

BFC Circular B6-78

STATEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON CHAPTER
OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
CONCERNING THE AUGUST 1977 REPORT OF THE
REORGANIZATION TASK FORCE

When reorganization of Indiana University was first proposed, the plan was criticized not only on substantive grounds, but on the ground that there was insufficient consultation by the administration with the faculty. The Reorganization Task Force, by its own admission, did little to rectify this lack of faculty input, as evidenced by the statement (page 1 of the report):

In preparing this report, we consulted with members of the Vice President's Office, the Central Administration, and deans' offices in the schools of Business and Education. We did not consult broadly with individual faculty members, students, and others--believing that our most effective role was to sort out, describe, and clarify problem areas for further discussion.

We believe that this one-sided consultation procedure by the Task Force has colored its very identification of the problems of reorganization, as well as its proposed solutions.

We are particularly troubled by the failure of the Task Force report to deal adequately with the question of how academic excellence, especially in scholarship and research, can best be preserved and strengthened on the Bloomington Campus. This is a critical question in view of the fact that the North Central Association team which recently accredited IUB stated in its report:

It is already clear that there has been a significant shift of resources to the Indianapolis campus which, if continued uncritically, may result in the formation of two or more mediocre programs geographically separated, instead of one excellent one at Bloomington.

We therefore recommend that the Bloomington Faculty Council emphasize its concern with academic excellence on the Bloomington Campus by including the following statement with any motions the Council passes pertaining to reorganization:

PURSUIT OF EXCELLENCE IN SCHOLARSHIP AND RESEARCH AND
RECOGNIZES THIS PURSUIT AS A PRIMARY MISSION OF THE BLOOMINGTON
CAMPUS. IN CARRYING OUT ANY RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE
REORGANIZATION OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY, NO STEPS SHOULD BE TAKEN
WHICH WOULD INTERFERE WITH THIS COMMITMENT TO EXCELLENCE.

In addition to expressing our reservations with the procedures adopted by the Task Force and with the general tenor of its report, we wish to call attention to a number of specific Task Force recommendations which are of particular AAUP concern.

I. FACULTY GOVERNANCE

A. We oppose the adoption of Task Force recommendation #2d (page vi) which states:

There is a need for a Bloomington-Indianapolis faculty body...to exercise the powers of the faculty with regard to problems common to these two campuses.

The decisions of such a body would presumably supersede the decisions of the Bloomington and Indianapolis Faculty Councils, and so would weaken these existing bodies. If matters of mutual concern do require discussion, such discussion could occur through conferences of the two Agenda Committees without creating a new governance body which would compromise the position of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

B. We oppose the adoption of Task Force recommendation #3 (page vii) which states:

provision be developed for systematic representation of deans and program directors as members of the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Certain administrators are, of course, already ex-officio members of the Council. If the Task Force means that more administrative voting members should be on the Council, we are opposed-- as their votes would lessen the effectiveness of the Council in expressing a faculty viewpoint, in contrast to an administration viewpoint. However, we have no objections to having additional deans and program directors as nonvoting members of the Council, as such a step might facilitate communication between faculty and administration.

II. PERSONNEL

A. We oppose the adoption of Task Force recommendation 1 (page viii) which states:

The faculties of the multi-campus units should move as rapidly as possible toward the development of common missions and standards for promotion, minimizing but not necessarily eliminating unique missions.

In our opinion, the development of common missions and the preservation of unique missions are likely to be conflicting goals. We believe that the preservation of unique missions should have the higher priority, as in this way costly duplication of effort and resulting mediocrity of programs can best be avoided.

B. We oppose the adoption of Task Force recommendation #3 (page viii) which states:

Program-specific tenure rather than campus-specific tenure should be applied to newly employed faculty members who may need to function on more than one campus.

As Margaret Peterson noted in her memo to the Faculty of May 19, 1977, both Bloomington campus and national policies have stressed the importance of campus-specific tenure. The 1972 Harvey Committee on Tenure, the University Faculty Council, and the IU Board of Trustees have all affirmed this principle in the IU Academic Handbook: "The tenure of any faculty member...is specific to the campus unit in which he is serving at the time of his acquisition of tenure." The Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education (jointly sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and the AAUP) endorsed the same position in its 1973 report. Recognizing the importance of making personnel judgments in particular institutional settings, the Commission recommended that "in 'system' or state-wide or multicampus operations, tenure should be explicitly granted in a particular institution and not in the system as a whole."

Established practice is not in itself sacred, unless as in this case the alternative threatens academic excellence. Program-specific tenure would foster precisely the tendency toward weakening of campus responsibility for academic judgments and sound governance which was criticized in the recent North Central Association accreditation report.

Task Force recommendation #3 also calls for shifting of

currently employed probationary faculty members from campus-specific to program-specific tenure tracks, by mutual consent of the faculty member involved, the dean of the program unit, and the Trustees.

We find this proposal to be inherently coercive, since the consent of non-tenured faculty members may be unduly influenced by the policies of their program administrators.

C. We propose that Task Force recommendation #7 (page ix) be modified. This recommendation, as worded by the Task Force, states:

As multi-campus faculties move toward common mission statements and standards for promotion and tenure, there should be movement to eliminate salary differentials attributable to geography.

We agree with the principle that there should be movement to eliminate salary differences based on geography. However, we believe that recommendation #7 would be improved if it read as follows:

AS MULTI-CAMPUS FACULTIES MOVE TOWARD COMMON STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, THERE SHOULD BE MOVEMENT TO ELIMINATE SALARY DIFFERENTIALS ATTRIBUTABLE TO GEOGRAPHY. THIS IMPLIES THAT STATED COMMON STANDARDS BE APPLIED TO ALL MEMBERS OF SUCH MULTI-CAMPUS FACULTIES, AND NOT THAT AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES BE THE SAME ON ALL CAMPUSES.

D. We oppose the adoption of Task Force recommendation #10 (page ix), which states:

In considering a case involving a faculty member of a multi-campus unit, a Faculty Board of Review may--where appropriate--augment its membership by adding a member or members from another campus.

Because the number of members to be added or the way they are to be chosen is left unspecified, a faculty member of a multi-campus unit might choose to take a grievance to the Faculty Board of a particular campus, only to find that the group deciding on the case had a very different composition than that originally chosen. In place of Personnel recommendation #10 we favor the revision suggested by Acting Dean Margaret Peterson in her memo of May 19, 1977:

A FACULTY MEMBER OR LECTURER WITH MULTIPLE CAMPUS ACADEMIC INVOLVEMENT MAY BRING HIS OR HER GRIEVANCE TO THE FACULTY BOARD OF REVIEW OF EITHER OF THE CAMPUSES. THE SELECTION OF THE BOARD OF REVIEW EMBRACES THE PROCEDURES FORMALLY ADOPTED BY EACH CAMPUS AS PART OF THE BOARD OF REVIEW'S PROCEDURES, INCLUDING THE GRIEVANCE BOARD ON THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS.

ONCE THE CHOICE IS MADE, ONLY THAT BOARD OF REVIEW, USING ITS ASSOCIATED PROCEDURES, MAY CONSIDER THE CASE. THE BOARD OF REVIEW SHALL USE ITS REGULAR OPERATING PROCEDURES.

III. BUDGET

A. We endorse Budgetary recommendation #4 (page ix) of the Task Force report, which states:

THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS BUDGET SHOULD REFLECT ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES ON THE BLOOMINGTON CAMPUS; THEREFORE THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION BUDGET, BUDGET REQUEST, AND BUDGET APPROPRIATION SHOULD BE DISTINCT FROM THE BLOOMINGTON VICE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET, BUDGET REQUEST, AND BUDGET APPROPRIATION.'

We believe that such separation of the Bloomington Campus academic expenditures from system-wide service and administrative expenditures is consistent with our concern for excellence on the Bloomington campus.