Senate Document SD 84-14
(Approved, 4/15/1985)

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: John P. Brennan, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: 25 March 1985

SUBJ: Recommendation on SD 83-13

DISP: To the Presiding Officer for Implementation

RESOLVED, that consideration of SD 83-13 be postponed indefinitely.

Rationale:

1. The hearing records for 26 and 28 March 1984 reveal that, in addition to legitimate concerns over the language and procedures embodied in SD 83-13 (which, insofar as they might entail innovations in the system for professional advancement, demand careful and critical scrutiny), there is much emotional resistance to any merger of the promotion and tenure systems. Some faculty members seem to feel that any accommodation to the traditions of the parent institution with which they are not affiliated would be a betrayal of their interests and the institution they identify with. Without compromise and negotiation, no acceptable unified system can evolve; but the faculties seem not to be in the mood for any such compromise or negotiation.

2. Our inability to accommodate the conflicting demands of the various interest groups among the faculty made for insurmountable difficulties in revising SD 83-13 so as to make it acceptable to the IPFW faculty as a whole. Not only could we not determine what the faculty might want, we also could not determine what we as a committee wanted.

3. We suspect that SD 83-13, even if it could be tailored to meet the demands of the IPFW faculty, would fail to pass muster with one or both of the central administrations and thus fail to be accepted by both boards of trustees. This is illustrated by the fate of SD 82-14, the revisions to FWSD 76-20 (Promotion and Tenure Policies, Criteria, and Procedures), a document affecting Purdue faculty only, as reported by the Presiding Officer in the March Senate meeting: the President of Purdue University declared null and void provisions for the documentation of recommendations, because they were not consistent with central Purdue policy. It is hard to believe that a document entailing much more obvious departures from Purdue policy would be acceptable; there is, to our knowledge, no reason to believe that Indiana University's administration would look kindly on a document that deviated from IU policy in any significant way. The Dean of Faculties last year made inquiries for us about how the central administrations would react to such a system as we were designing in SD 83-13; the lack of clear answers should probably be taken to signify something other than warm feelings about the proposal.

We conclude that SD 83-13 embodies an idea whose time is yet to come. Thus our recommendation. If the Senate, however, thinks that discussion of SD 83-13 should continue, we ask that, before it is sent back to the Faculty Affairs Committee it be referred to the two committees on institutional affairs for commentaries and revisions from the two different institutional perspectives. A copy of the latest draft of SD 83-13, dated 8 March 1985, has been filed with the Secretary of the Senate and has been assigned Senate Reference No. 84-16.