the criteria taken from the Handbook are not sufficient.

g. Recommendation based only on material in dossier - 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." We believe that this rule should be followed by committees in all schools and departments and at all levels. It should be expressly so stated in the Handbook.

h. Procedures for 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.). We see no reason to limit the right to reconsideration to the two enumerated situations and believe that, in many departments and schools, reconsideration is already considered to be an absolute right. It should be expressly so stated in the Handbook. No specific procedures for conducting a reconsideration are stated in the Handbook. We believe that it should be a full and comprehensive rehearing by all faculty members who participated in the original decision. It should be appropriate for the candidate to request that additional information be sought and brought before the faculty. There would also seem to be no reason that the candidate should not be allowed to address the faculty, either orally or in writing, and to present arguments or information in response to the reasons which have been provided by the dean or chairperson. The candidate should also have the right to have a representative appear before the faculty or his or her behalf. Although the Handbook does not specifically so provide, it would also seem to be appropriate for a candidate to request an explanation for a second negative recommendation upon reconsideration in order to determine whether the reasons are still the same.

i. Application to the Faculty Grievance Board on claim of improper procedures - Although the Handbook provides that faculty members may request that their department or school accord them the benefit of proper procedures, there is no provision for immediate relief at a higher level. Thus a candidate who believes that improper procedures have been followed at the departmental level has to wait until notice of denial of tenure at the university level to petition the Faculty Board of Review. The Bloomington Faculty Grievance Board would appear to be a proper forum for an interlocutory petition while the tenure process is still going on. The candidate who believes that procedures have been violated and who has not been able to obtain satisfaction from the appropriate administrative officer should be allowed to petition the Grievance Board.

j. Giving of reasons by committees above the departmental level - Although not presently required by the Handbook, committees above the departmental level should be required to make a written record of their reasons for a negative recommendation, and such reasons should be provided to the candidate upon request after notification of the adverse recommendation.

k. Mission of department or school should be taken into account - Promotion and tenure committees at higher levels (such as the College of Arts and Sciences and the University) must at times overturn favorable decisions made at lower levels; they have to serve as a check on the unwillingness of faculty members to apply the standards rigorously to a colleague whom they may like and respect. However, it is important that they do not ignore the differences and missions of each department and school. The 1974 Faculty Council "Statement on Criteria for Tenure" stated that "differences of mission between schools and departments are such that the relative weight attached to teaching, research, and service frequently vary considerably." We believe that the concern expressed by the Faculty Council that individual mission be fully taken into account by higher-level committees must be considered to be a mandate by higher-level committees.

3. Procedures of Faculty Board of Review - It should be expressly stated in the Handbook that the Faculty Board of Review has jurisdiction to consider not only "a review of the procedures employed in the decision" (p. 27, ¶4.e.), but also claims of irregularity, unfairness, discrimination, prejudice, or lack of "substantial evidence" in the dossier to support the reasons given for the denial of tenure or promotion.

FACULTY COUNCIL AGREES WITH AAUP  
PROMOTION-TENURE POLICY FOR LIBRARIANS

Last fall, the AAUP called attention to the fact that faculty and librarians were not treated equally in regard to tenure and promotion policy. At its meeting of January 18, the Bloomington Faculty Council removed the unequal policy. Beginning in 1977-78, librarians as well as faculty will be promoted to associate rank on being granted tenure if they do not already hold that rank.

AAUP SUPPORTS RECIPROCAL ARRANGEMENTS  
FOR IN-STATE FEES

At the present time, the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin have an arrangement enabling student residents of either state to attend a state university of the other while paying in-state tuition. The Bloomington AAUP is in favor of such arrangements and advocates that Indiana negotiate reciprocal arrangements with other states for in-state fees.

## SOUTH AFRICAN TO SPEAK ON RACISM

George Khotso Seatloho will talk on the racial situation in southern Africa on Thursday, March 17, at 2:30 p.m. in Whittenberger Auditorium. Seatloho is a past president of the Student Representative Council of Soweto. One of the leaders of the anti-apartheid movement, Seatloho found it necessary to flee South Africa in January of this year. He is now on a nationwide tour sponsored by the National Student Coalition Against Racism. The Bloomington AAUP is one of the cosponsors of his talk on this campus.

bargaining would hurt IU. (Schools with branches at more than one campus could be handled at one of the campuses, as is now done with promotion and tenure, or other arrangements could be made.) Another important fact is that there are recognized differences in mission at the different branches of IU, with different teaching and research duties of the faculty and different pay scales. Because of this fact, the AAUP believes that even if there were one bargaining unit, the contract would have to make provisions for these differences with little saving in time and effort. The AAUP position would not preclude a single bargaining unit for IU, but would allow the faculty on each individual campus the right to bargain collectively if it so chooses.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BILL WEAKENED  
[continued from page 2]

IU academic organization. However, promotion and tenure decisions are now made on individual campuses without threatening the organization, and the AAUP does not see why individual campus collective

The AAUP is working to restore the original language of the bill (except for the no-strike provision) before it comes to a final vote. However, as a last resort the AAUP will support even weakened bargaining legislation.

Indiana University, Bloomington Chapter

To: Oleg Kusryk, Library E350

Enclosed are my \$5.00 dues for membership in the IU, Bloomington Chapter of the AAUP. (Make check out to AAUP-IUB.)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Department/School: \_\_\_\_\_

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