PRESIDENT’S REPORT

The AAUP-ISU Chapter sponsored a fall forum on the pre-tenure, adjunct, and post-tenure evaluation processes, and the challenges associated with getting more faculty to full professor rank. The forum was held on November 3, 2011.

Rich Schneirov, Chapter President and ISU Professor of History, started off by arguing that the administration seems to perceive post-tenure evaluation as equivalent to post-tenure review, a position contrary to national AAUP and ISU Faculty Senate policy. He contended that this is part of an ongoing shift of power in universities across the country based on the adoption by university administrations of a corporate managerial model. This model assumes an adversarial relationship between faculty and administration in which faculty are perceived as having an incentive to shirk, while administrators hold them accountable. In contrast, AAUP principles say we should view faculty as members of an academic community and use peer professional standards for accountability. The managerial model undermines the academic community because it discourages the notion that we have common interests.

Schneirov explained that when the faculty evaluation system was passed by the Faculty Senate last year, it contained a proviso that this evaluation procedure not be used to trigger dismissal, which the president removed before submitting to the ISU Board of Trustees for final approval.

Julie Edwards, Lecturer III at ISU, described the performance evaluation system for contingent faculty members in the School of Music, which she concluded was a well-run system overall. Contingent faculty in the School of Music are evaluated once a year, but the diversity of faculty is respected in this process. The personnel committee and chair require concrete evidence of performance in the form of student evaluations, syllabi, and peer-teaching evaluations. Instructors have the right to invite anyone they wish to observe their teaching and write an evaluation. Furthermore, instructors can include any additional material they wish in their evaluation portfolio. She concluded that the process is fair and that contingent faculty can improve their performance as a result of this evaluation process.

Darlene Hantzis, ISU Professor of Communications, then discussed the challenges to getting more faculty to the rank of full professor. First, she noted the importance of having a high proportion of faculty at full professor rank in order to ensure effective faculty governance of the academy. Hantzis then presented statistics showing that ISU faculty are less likely to become full professors than faculty nationally, and that the gender gap in the attainment of full professor is particularly bad at ISU. This is on top of the fact that faculty nationally are becoming less and less apt to attain full professor rank. Since professional satisfaction is associated with becoming a full professor, this trend is not surprising because it parallels a decrease in faculty job satisfaction.

Dr. Hantzis also discussed problems in the faculty evaluation process generally, advocating a hybrid between judgmental and procedural standards for tenure. She said that the tardiness in the publication of a public procedure calendar is one of the biggest problems with getting tenure. Dr. Hantzis also noted that faculty members are sometimes given a later deadline because
their personnel committee has fewer candidates than normal, which is an unfair practice.

A general discussion on these topics then followed with quite active participation by the audience. Comments were made that the new faculty evaluation system creates ranking, which creates competition between faculty and wastes resources. There was general agreement that support must be given to move more faculty to full professor rank. The audience discussed barriers to full professorship, including heavy administrative duties for associate professors (that is in part a result of the low proportion of full professors) and the vagueness of standards in some departments for promotion to full professor. Discussion also covered inconsistencies in faculty classifications in the rules, especially as they related to evaluation.

The meeting also touched on the lack of solidarity among faculty due to the large proportion of contingent faculty. According to Economics Department Professor Rick Lotspeich’s estimates, ISU was out of compliance with its self-imposed restriction to 35 percent of course hours being taught by contingent faculty last year.

Carl Klarner
Vice President, ISU-AAUP

TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF THE INDIANA STATE CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS (AAUP) REGARDING COLLEGE COMPLETION

By Ted Miller
AAUP Executive Board
September 29, 2011

In most institutions of higher learning, many of the most basic elements related to college completion are controlled by the faculty. This includes whether or not students complete courses successfully and which courses are required in order to earn a degree. It therefore follows that the faculty role must be a key consideration in any effort to increase the academic performance of a campus.

We do not oppose performance funding as a matter of principle, but one of our major concerns is that in designing the current funding system, the Commission and the legislature have put the faculty in a position where they confront a conflict of interest.

Every time you stop a school, you will have to build a jail. What you gain at one end you lose at the other. It’s like feeding a dog on his own tail. It won’t fatten the dog.
-Mark Twain -Speech 11/23/1900

One of the most basic functions of the faculty in an institution of higher learning is to protect academic integrity. This is done in part by insisting that students perform at a certain level before assigning a passing grade in a course, and by designing a curriculum that includes courses which develop knowledge and skills that are useful to the student going forward. Conditioning university funding on increasing the number of successful course completions and on increasing the graduation rate could communicate a very clear message to faculty members: that too much academic integrity will damage the institution’s financial condition as well as their own. We do not believe it is in the best interest of the State to embed this dynamic into the higher education sector.

At the very least, we believe that the performance funding system must be reconfigured around a set of measures that take into account the nature of each institution.

One of the most fundamental ideas the Commission has endorsed repeatedly over the years is that each campus has a mission within the state system of higher education, and that these missions vary widely. The “one size fits all” aspect of the current performance funding formula is certainly inappropriate in light of that mission differentiation.
Consider the case of the graduation rate, which seems to be the most important performance measure. What is the ideal graduation rate for a particular campus? We believe that within the current performance funding system, the ideal rate is viewed as 100% -- the higher the rate gets, the bigger will be the change in relation to the baseline and the larger the share of funding the campus will garner. What would it take to get the rate to 100%, given current mission? It could be done by abandoning any pretense of academic integrity, which is not a place we want to go even though the system provides incentives to do so.

An alternative system could be based on the expected graduation rate for a campus, given the mission. If the actual rate was higher, the campus would score points in performance funding; if lower, points would be taken away.

U.S. News has used a system of this type for years to incorporate graduation rates into its ranking scheme and something similar could be done within the framework of performance funding. Grounding the funding system in an achievable reality would go far toward alleviating our conflict of interest concerns.

Rebecca Mullen
Secretary, Executive Board

Every time you stop a school, you will have to build a jail. What you gain at one end you lose at the other. It's like feeding a dog on his own tail. It won't fatten the dog.
- Speech 11/23/1900

These words are as true today as they were in the America of 1900 when Mark Twain penned them. He also famously advised students not to let school interfere with their education. Twain was a powerful cynic when it came to the mediocrity of formalized education. In fact, he wouldn't have much nice to say about most of us in this room today. But he would approve of what we are all at least trying to do here, or say we are trying to do. Education and educators, which includes all of us here to some extent or another, are in the business of not just preparing, but of saving, of inventing, of repairing, of expanding, of empowering, of redirecting, yes and of challenging human lives. And human lives are messy. They do not run a straight course. They come together and then they fall apart. Today's college students, in each one of their permutations, are creatures of choices and with choices. Some make better ones than others, but the fact is they all have lots of them to make. Staying enrolled in college is not a choice when you are faced with fighting breast cancer. too big a burden and walks away. Staying in college is not a choice when a good job comes along and you have bills to pay. Staying in college is not a choice because it just isn't any fun. These are a few of the dozens of student laments I hear as they tell me they will not be back next year. “But, I loved your class,” they assure me. That is nice to hear but small consolation. As much as I may implore them to stick it out, that it will get better, that they can have another few days to finish the paper, the bottom line is, I cannot make that choice for them. Are they failures? Maybe the state sees it that way,
but I don’t. Maybe they just have to learn another kind of lesson right now.

Education, it has been said, is an easy target for criticism, for its aims are so lofty. And to those lofty aims we assign large investments of time and money. And we all expect big things from something when we apply big dollars to it. There is education and there are graduation rates. They don’t necessarily have anything to do with each other. In Indiana, we can build ourselves a tiger made of diploma paper, but in the end it will not stand when the winds shift yet again.

Get Involved!

The Indiana Conference of the AAUP held a well-attended meeting November 5 at the University of Indianapolis. The meeting was in many ways a celebration of the vitality of the Conference. We are moving forward on a variety of fronts!

Mark St. John, our lobbyist at the statehouse, gave a detailed report that ranged from legislative committee hearings in Indianapolis to the possible political effects of this year’s redistricting. The Conference has been actively following discussions on higher education in the legislature. At hearings held by the Interim Committee on Education on September 29, Conference Board members Rebecca Mullen from Vincennes and Ted Miller from Indiana University Bloomington spoke to the issue of college completion rates. Ill-considered legislation on college completion rates could dramatically hurt the quality of higher education in Indiana.

It was an honor and a pleasure to present the William Eagan Award for Distinguished Service to the Indiana Conference to Otto Doering, professor of Agricultural Economics and Director of the Climate Change Research Center at Purdue University. Professor Doering has won many accolades over a distinguished career. He has advised the Department of Agriculture and the Environmental Protection Agency on legislation. He shared a Nobel Prize as a member of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Here in Indiana, Professor Doering played a leading role in revitalizing the Indiana Conference, both through many years as an Executive Board member, and as an AAUP leader at Purdue. Professor Doering brought an AAUP perspective to bear while serving as the faculty representative on the Indiana Commission of Higher Education. He also served on the Governor’s Education Roundtable, and as Chair of Indiana’s Articulation and Transfer Committee. Professor Doering is a leader who always rose to the challenge when the Conference faced a crisis. His lifetime of dedication to service and the AAUP’s ideals of academic freedom and shared governance is an inspiration to the rest of us. We were also joined by Professor Jim Crone of Hanover College. Professor Crone is an able scholar and award-winning teacher. He also holds the distinction of being a longtime AAUP member who is running for Congress, seeking the Democrat nomination in the 6th District. Professor Crone gave an eloquent presentation, relating his AAUP activism to the political ideals motivating his campaign.

Three guest speakers addressed the meeting. Richard Ludwick, President of the Independent Colleges of Indiana, Gretchen Gutman, Associate Vice President for Government Relations at Ball State University, and Jeff Linder, Associate Vice President for State Government Relations at Indiana University, all gave their perspectives on the challenges facing higher education in Indiana. Each talk was followed by a lively question and answer session. What became obvious as the discussions continued was that there was a lot of common ground between all as we looked to the future. There is a lot of room for united action in the days to come.

Twain didn’t cotton a whole lot to educators. “God made the Idiot for practice and then He made the School Board.” But then again, Twain wasn’t much fonder of politicians. Ladies and Gentlemen, we need your assistance, in both our successes and our failures; for both the successes and the failures are called human lives. Thank you.
I was able to report a wide range of activity in the Conference. In an unprecedented initiative, the Conference, in conjunction with the AAUP’s Assembly of State Conferences, is launching a major recruitment drive at Purdue University. Our Conference chapter Services Director, Lisa Phillips of Indiana State University, is working with the leadership of the Purdue Chapter and Joerg Tiede of the ASC to increase membership at this flagship university in Indiana. Elsewhere in the state, a chapter is being organized at the University of Indianapolis, and there is interest in starting chapters at other schools. Let us know if you want to start an AAUP chapter at your Institution! We will do all that we can to assist you.

I also announced the rebirth of a committee system for the Conference. We have a Committee A on Academic Freedom and Shared Governance, and a Government Relations Committee in operation. I hope to soon have committees on membership and contingent faculty organized. These committees offer members an exciting way of involving themselves in the work of the Conference. If you are interested in serving on one of these committees, or would like to start a committee that I have not mentioned, contact me at murphy@hanover.edu or 812-866-7222.

Our November meeting was a reminder that the Indiana Conference remains a potent force in serving the ideals and interests of its membership. We will endeavor to do more in the future.

Daniel Murphy
Conference President

---

The following letter to the editor appeared in a recent issue of the Indianapolis Star. It was written on behalf of IUPUI’s associate faculty by members of the Associate Faculty Coalition. The ASF will also host its Third-annual Teach-in next spring, April 2-7, 2012. For more information, contact Sarah Layden at: calmoost@yahoo.com

**UNEQUAL TREATMENT OF IU’S ASSOCIATE FACULTY**

We are members of the Associate Faculty Coalition at IUPUI, and as part-time instructors and supporters of part-time instructors at IUPUI. In the two years since the AFC’s formation, we have been working for more equity in the workplace. Although we have made some gains -- a small raise for the first time in years, access to limited professional development funds -- deep disparities still exist among faculty in the Indiana University system.

Associate faculty on the IU Bloomington campus earn substantially more than their counterparts at IUPUI, in some cases nearly twice as much. This situation sets a double standard. We have asked for a higher wage since the inception of the coalition, yet few have seen any substantial gains. Associate faculty are exploited everywhere, but our question is why we are more exploited in Indianapolis than in Bloomington. No reasonable explanations have been offered for this glaring iniquity. If an associate faculty member is qualified to teach introductory courses on either campus, location should not be the determining factor in compensation rates.

At the State of the University address in September, IU President Michael McRobbie announced that IUPUI received over $1 billion in donations. Associate faculty, poorly paid and repeatedly denied access to workplace health benefits, have no indication we’ll benefit from this pool of money. In addition, last year McRobbie announced raises for full-time faculty despite the difficult economic times, and according to IU’s Financial Management Services, he received a 22 percent raise of nearly $100,000. If the IU system wants to be regarded as a first-class institution in the academic community, it must reflect pride in its faculty. Its entire faculty.

In the ongoing campaign to boost student retention, it’s worth noting that associate faculty teach the majority of mandatory core courses for freshmen and sophomores. However, we receive very little incentive for continuing education and rarely are compensated for attending workshops and other professional development initiatives. Many associate faculty
members work two and three jobs to make ends meet. If it means missing another job or paying a babysitter to attend uncompensated workshops, it simply can’t happen.

Employee disparity poisons the work environment and breeds resentment for the corporate culture responsible for a discriminatory institution.

The AFC has raised awareness through Teach-Ins, documentary videos, and advocacy. Local and national media have shown an interest in this issue, and it won’t go away on its own. We ask that the university find within that billion dollars a wage increase and additional professional development funds for IUPUI associate faculty. At the very least, we ask to be paid like our counterparts at IU Bloomington.

Steve Schubert
Terry Simmons
Sarah Layden
Jacob Nichols
Joshua Bernardin
Terry Daley
Tracy Donhardt
Steve Fox
IUPUI

MISCELLANEOUS

LEGAL HELP

The Indiana Conference’s Committee A stands ready to assist faculty members who have been denied due process in questions of tenure or retention, or who have suffered violations of their academic freedom. Any grievance that comes to Committee A will be considered. If the Committee believes that the complaint has merit, it will, depending on circumstances, either pursue that matter on the state level, or refer the case to the national office. Every faculty member in Indiana should know that if he or she encounters injustice, there is a place to turn.

Please contact:
Daniel Murphy
History Department
Hanover College
P.O. Box 890
Hanover, IN 47243
murphy@hanover.edu
812-866-7222.

CHAPTER SERVICES PROGRAM

In order to further build our organization, the Indiana Conference of the American Association of University Professors offers a Chapter Services Program which aids any campus interested in starting or further building an AAUP chapter in recruiting new members and setting up organizational operations.

To find out more, contact:
Lisa Phillips
Department of History
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IN 47809
Lisa.Phillips@indstate.edu
812 237-2706

SUMMER INSTITUTE PROGRAM

The Assembly of State Conferences offers a scholarship to the Summer Institute covering tuition; in addition, the Indiana Conference has committed to help fund state AAUP members who desire to attend the Summer Institute.

Please contact
Conference President
Dan Murphy
murphy@hanover.edu
for more information.