

ORIGINAL LETTER

Professor Robert Greenleaf
Faculty Council Representative
Indianapolis Downtown Campus
Indianapolis, Indiana

Dear Professor Greenleaf:

The faculty of the Indianapolis Campus having met to consider "Faculty Document 13, Item 3" appointed, through its director, a committee to sift and express faculty opinion. In the remarks below, the committee advises you of its deliberations and requests that you present them before the Faculty Council as occasion recommends.

The committee notes that the faculty of the Indianapolis Campus views the report of the Hagen Committee with profound interest. Nothing less than the future role of the Regional Campuses in higher education and the relationship of their role to the hegemony of the Bloomington Campus is contemplated. Recommendations intended to shape the indefinite future of the Regional Campuses, their growing faculties and student populations are deserving of scrupulous consideration by both the proposed beneficiaries and benefactors. As benefits cannot occur except as those who are benefited conceive that their advantage is consulted and consent freely that it be enlarged, the committee, as its principal judgment, urges that all decisive discussion relating to the future of the Regional Campuses include adequate and just representation from their faculties. The committee feels strongly that the disposition of Regional Campus affairs cannot be happily effected unless the Regional Campus faculties are fully sensible that their opinions as respected members of the University have due weight in decisive deliberations.

Written statements of individual faculty opinion at Indianapolis concerning "Item 3 . . ." show diversity, as is expected, with regard to detail. As the moment requires both clarity and conviction, the committee postpones consideration of detail in deference to the establishment of one or two premisses as the basis for subsequent discussion. Written statements of opinion at Indianapolis concur in expressing distrust common to those weaker in number and smaller in power who receive notice of benefits to be derived from the supervision of those stronger in number and greater in power. Explicit statements in "Item 3 . . ." (e.g., "In short, our policy of departmental control of affairs at regional campuses can work only if interchange is reciprocal, so that the department gives to the remote member as much as it demands of him.") intended to reassure our desire of just regard are actually in contrast with a long history of practice.

Serious doubts that expressions of good will and sincere esteem scattered throughout "Item 3 . . ." are substantial are not fanciful. Faculty members have observed that their location and numbers alone render impracticable Regional Campus participation in Bloomington discussion. Still, this committee insists that a full participation of Regional Campus faculties in Bloomington decisions is indispensable, if the several interesting and advantageous recommendations it notes with pleasure are to be realized. On the other hand, failure to dislodge several obstacles to the harmony and satisfaction of relations among the various campuses will strengthen and perpetuate the existing drift toward looser association.

"Item 3 . . ." has much to recommend it, but at the same time it exposes just those attitudes and assumptions that cannot help prejudice the Hagen Committee's own case. To begin with, the visible fact that the Regional Campuses are unrepresented on a committee purportedly dealing with matters of common concern to the whole University, and in this instance of especial concern to the Division of University Extension, is an eloquent and ironic commentary on the actual state of affairs. It is not surprising then that the committee should have been mistaken on a number of counts regarding conditions peculiar to the Regional Campuses; as for example its questionable justification of the use of part-time faculty, a practice that cuts very close to the heart of our predicament. When the report talks of the need for maintaining uniform standards and specifies successful instances, it becomes clear that it is dealing with methods of control rather than participation; and that it can cite closed circuit television as a "unifying influence" is a reminder of a prominent ambiguity running through the report. Our remarks, however, are not intended to belabor the Hagen Committee for attitudes that have been built into the University over the course of many years, attitudes that the Committee seeks conscientiously to alter. It is necessary, however, to bring these matters to the attention of the entire faculty, if we are to make a start in the direction sketched in "Item 3 . . ."

Committee to Examine "Faculty
Council Document 13, Item 3"

Louise Dauner
Bernard Friedman
Robert Frye, Chairman
Robert Greenleaf
Peter Hanford

CC: Dean Higgins
Dean Hunt
Indianapolis Faculty