

# The IOWA ACADEMIE

NEWSLETTER OF THE IOWA CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Volume 9, Number 3

Spring 2004

Greg Scholtz, Editor

## Outstanding speakers to highlight Iowa AAUP forum on academic freedom in time of crisis

As noted in the previous issue of *Iowa Academe*, the spring meeting of the Iowa Conference will be dedicated to a forum on academic freedom in a time of national crisis—with particular focus on recent government actions at Drake.



Frank

Scheduled for Saturday, March 27, at the University of Northern Iowa (see box for program details), the forum will feature three speakers with special expertise on the pertinent topics.



Scott

Drake University law professor Sally B. Frank will provide an insider's perspective on what happened at Drake in early February. Frank is advisor to the student organization that was the subject of the federal subpoena.

Professor Joan Scott will place the events at Drake in a historical perspective. Scott is chair of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure and a member of AAUP's Special Committee on Academic Freedom and National Security in a Time of Crisis.



Burgan

And Mary Burgan, the general secretary of the AAUP, will discuss how the AAUP defends faculty

rights, how it responded to the crisis at Drake, and how it will anticipate future attacks on academic freedom initiated in the name of national security.

### DINNER WITH MARY BURGAN

At 6:00 p.m., on the Friday evening prior to the conference meeting, Wartburg AAUP is hosting

a dinner and reception at the Waverly Golf and Country Club. All Iowa faculty and friends are welcome.

This will be an opportunity to mingle with Saturday's speakers and with AAUP colleagues from around the state. Mary Burgan will speak after dinner.

*continued on page 2*

### PROGRAM Spring Meeting of the Iowa Conference

Saturday, March 27, 2004

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA  
Curris Business Building (CBB), Room 125  
Corner of 27th and Minnesota Streets

- 9:00-9:20 Registration & Informal Continental Breakfast (CBB lobby)
- 9:20-9:30 Introductions and Opening Remarks
- 9:30-10:00 "AAUP and the Tradition of Academic Freedom"  
Mary Burgan, General Secretary, AAUP
- 10:00-10:30 "Chronology of Recent Events at Drake University and Their Implications for Academic Freedom and Faculty/Student Rights"  
Sally Frank, Professor of Law, Drake University
- 10:30-10:45 Breakout for Informal Discussion and Refreshments
- 10:45-11:15 "An Historical View of Academic Freedom as a Fundamental Building Block in Higher Education"  
Joan Scott, Chair, Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure; Harold F. Lindner Professor of History, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ
- 11:15-11:45 Question and Answer Session with the Speakers
- 11:45-12:00 Chapter Reports/Business
- 12:00 Noon Adjourn for Lunch

## Iowa Committee A

Greg Scholtz (chair)  
English  
Wartburg College  
Waverly, IA 50677  
319-352-8224 (office)  
319-352-2163 (home)  
greg.scholtz@wartburg.edu

Ruth Caldwell  
French  
Luther College  
Decorah, IA 52101  
563-387-1181 (office)  
563-382-4804 (home)  
caldweru@martin.luther.edu

Diane Crowder  
Modern Languages  
Cornell College  
Mt. Vernon, IA 52314  
319-895-4345 (office)  
319-895-8580 (home)  
dcrowder@cornellcollege.edu

Heimir Geirsson  
Philosophy  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50010  
515-233-8583 (home)  
geirsson@iastate.edu

Elaine Kalmar  
English  
University of Northern Iowa  
Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0502  
319-273-3849 (office)  
319-266-4402 (home)  
elaine.kalmar@uni.edu

Mearl Kilmore  
Pharmacology  
Des Moines University-  
Osteopathic Medical Center  
3200 Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, IA 50312  
515-271-1435 (office)  
515-276-8289 (home)  
mkilmore@uomhs.edu

## Need Help?

The colleagues whose names, addresses, and phone numbers are listed above are prepared to assist you. Don't hesitate to contact one of them if you encounter problems related to your academic freedom or rights to due process.

# Almost two-thirds of faculty hold contingent appointments

Newly published figures indicate that, between 1998 and 2001, the number of non-tenure-track faculty grew from 57,360 to 213,232, a one-third increase. In November, the US Department of Education released a new set of tabulations about the number and types of faculty positions in 2001. John Curtis, AAUP's director of research, has compiled some disturbing figures on contingent faculty from these data.

19.5%, part-time faculty increased by 19.1%, and full-time tenured faculty declined by 6.2%.

- The percentage of contingent faculty was 63.7% in 2001, up from 58.7% in 1998.

### NOTES

These figures are reconstructed from multiple tables released by the US Department of Education; contact John Curtis if you need exact citations.

The figure for part-time faculty probably includes a small number who have tenure; these would likely be faculty members in a phased retirement. However, even these "tenured" faculty members might have teaching assignments withdrawn on short notice

if they do not attract sufficient enrollment.

The percentages are of faculty "headcount"; the percentage of actual courses or credit hours taught by part-time faculty would likely be lower, since many part-time faculty teach only one course.

However, the figures for part-time and full-time non-tenure-track faculty are probably underestimates; these numbers are often incomplete at the institutional level.

FACULTY POSITIONS, FALL 2001 (latest figures available from US Dept. of Education)	
Full-Time Tenured Faculty	278,825 (25.0%)
Full-Time Tenure-Track (probationary)	125,811 (11.3%)
Full-time Non-tenure-track	213,232 (19.2%)
Part-Time	495,315 (44.5%)
Total	1,113,183

### HIGHLIGHTS

- The absolute number of full-time tenured faculty actually declined between 1998 and 2001, from 297,360 to 278,825. In percentage terms, this group represented 30.5% in 1998 and 25.0% in 2001.

- The most rapid growth between 1998 and 2001 came among full-time non-tenure-track faculty, increasing from 157,360 to 213,232, an increase of 35.5%. By contrast, the number of probationary faculty increased by

## Wartburg dinner with Mary Burgan

*continued from page 1*

For \$13.50 (collected at the door), diners will be able to enjoy a buffet dinner featuring roast pork loin, champagne chicken breast, wild rice, potatoes au gratin, California vegetable medley, green bean casserole, tossed salad, dinner rolls, assorted cheesecakes, and coffee (other drinks, including alcoholic beverages, will be available for purchase at the bar.)

RSVP by Monday, March 22, to Wartburg treasurer Josef Breutzmann—either by e-mailing <josef.breutzmann@wartburg.edu> or by calling 319-352-8670 and leaving a voicemail message. Please indicate how many will be in your party.

The Waverly Golf and Country Club is the municipal golf course in

the southwest quadrant of town. The address is 722 8th Street SW.

If you are coming to Waverly from the south on Hwy. 218, take exit 198, continue on 4th Street SW (Business 218) north, and turn left (west) on 5th Avenue SW (there will be a city park on the left before you reach the corner). Go west on 5th Avenue past the swimming pool and the county fairgrounds until you reach the golf course fence; then turn left (south) on 8th Street SW. The clubhouse is on top of the hill.

If you're coming from the east or west on Highway 3, drive into the center of town until you reach the intersection with 4th Street SW (Bus. 218). Turn south, drive five blocks, turn right on 5th Avenue SW, and follow the directions above.

# Faculty service expectations: how much is enough?

by James G. Andrews

Tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty members generally have significant responsibilities in all three traditional areas of faculty activity—namely teaching, scholarship or creative work (hereinafter referred to as research), and service.

Depending upon the type of institution of higher education and the particular academic unit within it, the relative effort a tenured or tenure-track faculty member normally devotes to these three areas of activity can vary considerably. For example, in a liberal arts and sciences department at a public or private research university, this allocation of effort may be something on the order of 40 percent to teaching, 40 percent to research, and 20 percent to service. The question I wish to consider here is whether, in most circumstances, 20 percent of a faculty member's effort is a reasonable expectation for academic service.

Before proceeding further, let me clarify what I am including within the scope of faculty service obligations. In what follows, I am referring to faculty service obligations as anything faculty members are generally expected to do, occasionally or routinely, that cannot be classified as either teaching or research. These service obligations include the following:

- Serving on various standing and ad hoc departmental, college, and university committees, councils, panels, commissions, task forces, etc.
- Serving as a student academic advisor and mentor.
- Serving as the faculty advisor of a student organization.
- Serving as an administrator of an academic unit.
- Serving as an advisor and mentor for new faculty members.
- Serving as a representative of the department, college, or university in various outreach activities and programs.
- Serving on various standing and ad hoc committees, councils, panels, etc., of one's professional

societies.

- Serving as an officer in one's professional society.
- Serving as an expert consultant or reviewer in response to requests from within and outside the university.
- Serving as a qualified and conscientious peer in reviewing the performance and contributions of other faculty members both within and outside the university.
- Serving as an active and effective faculty participant in establishing and maintaining an exemplary system of academic shared governance.
- Serving as an active and effective faculty participant in establishing and maintaining a learning environment where academic freedom flourishes and where due process protections are carefully observed in all personnel policies and procedures.
- Serving as a reference by writing letters of recommendation for current and former students, staff, faculty colleagues, and academic administrators.
- Serving patients and clients in medical, dental, speech, hearing, and legal aid clinics, etc., that are affiliated with the university.

In considering the question of what constitutes a reasonable allocation of a typical faculty member's effort to service activities, one must recognize initially that trying to hold all faculty members within an academic unit to any particular and precise allocation of effort is neither wise nor possible.

Faculty members are generally not supervised in the large majority of their activities, and this lack of oversight combined with the difficulties associated with keeping careful records is likely to lead to unreliable reports of effort devoted to most activities, even for faculty members with the best of intentions.

And a policy of trying to coerce all faculty members into allocating their time and energy in exactly the same proportions fails to take advantage of the normal variability not only in their aptitudes, skills, and interests, but ultimately in their

contributions, career advancement, and overall job satisfaction.

Consequently, experienced academic administrators generally regard any faculty-effort allocation norm as more of a guideline for the academic unit as a whole, rather than as a hard and fast standard for each faculty member within the unit. In fact, minor departures by individuals from the unit norm are not only tolerated but sometimes even encouraged by experienced academic administrators. And, of course, what constitutes a minor departure remains in the eye of the beholder.

The issue of approximately what percent of their overall effort faculty members should devote to service activities must also be resolved within the context of the institution's mission and of the role faculty members are expected to play in accomplishing that mission.

For the sake of specificity, let us confine our attention to a typical public or private research university, and let us assume that the overall mission of this institution involves the pursuit of knowledge, the preservation of knowledge, and the dissemination of knowledge.

Let us also assume that in an effort to accomplish this threefold mission, tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty members have significant responsibilities in all three traditional areas of faculty activity.

Finally, let us assume that the institution has a well-established and healthy shared governance system with exemplary policies and procedures that conform to those articulated by the AAUP. (See, for example, the 1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* jointly formulated by the AAUP, the Association of Governing Boards, and the American Council on Education.) Within this particular context, we seek to discover what constitutes a reasonable normal distribution of faculty effort devoted to service as opposed to efforts devoted to teaching and research.

Before addressing this question, it is useful to recall some of the priv-

*continued on page 4*

## Faculty service

*continued from page 2*

ileges and obligations that are part of the unwritten agreement or social compact that exists between the faculty as officers of the institution, on the one hand, and the institution's remaining stakeholders (e.g., the governing board, students, their parents, etc.) on the other. This compact is based on mutual acceptance of the observation that excellent and accessible higher education is required for a democratic society to survive and flourish. The compact implies that the faculty will provide excellent educational opportunities in a broad range of areas and at reasonable cost to all eligible applicants for admission. The institution's other stakeholders, with appropriate leadership from the governing board, will in turn provide the faculty with the environment and resources needed to fulfill the institution's mission and the goals and objectives of its strategic plan.

The special **privileges** that faculty members enjoy at this typical research institution include

- academic freedom in both teaching and research,
- a tenured appointment after establishing a clearly adequate record of achievement during an extended probationary period,
- the opportunity to participate actively and meaningfully in shared institutional governance, including the development, implementation, and periodic review of exemplary institutional policies and procedures that include due process protections, and
- the opportunity to have their performance reviewed, evaluated, and rewarded or sanctioned in accordance with the recommendations made by qualified internal and external peers.

The special and corresponding **obligations** that faculty members at this typical institution are expected to satisfy include

- not abusing academic freedom in teaching or research,
- establishing and maintaining a

clearly adequate record of achievement in carrying out their duties and responsibilities,

- participating actively and effectively in shared institutional governance, including the development, implementation and periodic review of exemplary institutional policies and procedures that include due process protections, and
- participating actively and effectively in the established peer review process, both within and outside the institution.

One of the very special features of the unwritten social compact that exists between the institution's faculty and its additional stakeholders is the faculty's insistence upon and the additional stakeholder's general but sometimes wavering acceptance of

- the necessity of having tenured faculty appointments as an appropriate mechanism to encourage academic freedom in teaching and research,
- the necessity of having an active and responsible peer review process as an appropriate mechanism to facilitate an informed, fair, and critical evaluation of faculty performance, and
- the need to protect the institution and its programs from the vagaries of inappropriate external oversight and control by imposing a governing board between the institution and those external groups and individuals who may wish to influence the institution's mission, current policies, procedures, strategic plan, etc.

One of the recurring criticisms leveled at the faculty is that it insists on using the peer review process to govern its members without interference from external institutional stakeholders, but fails to properly regulate and discipline its own members when they abuse the privileges and obligations of tenure, academic freedom, shared governance, due process protections, and peer review. Such criticisms are directed at the faculty's perceived failure to satisfactorily fulfill one of its many

*continued on page 5*

## Iowa Conference Executive Committee

### PRESIDENT

A. Frank Thompson (Finance)  
University of Northern Iowa  
Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0124  
319-273-2949  
frank.thompson@uni.edu

### VICE PRESIDENT

Ruth Wachtel (Anesthesia)  
University of Iowa  
College of Medicine  
Iowa City, IA 52246  
319-353-7681  
ruth-wachtel@uiowa.edu

### SECRETARY

Gail Ament (Spanish)  
Morningside College  
Sioux City, IA 51106  
712-274-5187  
ament@alpha.morningside.edu

### TREASURER

Warren Zemke (Chemistry)  
Wartburg College  
Waverly, IA 50677  
319-352-8367  
warren.zemke@wartburg.edu

### BOARD MEMBERS

Heimir Geirsson (Philosophy)  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50010  
515-236-6798  
geirsson@iastate.edu

Wayne Oberle (Economics)  
St. Ambrose University  
Davenport, IA 52803  
565-333-6102  
oberlewayne@ambrose.sau.edu

Jon Torgerson (Philosophy)  
Drake University  
Des Moines, IA 50311  
515-271-3748  
jon.torgerson@drake.edu

Jacqueline Wilkie (History)  
Luther College  
Decorah, IA 52101  
563-387-1369  
wilkieja@luther.edu

Send letters/submissions to  
**Greg Scholtz**  
English department  
Wartburg College  
Waverly, IA 50677  
-or-  
**greg.scholtz@wartburg.edu**

continued from page 4

service obligations—namely, proper oversight and regulation of the professional behavior of the members of the peer collegium.

It should also be emphasized that in a properly functioning system of shared governance (as set forth, for example, in the abovementioned *Statement on Government*) the faculty has *primary* responsibility for institutional decision-making in such fundamental areas as

- curriculum,
- subject matter and methods of instruction,
- research,
- faculty status (e.g., appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and dismissal), and
- those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.

While the first three of these five areas of primary faculty responsibility relate to the faculty's obligations in teaching and research, the last

***If the faculty fails to fulfill its service obligations ... either the faculty's service obligations will fall on the shoulders of those less well-qualified to address and respond to them, or these obligations will simply not be addressed and fulfilled.***

two areas fall squarely within the faculty's recognized service obligations, some examples of which have been identified previously.

Problems arising in the fourth area of primary faculty responsibility—those dealing with faculty status—are generally unavailable to interested external stakeholders because faculty status is properly viewed as a personnel matter and therefore rarely subject to public scrutiny. Perhaps one of the more noteworthy examples of perceived neglect in the fifth area of primary

faculty responsibility—that dealing with those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process—is the area of intercolle-

***If faculty service obligations are to be addressed and discharged in an exemplary manner, the faculty reward system must identify, recognize, and reward these service efforts.***

giate athletics, since student participation in intercollegiate athletics is clearly very closely related to the educational process of those students involved.

The point to be made here is that if there are alleged problems or abuses in either or both of these last two areas of primary faculty responsibility, the faculty has the obligation to quickly and carefully review the allegations and take appropriate action to address and remedy any shortcomings that the review brings to light.

Based on these observations, the following conclusions appear to be justified:

- In any academic unit, faculty service obligations (especially those associated with maintaining and strengthening the fundamental faculty privileges and obligations related to academic freedom, tenure, shared governance, due process, and peer review) constitute a critically important set of responsibilities that directly influence the quality and long-term success of the overall educational enterprise. Hence, strictly from the standpoint of enlightened self-interest, faculty members should be highly motivated to accept and respond quickly and effectively to their service obligations.
- Faculty members, however, are not insensitive to the faculty reward system when deciding how to allocate their effort between teaching, research and service activities. Consequently, if faculty service obligations are

to be addressed and discharged in an exemplary manner, the faculty reward system must identify, recognize, and reward these service efforts.

- Expecting faculty members to devote, on average, a very small percentage of their time (e.g., five to ten percent) to any critically important set of obligations (e.g., service) makes very little if any sense. Hence, allocating something on the order of at least 20 percent effort to such obligations, and rewarding that effort in an appropriate manner, would appear to be necessary to successfully fulfill those obligations.
- If the faculty fails to fulfill its service obligations while the institution's other stakeholders are fulfilling theirs, either the faculty's service obligations will fall on the shoulders of those less well-qual-

***The ramifications of [the faculty's] failure to fulfill its [service obligations] are likely to be extremely serious and potentially disastrous for the long-term best interests of the institution, its academic programs, and all of its stakeholders.***

ified to address and respond to them, or these obligations will simply not be addressed and fulfilled. In either instance, the unwritten social compact between the institution's faculty and its additional stakeholders will have been abrogated unilaterally by the faculty, and the ramifications of that failure to fulfill its social-compact commitments are likely to be extremely serious and potentially disastrous for the long-term best interests of the institution, its academic programs, and all of its stakeholders.

*James G. Andrews, professor emeritus (mechanical engineering) at the University of Iowa, is a long-time AAUP leader on both the state and chapter levels.*

#

## Yes! I want to join the AAUP

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Last First Middle

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Academic Field: \_\_\_\_\_

Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

Preferred Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Tenured?  Yes  No

Daytime Telephone: ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail: \_\_\_\_\_

### Please choose appropriate membership category:

Tenured Faculty (\$151)

Administrator or Associate Member (\$114)

Non-Tenured Faculty (\$76)

Public Member (\$114)

Part-time Faculty (\$38)

Joint Member (\$76)

Graduate Student (\$10)

(i.e. spouse already belongs)

***Dues include National and Iowa Conference AAUP membership.***

**Note:** National dues are tax deductible as a charitable contribution except for the \$30.00 attributable to *Academe*.

Cut out and return with check, payable to **AAUP**, or credit card information to:  
AAUP, P.O. Box 96132, Washington, D.C. 20077-7020

The Iowa Conference of the American Association of University Professors

Iowa Academe  
Department of English  
Wartburg College  
100 Wartburg Blvd.  
Waverly, Iowa 50677

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Permit No. 46  
Waverly, IA 50677