

AAUP NEWS

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS - INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON CHAPTER

Vol.3, No. 2 November, 1978

AAUP POSITION ON THE EVALUATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN RYAN

In preparing this communication to the Faculty Presidential Review Committee, the IU-B AAUP Executive Committee has considered John Ryan's performance in office in terms of a number of traditionally central AAUP concerns: institutional leadership, respect for the faculty role in governance, representation of faculty views to the Trustees, academic freedom and tenure, affirmative action, and economic status.

Before addressing these issues, however, we wish to make two points about the structure and context of the evaluation as a whole. First, it is important to assert the special status of the faculty committee among the four review committees. In appointing student, alumni, and staff committees to evaluate the president, the Trustees have properly guaranteed that the views of such groups will be carefully considered. But we must emphasize that the faculty committee should be regarded as more than the fourth among four equal voices: it has a unique competence and authority in the evaluation of a chief academic officer which should be recognized at each stage of the process. The second preliminary point concerns the policy of an indefinite term of office for the president. Evaluations like the present one would have a clearer function and a stronger impact if they occurred automatically as part of a regular, scheduled process for deciding between renewal and non-renewal of the president's appointment, upon the expiration of a stated term.

Leadership: The widely accepted Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities--formulated in 1966 by the AAUP in cooperation with the

American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges--points out that a university president "is measured largely by his capacity for institutional leadership," including definition of goals and description of those goals to the internal and external publics of the university. John Ryan's performance in this area is deeply deficient. He remains a nearly-invisible managerial presence to most of the faculty and students of the institution, and he has wholly failed to provide a clear description of our goals to the Legislature, the IHEC, or the people of the State.

Governance: The period under evaluation began with two major departures from established standards of university governance. The 1974 reorganization of the University worked out by a "task force" of President Ryan's own choosing (rather than by an appropriate faculty body such as the UFC University Structure Committee) and was approved in principle by the Trustees before it was disclosed to the Faculty Councils or the faculty at large. The 1975 student fee decision was again given to a task force. In this case, however, President Ryan took the truly exceptional step of subverting his own appointed body, composing his own report even as the task force was meeting and taking his own report to the Trustees despite its overwhelming rejection by the UFC. In each case, subsequent faculty committees have had to bear the burden of clarifying the implications of an ill-judged administrative act.

President Ryan's overall performance on due-process issues--including responsiveness to the recommendations of faculty personnel and search and screen committees--has improved markedly during the past five years, and now constitutes one of the stronger points of his presidency. Nevertheless, he has continued to circumvent appropriate principles of faculty participation in his selection of numerous presidential assistants without publicity, affirmative action, or search and screen. Although President Ryan seems willing to tolerate the operations of the UFC within

a restricted system, he continues to make all decisions of substance in the closed sessions of his own Administrative Committee.

Representation of Faculty

Views: The Statement on Government-SRCE asserts that it is "incumbent on the president to insure that faculty views, including dissenting views, are presented to the board in those areas and on those issues where responsibilities are shared." The UPC Secretary has a place on the Trustees' formal agenda, but little opportunity for participation at earlier, more meaningful points. The Trustee Faculty Relations Committee has improved communication somewhat. But it has operated without John Ryan's support; and he has also shown himself unwilling to present faculty opinion on such issues as collective bargaining to the Trustees or the Legislature. Overall, he has functioned more as a representative of the Trustees to the Faculty than the Faculty to the Trustees.

Academic Freedom and Tenure:

While President Ryan has not put himself forward as an exponent of faculty rights in these areas, he has shown adequate respect for the principles involved.

Affirmative Action: Efforts at the University level have been pro forma at best. Approval of a University Affirmative Action Plan still includes no meaningful statement of objectives. The Central Administration has been totally negligent with respect to affirmative action hiring in the Athletic Program, an area falling under its immediate supervision. It has been merely passive in its response to the very pertinent issues of differential benefits for men and women faculty under TIAA-CREF.

Economic Status: The AAUP 1977-78 salary survey showed that Indiana faculty salaries have slipped to last place in the Big Ten during the past five years. Moreover, the general financial situation of the University has faltered as well. We have lacked vigorous representation before the Legislature, and the University has offered no coherent response to dis-

astrously large rate increases in telephone services, public utilities, and other areas of fixed operating expense. Physical facilities have not been properly maintained during the past five years. The library budget cannot meet all our instructional needs, and is totally inadequate for research needs.

We have concentrated on selected categories of evaluation, but together they comprise many of the most central responsibilities of the president. We find that John Ryan's performance in these categories does not merit his continuation in office.

AAUP CONVERSATIONS WITH VICE PRESIDENT O'NEIL

Will the I.U. administration lobby against collective bargaining rights for faculty in the coming legislature? Would it not ultimately benefit I.U. if the administration were to support and encourage the activities of a faculty organization such as AAUP? These were among the many questions addressed by Vice-president Robert O'Neil when he met with the local AAUP membership for a discussion over lunch on November 1st.

Summarizing a very wide-ranging discussion in difficult, but the several items were most pertinent to AAUP. The Labor Department, for example, is now reviewing responses to its proposal for mandating equal treatment under retirement programs regardless of sex, which would alter the way that TIAA-CREF operates. At this point, Vice President O'Neil suggested, neither faculty nor administration at I.U. could likely alter what emerges. The implementation of proposed changes has not yet been revealed.

Another topic was the amount of faculty time at Bloomington devoted to service on a plethora of committees. If faculty were to push for simplification of the system which has grown piecemeal, considerable savings of faculty time and energy could probably be saved. Related to this was V.-P. O'Neil's comment that promotion and tenure procedures (involving much committee time) could perhaps be improved. The Faculty Council would be the focus for generating any such changes, he suggested.

Regarding collective bargaining, V.-P. O'Neal reiterated his feeling that collective bargaining should be considered only as a last resort when other approaches to the employee-employer relationship fail. (Some AAUP members obviously feel that point has been reached). He also contended that collective bargaining does not necessarily lead to better compensation for faculty. He knows of no discussions about what stand the I.U. administration will take on collective bargaining when the new Legislature convenes. AAUP members expressed strong sentiment that the administration cannot legitimately take an "I.U. position" opposed to collective bargaining enabling legislation when an overwhelming number of the I.U. faculty signed a position supporting it just last year.

New sources of income are obviously needed for Indiana University. Besides personnel, the three major budget items are library, physical plant, and equipment and supplies. Given a particular income, no one of these major categories can be markedly increased without cutting significantly into another. After the severe budget cuts of the last few years, none of these categories contains fat. We are down to the bone.

The conversation next covered ways that the local AAUP organization could strengthen both itself and I.U. Bloomington. Ideas included inviting state legislators to AAUP meetings; working for some changes in academic personnel policies (O'Neal feels that AAUP guidelines on this are the best available and that only minor discrepancies from them exist here at I.U.); helping generate solutions to the enrollment problem, and starting to generate a model for what must almost certainly be a Bloomington campus with fewer students in the mid-80's.

Finally, the need to recruit and retain the good students from Indiana and the surrounding states was discussed. Recruiting more marginal students may be counterproductive in terms of maintaining intellectual quality in the classroom and keeping student morale high. A drop in morale would lead to even worse problems with retaining students. We should be doing more to bring students from the top quarter of their high school classes in Indiana and nearby states to I.U.

NEWS OF INDIANA CONFERENCE
OF AAUP, ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the Indiana Conference of the AAUP took place in South Bend on November 3 and 4. The Conference inaugurated a new president, Ralph Calkins of Hanover College. At the business meeting, delegates agreed to an increase in Conference dues and adopted a motion on salary policy for faculty at Indiana colleges and universities.

The resolution on salaries was adopted following a report from Conference Committee 2 (Economic Status). The report concluded that "unless the rampant inflation is brought under control, the next decade will find many faculty families in a state of privation and lack of necessities." The delegates also discussed President Carter's wage-price guidelines and the possible impact of these guidelines on faculty salaries across the state. After debating several motions urging the Conference to take a stand on the minimum acceptable salary increases for the coming academic year, the delegates voted unanimously to adopt the following resolution: "The Indiana Conference of the AAUP cannot support any faculty salary proposal that does not reflect the actual rise in the cost of living."

Inflation was also an issue in the decision to raise Conference dues from \$3.00 to \$5.00 for regular members. (Sustaining members will pay \$10.00 in dues.) Chester Eisinger of Purdue, outgoing president of the Conference, explained that the rise had been recommended by the Assembly of State Conferences, a major source of funding for the ICAAUP. Eisinger pointed out that in 1978 Indiana and Iowa had the lowest dues in the AAUP Midwest Caucus and that the dues were not sufficient to cope with inflation or to send an AAUP lobbyist to the hearings of the Indiana Commission on Higher Education and the state legislature.

A main speaker at the meeting was U.S. Representative John Brademas (Indiana), member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and Chairman of the Select Education Committee. Brademas gave a full report on education bills recently passed by Congress, including the Middle Income Student Assistance Act and the as yet unfunded provision for White House conferences on the Arts

and Humanities Brudemas stressed the importance of "more fruitful and creative cooperation between members of university communities and politicians."

The delegates also heard Reverend Theodore Hesburgh review the challenges to academic freedom that had been presented by the federal government and alumni during his presidency at the University of Notre Dame.

Representing IU-Bloomington at the meeting were William Burgan (English), Oleg Kudryk (Library), Don Lichtenberg (Physics), and Sheila Lindenbaum (English). Burgan and Lindenbaum are members of the Indiana Conference Executive Committee.

```

*****
**
** Indiana University Bloomington
**
** AAUP Chapter
**
**
** To: Oleg Kudryk, Library E350
**
** Enclosed are my $5.00 dues
** for membership in the IU-
** Bloomington Chapter of the
** AAUP.
**
** Name: _____
**
** Department/School _____
**
**  Please send an appli-
** cation form for National
** AAUP. (Members of local chapter must
** be members of National AAUP or join
** it concurrently).
** Dues are tax deductible
**
*****

```

AAUP NEWS
Volume 3, Number 2
November, 1978

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