The Politics of Intervention: External Regulation of Academic Activities and Workloads in Public Higher Education

A report of Committee C on College and University Teaching, Research, and Publication

"The Work of Faculty: Expectations, Priorities, and Rewards," an earlier report of Committee C, appeared in the January-February 1994 issue of Academe. It was adopted by the Association's Council in June 1994. The report which follows extends the committee's examination of faculty workload issues by studying external attempts to legislate and regulate the way in which faculty in public institutions of higher learning distribute their work. Committee C invites comments from chapters, conferences, and other interested parties.

I. Introduction

The 1990s are not easy times for higher education. In the United States, where public higher education now embraces about three-quarters of the students and faculty, almost half the state governments are turning toward direct intervention in the inner workings of the academy.1 The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac issue, published in September 1995, reports that twenty-four states conducted studies in 1994-95 of the workloads of faculty members at public colleges (See Table I). Simultaneously, most states have been seeking to reduce their financial commitments to their state systems. Together these two developments bespeak a future of declining resources for higher education and greater managerial oversight—in a climate of diminishing public support for the traditional values and purposes of the state systems of colleges and universities.

In many states, governors and legislators are making pronouncements about the need for more supervision and more productivity. In some, demands for managerial assessment and intervention have come from state boards of higher education or the regents and trustees of the colleges and universities. A survey conducted by the Southern Regional Education Board found that twelve of its fifteen member-states have adopted stricter higher education accountability laws in the past five years.2 In others, intrusion is taking the form of legislation embodying dictates about a variety of intramural and pedagogical matters: classroom contact hours, teaching loads, faculty productivity, and research agendas.3 These new forms of intervention are inimical to the traditional governance processes and goals of higher education. They impose extramural constraints upon the disciplines and threaten the much-valued diversity of educational experiences available to students. They mandate uniformity and conformity upon the

Table I. States Conducting Faculty Workload Studies: 1994–95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As of August 1994, twenty-one states had mandates related to faculty workload from the state legislature or a state higher education authority.


3 Legislation has been passed in Florida, Hawaii, Mississippi, and Ohio. In other states, including Arkansas, Florida, and South Carolina, legislative subcommittees have considered eliminating tenure at public institutions, though so far no bills have been reported out of committee. In July 1995, the Pennsylvania House of Representatives charged a select committee with "reviewing issues related to the Commonwealth's institutions of higher education" and reporting back with recommendations by February 1996; topics to be examined include teaching loads, tuition, scholarships for employees and their dependents, honoraria, travel expenses, and sabbaticals. The Ohio legislation was challenged in court on grounds that a change in working conditions during the life of a negotiated contract is illegal. The case was dismissed, but the fact that the state of Ohio was so indifferent to the provisions of its own legislation and labor negotiating process with branches of the state university system is an indication of how dominant controlling legislation has become.
varying missions and purposes of the units of vast and complex state systems. All in all, they pose a serious problem for the autonomy and intellectual integrity of public higher education.

Committee C worries that these forms of intervention may be driven more by extramural political and economic agendas than by educational concerns. We fear that such direct intervention in, and regulation of, the academic community from outside are more likely to diminish the role of public higher education than to result in “better” teaching or in a better perceived balance among teaching, research, and service. We also regard such intervention as obstacles to the creation of an informed public understanding of the academy as the proper testing ground of free expression, dissent, and challenges to accepted wisdom.

We strongly suspect that what is being so readily and casually passed off to the public as a search for less costly and “more productive” public higher education will in fact lead to education that is really worth less—less for our students on the job market, less for our economy in terms of basic and high-tech skills and research, and less for all of us in terms of building an educated, diverse, and just society.

II. Historical Dimensions of Intervention and Support: The Growth of State Systems

Public higher education in this country has always rested heavily on financial support provided by the states. The great upsurge of state support for colleges (and subsequently for universities) began with the Morrill Land-Grant legislation of 1862, in response to demands for advanced training in “agriculture and the mechanic arts,” although the way had already been paved by a tradition of state normal schools (since 1839) and of state colleges, founded in large part to rival the sectarian and denominational schools of the early republic. By the turn of the 20th century every state in the country was using a share of its tax revenues to build and support institutions of higher education for its young men (and, eventually, its young women).

With such public subsidies came, quite properly, a need to define the nature and roles of the many and different institutions coming into existence, their relation to the state, and their relation to each other. What were the responsibilities of governmental agencies and what was best left for the academy’s independent, internal interpretation and implementation? Dealing with such questions led to the creation of supervisory and administrative mechanisms whereby the states kept an eye on revenues expended for (and generated by) higher education, and by means of which they could deliberate on where and how to draw the line between public and support institutions of higher education for its young men and political concerns on one side, and the proper intramural responsibilities of those who administered, taught, and studied in the academy as the proper testing ground of free expression, dissent, and challenges to accepted wisdom.

In the half-century since World War II, public higher education has grown from these roots to become a gigantic industry. Immediately after the war all varieties of public higher education expanded dramatically to accommodate the wave of veterans and to respond to the national concern for research, primarily in “big science” but also in such areas as applied social science. As both a cause and effect of these changes, public higher education was transformed from a limited or small-time enterprise into a major institution central to the democratic promise. Implicit in this change was the concept of the federal and local government as a guarantor of equal educational opportunity for all its citizens. Campuses were increasingly expected to welcome the growing legions of older and nontraditional students, as well as women and minorities, calling for places within the new community colleges as well as in the four-year colleges and university centers.

Then, only a generation after the veterans of World War II, there arrived at the doors of the academy the college-age population boom of the 1960s. Moreover, partly but not solely because of their numbers, the nation endorsed the federal government’s fierce commitment to public expenditure for education, research, and social service. These intertwined and populist phenomena led directly to two major developments in higher education. One was another growth spurt of tremendous proportions—measured by student and faculty demographics, and by a tally of schools, programs, and even of whole campuses. Sputnik had caught the nation by surprise and, in a mad scramble to catch up, the government pushed for and funded major initiatives in science and technology in secondary schools and on college and university campuses. In step with this growth and the concomitant costs came the full-bodied creation of state systems of higher education.

State boards of regents or of higher education became the usual agencies for mediating relations between governmental and academic institutions. They were designed with one eye on the demands of the state capital and the other eye on the needs of the campuses under their jurisdiction. These boards generally came to develop a working position—through trial and error, and some pain—regarding how and where to draw the line between public and political concerns on one side, and the proper intramural responsibilities of those who administered, taught, and studied in the academy on the other.

We were witnessing, in virtually every state, the coordination and articulation of the four-year colleges, the agricultural and technical schools, the universities and medical centers, and the community colleges, into a single system. Public higher education not only became a gigantic enterprise, it was becoming a centralized and rationalized one.

III. Intervention and Supervision: Old Style

States have sought, from their first serious involvement in higher education in the 19th century, to exercise a voice in shaping the nature and roles of their institutions. In its anticipated role this voice has made itself heard in the mission statements of institutions (or even of entire systems), charging colleges with responsibility for training students in animal husbandry and agronomy, in mining and engineering, in the preparation of teachers for K–12, in the liberal arts, or—more recently—in advanced scholarship and aca-
ademic research in a wide variety of fields. Such statements might re-
force the role of, and priority accorded, undergraduate education in
the context of the multiversity, or they might emphasize the spe-
cial needs of lower-division students in the allocation of resources.
In many instances they have affirmed the value of academic free-
dom and of the contributions of higher education to society.

Beyond this definitional level, the realities of public expenditure
demand ongoing and informed oversight. State appropriations
for higher education—like all other forms of public expendi-
ture—are open to regular accounting and scrutiny. The U.S.
Department of Education to this day compiles statistics on the
land-grant colleges, state by state and category by category. In
most states salaries of faculty at public colleges and universities,
along with those of all other public employees, are public infor-

dation. And data on recruitment, on retention and graduation
rates, on research expenditures, on campus construction and
maintenance—on virtually everything but alumni gifts to athlet-
ics—are available to administrators, to legislators, and to the pub-
ic whose taxes pay so much of the bill.

Many forms of public interest and concern work to the benefit
of the academy and for the enhancement of the social and intellec-
tual role of public higher education. Their existence can contribute
to constructive interaction between state government and
the academy. Examples might be expressions of public interest in such
social and educational policy as integration or affirmative action,
or a demand for more opportunities for returning students, or in
calls for new majors and fields of concentration. Committee C en-
dorses this constructive dialogue between public authorities and
the academy. The principles behind such deliberations, along with
the planning that accompanies their implementation, have pro-
moted the general welfare of faculty, students, and institutions.

The current dangers for higher education arising from recent
instances of state intervention stem from departures from the
older understanding or consensus and the policies upon which it
rested. The traditional balance between politics and higher educa-
tion was characterized largely by a level of concern and supervi-
sion that stopped short of on-site intervention. The boundaries
that had been drawn were generally understood and honored.

IV. Intervention and Supervision: New Style

The new state involvement in higher education often amounts to
a policy of aggressive micro-management. Two aspects of the cur-
rent interventionism are most troublesome, and neither has much
to do with the quality of education as generally defined. One as-
pact, often referred to as the "managerial revolution," involves in-
creasingly intricate efforts at detailed quantitative measurement of
varied aspects of academic life. With a focus on data collection,
accountability, cost-benefit evaluations, and a search for statistical
norms against which the "product" can be gauged, this process
imposes a set of external and often inappropriate criteria upon a
complicated intellectual process. The managerial approach begins
with the assumption that the proper purpose of higher education
is the creation of a "product," commodities best judged by some
market standards of quantity and quality, and that academic "pro-
ductivity" can be gauged by the standards that accompany such a
definition or conceptualization. We think, rather, that what
higher education offers cannot appropriately be described as a
"product," and is not readily or usefully judged in terms of mar-
ket-based models of consumer satisfaction or output.

Unfortunately, many states and many authorities—including
some within higher education—have chosen to accept the man-
gerial frame of reference. Accordingly, they are now working to
define and impose levels and standards of reporting and account-
ability upon state systems that are sadly out of harmony with the
values and purposes those very systems were ostensibly created to
serve. Tennessee, the only state that has implemented perform-
cance-based funding over a sustained period of time, relies on
test scores and a few other easily measured criteria to determine
the quality of faculty performance. In the sixteen years since the
system was adopted, the percentage of funding based on perform-
ance has increased from 2 percent to 5.45 percent. This is
clearly much work for a minimal return.

We hardly wish to argue that higher education is now about to
move away from some mythic golden age of state-gown relations.
Such relations have frequently been contentious, and are best seen
as part of the give-and-take of public life. Rather, we look back on
the old ground rules regarding the limits and scope of state super-
vision of higher education as the result of decades of compromise
and accommodation. Traditionally such areas as workload, the
campuswide and departmental distributions of faculty labor
among teaching, research, and service, and matters involving aca-
demic freedom, tenure, the curriculum, and governance, were
considered as being best defined by those within the academy. As
well as a regard for boundaries, there was a broad acceptance of
the special character and role of higher education, touching both
its internal workings and its social contributions. Education was
understood to be an investment: in our young people, in our na-
tion, and in the international community.

This special regard is now increasingly being jettisoned. It is
rather as though the states were vying with each other in an effort
to claim the most aggressive stance regarding intervention and
hands-on assessment. In Wisconsin, for example, the goals of the
State Faculty Education Workload Policy include seeing that the
regents are provided with "regular managerial information regard-
ing educational workload." Such reports, passed upward from the
campus administrative structure to the statewide bureaucracy of
higher education, are designed to "document non-classroom ele-

4 Governing, p. 26
(back page editorial) on the failure of the state systems to surmount their
own bureaucratic limitations and to make substantive contributions to
the education offered within the states.
ments of faculty education workload," among other activities. Such data are to be fed to the "accountability task force"—a statewide structure, encompassing the universities and the colleges, will be constructed to guide comparison and accountability.

In 1994 the Maryland legislature withheld $22 million from its public colleges and universities pending receipt of faculty workload reports from the eleven campuses. The money was subsequently released, and, while legislators acknowledged that faculty work long hours, they remain unconvinced that faculty are using their time productively. To assist in preparing future appropriations, the legislature has demanded additional information to provide evidence of increased teaching loads. These data will be compared on an annual basis.6

The second major form of intervention now emerging comes in the form of efforts at control through intrusive and detailed rules and regulations. These prescriptions emanate, variously, from state boards of regents, from state commissions of higher education, and, increasingly, from state legislatures. They are directed at those areas of faculty work and faculty-student contact that seemingly lend themselves to quantitative measurement and to the imposition of quotas or uniform standards regarding work and time. Attention is given, in policies and in public laws, to such matters as the number of in-class contact or teaching hours and the number of courses taught.

Responding in 1994 to the Governor's Task Force on Accountability, the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents acted on six general recommendations. Among the procedures adopted were the establishment of eighteen systemwide accountability indicators with performance goals for each indicator; the imposition of a system of post-tenure review; mandated publication of accountability reports by the president of the UW system and the chancellors of each institution; and the review of accountability measures every three biennia (six years) to coincide with the state's biennial budget cycle.7

While the managerial revolution came to higher education as part of a growth in administrative cadres and an obsession with quantification and accountability, the impetus for legislative and administrative intervention has been fueled primarily by economic and political concerns. A long economic slump and a souring public attitude toward public spending determined our social agenda. Today economic pressure on state resources, a diminishing commitment to the role of higher education in the realization of "the American dream" (especially for cultural and ethnic minorities), and the drying up of federal funding have made states look for ways of getting "more bang for the higher education buck," as public officials are apt to state the issue.

Table II. Percentage Change in State Appropriations for Higher Education, 1992-93 to 1994-95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


8 "Other states can match this effort. Kentucky (KRS Ann 164.095) talks of "performance goals." Florida State University (662.4.029) says "the faculty member is expected to check attendance in all classes," though the instructor does have the freedom to work out the effect of student absence on the grade. The Maryland higher education authorities, very active in these endeavors, lean toward language referring to "learning outcomes evaluation" and the like.

This search is being translated, across much of the nation, into a call for speed-up within the academic sector: fewer full-time faculty teaching more students, and now being ordered to do so by way of more prescribed hours of classroom contact.9 Rising tuition in private colleges and universities and hard times in many states have driven even more students into public institutions. With no overall growth in resources, this squeeze has exacerbated problems of crowding and forced the need to make cruel decisions about the distribution of labor and time. In the 1980s, campus administrations were quite willing to impose new working conditions and strictures regarding accountability upon the faculty. For the most part their efforts were ineffective. Now, we find, if the campus administration is unwilling or unable to impose accountability standards and controls upon the professoriate, there is a growing interest, in state capitals and state commissions, in imposing them from above. The desire to assert the ultimate power to call the tune is taking precedence over an informed concern with the quality and future of the great systems.

V. The Educational Dangers of Extramural Intervention

As an association of academics, AAUP is not a completely disinterested observer of the recent trends toward extramural intervention in higher education. On the other hand, the Association is not concerned solely with the working conditions and well-being of its members. The history and purposes of AAUP reflect a long-range interest in the health of academia. This means, among other things, working to define and to promote a balance between the interests of students, faculty, administrators, legislators, alumni, students' parents, and the citizenry at large. Universities best serve those who work within them when they simultaneously serve the larger and long-term interests of the society in which they are located.

We believe that the recent forms of intervention being imposed upon the academy will not lead to qualitative improvements, neither in teaching nor in other forms of faculty endeavor. Nor, we suspect, will they improve student response or learning in any meaningful fashion. Accountability and/or legislative controls that concentrate upon contact hours and in-class teaching ignore the facts of life concerning higher education and pedagogy.10 College "teaching" is neither defined by, nor confined to, in-class contact time. To focus on quantitative tallies is to ignore or discount the multitude of intellectual and professional contacts between teachers and students, along with the time, depth of knowledge, and teaching skills, needed to prepare a given class. "Time devoted to teaching" far exceeds time spent "delivering" lectures or leading discussions, whether we look at weekly preparations or at the career experience the instructor brings to the classroom.11

Moreover, to focus on in-class pedagogy conceives of higher education in terms of a simplistic model that assumes the delivery of predetermined information, rather than the shared discovery and exploration of a subject to be the main purpose of the process. Few would claim that either the efficiency or the ultimate value of research and creative endeavor could be quantified; and yet without such activities higher education is but rote learning writ large. And service, at any level from a department committee to national research panels and international conferences, is likewise not amenable to a reductionist treatment, although without this service the academy becomes insular, its faculty provincial, its students exposed only to local scenarios and locally received wisdom, which by restricting their experience limits their opportunities.

Much of the strength of the modern university and the basis for many of its contributions to our world lie in its institutional autonomy. These special conditions have complex historical origins. They reflect a view of the profession that goes back to the medieval guilds with their quality and quantity control over those who enter, and with a due regard for the interests of the public that is to be served. Committee C fears that—whatever the expressed motives and purposes of the current intervention into the academy—the long-range consequences will go far beyond a concern for budgets and hours. The special contributions of the academy stem directly from the principle or concept we express as academic freedom, the view that the university best serves society by eliminating restraints upon the freedom and willingness of faculty to raise awkward questions. Academic freedom, coupled with the stance of institutional neutrality and sanctity, is a foundation of

9 Though newspaper coverage is often sympathetic to academics, the headlines in articles that cover some of the state-directed intervention certainly give an impression that "we" have been caught out: "Profs Find Themselves in a Class Struggle," Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 14, 1995; "Budget Panels Assail Colleges on Teaching Load," Baltimore Evening Sun, March 25, 1995; "Vote Boosts University Monitoring Plan," Milwaukee Sentinel, March 11, 1994. Newspapers transmit what is offered, and states seem quite pleased to wrap the material so as to emphasize an adversarial relationship when they look at higher education. The University of Maryland System Administration: Office of Academic Affairs (March 24, 1994) released its report on faculty and teaching under the heading of "The Instructional and Noninstructional Productivity of the UMS Faculty."

10 Wisconsin, with its current interest in supervision and intervention, shows a remarkable appetite for data gathering and confidence in the power of statistical measures. The "System Faculty Educational Workload Policy" is to include the "average" for weekly group contact hours by instructional faculty, for student contact hours taught by instructional FTE faculty, for weekly individual instructional contact hours, and in the number of sections taught by faculty (both group and individual instruction). If the averages decrease, the dip can be justified by efforts toward qualitative improvement but must be explained. Presumably, increases speak for themselves.

11 Kentucky has taken into account the nonclassroom aspects of teaching and has recognized (KRS Ann. 164.059) that "a measure of faculty workload [is] to include the hours spent in the following activities: instruction, course preparation, noninstructional student contact, research, and public service." But it also requires that "institutional quality" be judged in part by a survey conducted among "alumni, parents, clients, and employers."
VI. Conclusions

In so far as the mandates and mission statements of state boards and legislators articulate the role of public higher education as a public and social process, they are useful and important. It is appropriate for an institution, at its inception and at intervals thereafter, to be told (or reminded) in official terms of its obligation to train the young of the community, or to provide teachers for the public schools, or to support basic research, or to prepare men and women for business or industry or public service. Such statements can be internalized into the culture of a given school; they are useful reminders of our mission and obligation to serve the extramural as well as the intramural community and our own academic disciplines. But to reflect due sensitivity to educational priorities and to place public and political goals within a meaningful context of resources and goals, such statements are best formulated, at state and campus levels, with a role for academic and professional involvement.

The broad purposes of higher education are traditionally understood to include education and training, the generation of new knowledge, and public service. The micro-management of academic lives, schedules, and professional duties is not conducive to the vital and creative fulfillment of these purposes. Whether the micro-management that comes with accountability and cost-benefit analysis involves teaching schedules, student-faculty ratios, or the comparative "output" and productivity of institutions within a system, it offers little that contributes to the enhancement of the aims and goals of higher education. At best it is wasteful of time and energy. At worst—and we anticipate that we will often be very close to the worst-case scenario—it is damaging to the very institutions it ostensibly claims to improve.

We see little likelihood that more basic reading and writing skills will be imparted, more expertise in computers and math and science instilled, more sensitivity to the art and literature of diverse cultures fostered, or a more sophisticated level of data analysis in the social sciences achieved as a result of efforts to impose a heavier teaching load or time-studies upon the academy. Efforts along these lines, now being pursued by state systems in Maryland and Pennsylvania, neither augur well for the quality of education nor reflect well upon the public and political climate that has such rules and regulations. State commissions of higher education and state regents and trustees should, rather, be leading a fight for academic autonomy and empowerment, as well as for more resources.

Legislation that mandates an increase in teaching hours for the faculty, such as that adopted in Ohio, is understandable in political terms. Like other forms of regressive and hectoring social legislation, the legislation sounds good when presented to the public. The academic profession has perhaps allowed its perquisites to be more heavily publicized than its contributions, and the professor has become a ready target for political reaction and cost-cutting. Consequently it seems easy today to formulate rules designed to impose speed-up on the workforce. But it is not so easy to legislate that students learn more, better, and more quickly. Studies indicate that faculty work as hard as other professionals, as measured in terms of hours, of commitment, and of productivity. They have played a major role in building an institution—public higher education—that educates a huge proportion of our population and that is looked upon as a model by other countries as they contemplate the challenges and realities of mass education.

The Association has been sensitive to the professoriate's need to integrate teaching, research, and service, and it has worked in various reports and statements to remind the public that in-class teaching is but a small part of the way in which knowledge is formulated, articulated, and transmitted. Legislating about the classroom and about faculty time makes little sense as far as the ends of higher education are concerned. Some states that have contemplated ways of demanding a higher measure of service and accountability have been led to reverse their course upon discovering that the complex nature of academic work makes such efforts at reporting self-defeating and meaningless. Others have had to establish so many equivalencies to accommodate the varieties of academic endeavor that the gauges do not register meaningful swings in one direction or another. Regular assessment sounds like a simple mandate. In practice it is complex and, as the process develops, it diverges from the enunciated goals of public higher education. It also leads to the creation of more bureaucracy, with attendant costs to the public, to assess the meaning of the data generated: the states of Wisconsin and Maryland are now moving in this direction.

---

12 The California Education Code (66015.1) does enunciate a concern for the quality of the student experience in contrast to a mere concern for quantitative speed-up and cost accounting. It talks of the need for more freshman and sophomore seminars, more opportunities for freshman research, and a reduction of class size where possible. But as resources for these laudatory ends are not touched upon by the report, the inescapable conclusion is that there would have to be an increase in course load were such reforms to be implemented.

13 In "The Work of Faculty: Priorities, Expectations, and Rewards," published in the January–February 1994 issue of Academe, Committee C reported in detail on the work of faculty and the three major components—teaching, research, and service—that comprise the totality of what faculty do. That report showed that faculty work, on the average, between fifty-two and fifty-seven hours per week. It also indicated that even at public research universities faculty report spending 43 percent of their time teaching compared to 29 percent in research.
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Moreover—and of serious concern to AAUP—some forms of post-tenure review of faculty, if couched in terms of accountability or performance evaluation or in blunter language, could be used as a stepping stone to attack tenure. It may be a direct assault, for open political reasons, or it may be veiled and even inadvertent, covered by the fashionable language and logic of cost-benefit analysis. Tenure is the foundation of academic freedom, and AAUP is impelled to speak against any proposals that, if implemented, would threaten this basic foundation. The record is clear that enlightened and benevolent reform and renewal within academia come only when change is made within a framework that protects the principles of tenure and academic freedom.

We cannot escape from the conclusion that much of the state intervention now confronting us is disingenuous—easy criticisms of the moment, being fired against the large, complex, and costly institution that is higher education. We indeed are at a crossroads in the history of the public commitment to colleges and universities.

The hard truth about higher education in the mid-1990s is that life in academia is not likely to become more rewarding in the near future. Much of the current call for regulation and increased productivity is actually after the fact. There has been a great deal of *de facto* speed-up for some years, and in the mid-1990s retrenchment—not academic complacency or expansion—is the fact of life in our public systems. Many of the attacks on the academy appear to be but rationalizations for deep cuts in public support—rhetorical cover-ups of a reversal of America’s historic commitment to education and to social and economic opportunity. Those who have trained for a life of teaching and scholarship know that for some years they, in the company of fewer and fewer colleagues, have been teaching more students—whether they meet more times a week to do this, or whether more men and women are simply being crowded into lecture halls and laboratories and libraries and seminar rooms. Many others of great talent and dedication are not able to find academic jobs, as states have chosen “downsizing” as their way of dealing with rising costs and shrinking resources. Higher education is no longer a growth industry. At this point in our history higher education needs a good deal of help—tangible and intangible—from those entrusted with public office, those given the power to help shape the nation’s future. The problems and the shortcomings of the academy are not going to be cured by managerial or political intervention any more than they will be by drastic budget reductions.

What higher education now needs is more resources and more encouragement for students, in terms of quality training while on campus and a better prospect of good jobs when college life has come to an end. Managerial intervention from the state capital is a symptom of the problems that confront our institutions; it is not their solution. Enlightened public leaders, working in conjunction with the academy, should reverse this easy-to-enunciate but anti-intellectual and ultimately destructive attack. The public’s attention should be directed toward better understanding of the role that public higher education has played in our history and toward increased support for the role it must play in our common future.
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16 "The Status of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty," published in *Academe* (July–August, 1993), documents the increased reliance on part-time and non-tenure-track appointments and includes recommendations for ameliorating the situation, such as capping the percentage of part-time faculty at an institution, and providing pro-rated compensation and insurance and health benefits. The Association remains concerned about the shrinking core of full-time tenured faculty and the concomitant use of part-time and contract appointments, and its Standing Committee on Part-Time and Non-Tenure-Track Appointments is continuing to collect data and work with faculty members on individual college campuses to address these problems.

14 Florida (Flor. Stat. 240.243–1993, 2), for example, has drifted into talk of “appropriate hourly weighing of assigned duties other than classroom contact hours,” to be assessed by a forum of each academic division. Jackson State has fallen back on “flexible quantitative released-time guidelines,” and Texas (Texas State and Codes: Education Code, 51.402–1994) is almost equally vague and permissive, in the final analysis.

15 The following state legislatures, boards, or independent study groups have considered modifying or eliminating tenure within the past two years: Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee.

---
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